

“We’re Building Frameworks”: Administrator and Educator Perspectives on Implementing a Dual Language Pre-K Program to Include All Students

KATHLEEN M. FARRAND

MEGAN T. DEEG

Arizona State University

SULTAN KILINC

Syracuse University

MICHAEL KELLEY

Arizona State University

ABSTRACT

In this study, one Southwestern public school district strives to implement a Dual Language (DL) for All Pre-K program that includes students with disabilities. The Arizona Revised Statute § 15-751-755 currently restricts K-12 students who speak a language other than English from entering DL programs until they are deemed English proficient. There are no specific standards for the implementation of DL in Pre-K used within the district or state, nor specific standards for the implementation of DL with students with disabilities. This article shares (a) the case of one urban school district implementing a DL Pre-K program for All students for the first time by unpacking the experiences of teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators, (b) the role of Division of Early Childhood (DEC) Recommended Practices in the implementation and revision of the program, and (c) implications for the future of inclusive DL Pre-K programming. Our research question is how do administrator and educator discourses demonstrate DL leadership in the implementation of programming for culturally and linguistically diverse learners with disabilities? We use the DEC Recommended Practices (2014) for our data analysis of focus groups with administrators and educators because the DEC Recommended Practices include guidance for implementing effective practices for early childhood students with disabilities who are DL learners. The findings suggest that there are five key components of the DEC Recommended Practices (leadership, families, instruction, teaming and collaboration, and environment) that contribute to a successful DL program. Recommendations are made for continued practices to support students and their families, as well as educators and district staff, as essential when designing instruction and programs for DL Pre-K programs.

Many people of diverse language and cultural backgrounds call Arizona home. Still, languages other than English are not regularly embraced in classrooms across Arizona. Restrictive language

policies at all levels (i.e., federal, state, and local) often limit when and how languages other than English can be used. For example, in 2000, Arizona passed Proposition 203 (2000) (now Arizona

Revised Statute § 15-751-755), more commonly referred to as Arizona's English-only law. This statute restricts the eligibility of K-12 students who speak a home language other than English from entering a dual language (DL) program until they are deemed English proficient by the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment, are older than 10 years, or have a disability. Although this statute does not specifically address DL in pre-K, many districts have been fearful to incorporate DL programs. At a time when many districts across Arizona have been decreasing and/or eliminating DL programming, one Southwestern public school district is embracing the benefits of DL learning and expanding its established K-6 Spanish/English DL program to include all (i.e., English language learners, students with special needs/disabilities, students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, and general education students) pre-K students. In addition to the expansion of DL to pre-K, the district incorporated inclusive DL classrooms designed to support students with disabilities alongside their peers in general education. This study examines the discourses of administrators and educators (i.e., teachers and paraprofessionals) who were implementing DL Pre-K for All students for the first time. Specifically, we explore how their discourses align with the Division of Early Childhood (DEC) Recommended Practices (2014) as well as demonstrate DL leadership in supporting culturally and linguistically diverse learners with disabilities.

To better understand the discourses of administrators and educators in this context, we draw upon Ruiz's (1984) seminal work in language planning that proposes three orientations people take toward language: language-as-a-problem, language-as-a-right, and language-as-a-resource. Language-as-a-problem concentrates on a person's lack of proficiency in the dominant language and works to fix this problem—often by forcing this person to learn the dominant language as quickly as possible. Language-as-a-right, on the other hand, focuses on the right of a person to use and maintain their heritage language. Finally, language-as-a-resource emphasizes the utility of various forms of language in different contexts and how languages benefit society. Unfortunately, rather than viewing language-as-a-right and as-a-resource, the deficit orientation of language-as-a-problem circulates

widely within the sociopolitical climate in Arizona (Heineke, 2016). These deficit discourses and their impact are evidenced in Arizona Revised Statute § 15-751-755 as well as in the language ideologies of some Arizona voters (cf. Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2011). Thus, “[e]ducation language policies often reflect social and political perspectives related to race, class, and immigration status [as well as language use] rather than on recommendations from education research” (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2018, p. 53).

Education research recommends DL education (DLE) as an effective instructional method for closing achievement gaps (Collier & Thomas, 2004; Lindholm-Leary, 2016) as well as improving language arts scores (Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Steele et al., 2017) and cognitive functioning (Barac, Bialystok, Castro, & Sanchez, 2014). Moreover, DLE draws upon asset-based pluralist views of language rather than the assimilationist views (de Jong, 2013) represented in many Arizona state-level education language policies. Consequently, some district leaders may choose to navigate these policies and find ways to implement DL because DLE benefits the social and academic outcomes for all student subgroups and honors the diversity of the district community (Kotok & DeMatthews, 2018). However, the quality of DL implementation affects whether DLE will help address achievement gaps (Li, Steele, Slater, Bacon, & Miller, 2016). Li et al. (2016) found effective teaching practices which supported implementation included consistently using sheltered instructional strategies (e.g., building background, comprehensible input, interaction, and SIOP Model; Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2013) as part of instruction and following district guidelines for language use (e.g., using Spanish on Spanish days).

In the present study, the participating district aimed to counter hegemonic state-level policies through the implementation of a DL Pre-K for All program which honors language-as-a-right and as-a-resource. Nonetheless, even the best laid plans can fall apart if not well-articulated to those educators implementing them on the ground. A recent mixed methods study of the language ideologies of pre-K DL educators in Arizona revealed although most educators held pro-multilingual beliefs, in line with language-as-a-right and as-a-resource, they exhibited concerns related to the practical and

logistical nature of implementing DL (Bernstein et al., 2018). Thus, in this study, we examine the discourses of administrators in addition to educators to better understand the practical and logistical nature of DL implementation, specifically in regard to educating culturally and linguistically diverse learners with disabilities. Therefore, we ask the following question:

How do administrator and educator discourses demonstrate DL leadership in the implementation of programming for culturally and linguistically diverse learners with disabilities?

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To effectively unpack the discourses of administrators and educators implementing DL Pre-K for All, we reviewed literature related to the use of DL for students with disabilities as well as DL leadership frameworks which support DL implementation.

DL FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Despite the many benefits of DL programming aforementioned, educators (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, Palmer, & Henderson, 2015), support services staff (Kay-Raining Bird, Lamond, & Holden, 2012; Ware, Lye, & Kyffin, 2015), and parents (Dai, Burke, Naigles, Eigsti, & Fein, 2018; Hambly & Fombonne, 2012) share concerns about the appropriateness of the DL model for serving all students which can perpetuate fears of a-lingualism (i.e., lacking proficiency in any language), further confusion, and language delays (Cheatham & Barnett, 2017). These fears mark deficit perspectives of DL Learners (DLLs) (MacSwan, 2013) and indicate a language-as-a-problem orientation (Ruiz, 1984) because people tend to focus on what students cannot do with language rather than what they can. Although DLLs may go through an initial silent period in the beginning stages of learning a new language, there is no reason to fear a-lingualism. In fact, research suggests students with disabilities can successfully learn more than one language without adverse effects (Kay-Raining Bird, Geneese, & Verhoeven, 2016; Cheatham & Barnett, 2017; Dai et al., 2018). However, students with disabilities

need sufficient access to quality DL programming and inclusive environments to support their bilingual development (Raining Bird et al., 2016; Kay-Raining Bird, Trudeau, & Sutton, 2016) because the amount of exposure to a language a DLL with disabilities receives predicts future language skills (Gonzalez-Barrero & Nadig, 2018).

Thus, in this study, we aim “to dispel popular notions that equate code-switching with confusion, ‘alingualism,’ [and] imperfect acquisition” (Lipski, 2014, p. 24) and to show DLLs with disabilities can successfully learn two languages and succeed academically. Researchers have determined that there is no significant difference in the achievement of DLLs with disabilities and their monolingual peers (Kohnert, 2010; Cheatham, Santos, & Kerkutluoglu, 2012; Dai et al., 2018). In many cases, bilingual students with disabilities actually out-perform their monolingual peers (Cheatham et al., 2012). Furthermore, there is no evidence to support that learning two or more languages will cause additional language delays in students with disabilities (Kay-Raining Bird et al., 2005; Feltmate & Kay-Raining Bird, 2008; Gutierrez-Clellen, Simon-Cerejido, & Wagner, 2008; Cheatham & Barnett, 2017). To address fears of a-lingualism and other concerns, educators, as well as support services staff and parents, need more training and resources to support their understanding of best practices in language education (Hammer, Detwiler, Detwiler, Blood, & Qualls, 2004; Rinaldi & Samson, 2008; Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2015).

Not surprisingly, educators cite having insufficient training in appropriate methods for supporting DLLs with disabilities as a main concern (Rinaldi & Samson, 2008; Paneque & Rodriguez, 2009). Lack of training and expertise have been attributed to an over identification of DLLs who are learning English as an additional language in special education because educators struggle to distinguish difference from disability (Klinger & Harry, 2006; Lesaux, 2006; Rinaldi & Samson, 2009; Becker & Deris, 2019). As a result, minoritized populations, including DLLs, are often overrepresented in special education (Strand & Lindsay, 2009; Becker & Deris, 2019). Research suggests additional educator training in bilingual issues in special education including distinguishing difference from disability, understanding the second language acquisition

process, and developing cultural competency should be encouraged (Paneque & Rodriguez, 2009; Cheatham & Barnett, 2017).

DL LEADERSHIP

Superintendents (DeMatthews, Izquierdo, & Knight, 2017), principals (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2018a, 2018b; DeMatthews, Izquierdo, & Kotok, 2019), and other school or district-level leaders (Morita-Mullaney, 2019a, 2019b) play an important role in deciding on and implementing inclusive DL programming to benefit students. When school and district leaders draw upon theories of social justice leadership, they are better able to implement effective DL programming because social justice leaders focus on developing inclusive practices, challenge deficit perspectives, engage the community and other stakeholders, and provide training and professional development (PD) to foster the growth of their teachers and staff (DeMatthews et al., 2017; DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2018a). Moreover, according to DeMatthews and Izquierdo's (2018a) proposed DL social justice leadership framework, DL social justice leaders:

- dialogue with stakeholders to assure programming is responsive to the needs of the community,
- recognize that a program cannot be “pre-packaged” and must evolve based on the needs of the community,
- create and implement plans to increase the school's capacity to support DL,
- evaluate DL programming to ensure on-going improvement, and
- share finding with stakeholders and enlist their feedback.

THE STUDY

In this case study, we use the DEC Recommended Practices to examine the implementation of one urban school district's DL program for all students in pre-K. The DEC is a special interest division of the Council for Exceptional Children focused on the education of students with disabilities in early childhood settings. Because there are no specific standards used for the implementation of DL in

pre-K within this district, nor specific standards for the implementation of DL with students with disabilities, we used the DEC Recommended Practices because they include guidance for implementing effective practices for early childhood students with disabilities who are DLLs. The DEC Recommended Practices “provide guidance to practitioners and families about the effective ways to improve the learning outcomes and promote the development of young children birth through age 5, who have or are at-risk for developmental delays or disabilities” (DEC Recommended Practices Commission, 2014, p. 1). In addition, we draw upon DL social justice leadership frameworks to understand the role of various district and school leaders in planning, implementing, evaluating, and sustaining DL programming. Specifically, we investigate how the discourses of administrators and educators in the district demonstrate elements of DL social justice leadership. Using these practices and frameworks to guide our investigation, the study presented in this article explicates (a) the case of one urban school district implementing a DL Pre-K program for all students for the first time by unpacking the discourses of administrators and educators, (b) the role of DEC Recommended Practices and DL leadership in the implementation and revision of the program, and (c) implications for the future of inclusive DL pre-K programming.

METHODS AND DATA ANALYSIS

This article comes from year one of a 4-year study examining DLL in nine pre-K classrooms where the educators participated in the Early Years Educators at Play (EYEPlay) PD program. The EYEPlay PD program is an evidence-based PD approach, which supports early childhood educators in using drama strategies as tools to develop children's English and Spanish literacy skills. The EYEPlay program aims to cultivate inclusive classroom environments that foster learning for all students, including students with disabilities.

OVERVIEW OF THE EYEPLAY DLL PD PROGRAM

The EYEPlay DLL PD program guides pre-K teachers and paraprofessionals in incorporating

drama strategies in their DL literacy contexts. A professional teaching artist is paired with a teacher to scaffold learning and aide in the application of new drama tools following the “I do (model lesson), we do (team lesson), and you do (solo lesson)” unit structure; PD includes an in-service as well as planning and reflection sessions. During these sessions, a drama strategy is purposefully matched with one or two curricular objectives called drama frames. In year one, three drama strategies, pantomime, character development, and group story building are incorporated to enhance receptive language and key ideas and details, expressive language and point of view, and problem-solving (Kilinc et al., 2017). Every lesson promotes the use of language variety to support young DLLs’ language and literacy development in English and Spanish.

SCHOOL DISTRICT

The urban public school district in this study has a 19-year history of DL in grades K-6, but for the 2016–2017 school year, district personnel decided to expand the program to include pre-K DL programming for all students, including pre-K DL students in inclusive special education classrooms. During the first year of the expanded program, the district served 132 pre-K students, ages 3.5–5 years old, in five general education classrooms (73% of the students) and four inclusive half-day special education classrooms (27% of the students). Seventy-three students were male and 59 were female. Students’ ethnicities were reported as Hispanic (48%), White (25%), African-American (14%), Asian-American (6%), Native-American (2%), and unknown (5%). Students’ primary home languages were English (70%); Spanish (22%); Amharic (3%); Arabic (1%); Burmese (1%); Hindi (1%); Kru, Ibo, and Yoruba (1%); and Nepali (1%). Ninety-five percent of the students were eligible for free or reduced price lunch.

PARTICIPANTS

Educators. Teachers and paraprofessionals involved in the district’s DL Pre-K program were invited to participate in focus groups by signing the institutional review board approved consent forms. In-

cluded in the focus groups were three lead teachers who were bilingual in both Spanish and English, four lead teachers who were monolingual English speakers, and six paraprofessionals who were proficient in Spanish. In addition, four of the paraprofessionals acted as lead Spanish teachers to fulfill the Spanish portion of the implemented 50/50 DL immersion model. All teachers and paraprofessionals were female spanning ages 21 to 68. They self-identified as White ($n = 5$) and Hispanic ($n = 8$). Their teaching experience ranged from 0 to 25 years. They held bachelor’s degrees ($n = 4$), master’s degrees ($n = 2$), associate’s degrees ($n = 4$), a high school diploma ($n = 1$), a child development Associate credential ($n = 1$), and some college-level coursework ($n = 1$).

Administrators. Members of the school district’s administrative team actively involved in the DL program were invited to participate in one end-of-year focus group. The members of the leadership team who participated included the outgoing superintendent, the incoming superintendent (who at the time was an elementary school principal in the same school district that had participating pre-K classrooms), the director of student services, and the language acquisition and curriculum specialist.

DATA COLLECTION

The data for this study come from focus groups with the district’s pre-K DL teachers and paraprofessionals, and with the district’s leadership team. The teacher and paraprofessional focus groups emphasized the lived experiences of implementing DL and drama strategies at three points throughout the school year: fall, winter, and spring. However, the administrator end-of-year focus group reflected on the triumphs and challenges of the district’s first year implementing DL programming for all pre-K students, including specific questions considering students with disabilities (e.g., Are any of your current students enrolled in your K-8 DL program identified as having a disability? Are there plans to offer DL to students with disabilities who continue in your district after pre-K?).

The teacher and paraprofessional focus groups consisted of questions across three time points to both capture the teachers’ evolving experiences

of implementing DL and drama strategies and to learn any emerging new experiences and perspectives. Different from the winter and spring time points, at the fall focus groups, we initiated questions related to teachers' backgrounds, their previous experiences in drama (e.g., Tell us about any specialized training and any background you have in drama; Tell us what experiences you have using drama in your classroom setting), their current DLE practices (e.g., What does DLL look like in your classroom?; How do you divide responsibilities during different language times in your classroom?), their approaches to literacy (e.g., Tell us about how you approach the teaching of literacy), their perceptions of their students (e.g. What are your first impressions of the students in your classroom?), their possible challenges (e.g., What are some unique challenges that you have in your classroom?), their anticipation of the PD program (e.g., What are your expectations or anticipations of this PD program?), and their inclusive education practices (e.g., What strategies do you use to make your classroom as inclusive as possible for your children?). The mid-year focus group was structured into two domains—drama and DLE—with some questions that investigated the relationship between inclusive education and drama and DLE (e.g., How have the drama strategies helped you to create an inclusive DL learning environment for your children?). Questions related to drama focused on the PD, the relationship between drama and literacy (e.g., How is the drama helping you teach for specific literacy outcomes in your DL classrooms?) and drama and DL (e.g., What new tools have you as individuals or as teaching teams gained from this experience? Tell us about how these tools are effective in the DL classrooms). With the DL questions, we aimed to learn how the teachers were doing in terms of successes and challenges of implementing DLE and the division of responsibilities during different language time. The spring focus groups were more of a follow-up including some of the mid-term questions and some new ones to explore the impact of drama and DL on students (e.g., What, if any, changes have you noted in the culture or climate of your classroom?; As you think back over the year, describe one or two "AAHAA" moments or positive take-aways that your children demonstrated while being

a part of the EYEPlay experience in the DL environment?).

The teachers and paraprofessionals were together in the fall focus group; whereas, we purposefully separated the teachers and paraprofessionals into separate focus groups at the mid-and end-of-year focus groups to decrease the power dynamics between them and to give more voice to the paraprofessionals. Each focus group lasted for approximately one hour.

DATA ANALYSIS

Case study analysis. Case study analysis, a form of qualitative analysis, was used to examine and explain how the discourses of administrators and educators in one school district implementing an inclusive DL Pre-K program aligned with the DEC Recommended Practices. Case studies provide a way for researchers to discuss how people make meaning of their lives in a particular environment (Dyson & Genishi, 2005). For this case study, data from focus groups with district administrators, school administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals involved in the implementation of the program were analyzed. Transcripts from three teacher and paraprofessional focus groups throughout the first year of implementation, fall, winter, and spring, were analyzed. Through studying the focus group data from year one of implementation, researchers wanted to gain insight into factors that inform the implementation of the DEC Recommended Practices for an inclusive DL Pre-K program for all students in one urban public school district. Because DEC practices are designed to support learning outcomes for young children with disabilities, the authors hoped to see alignment among the DEC Recommended Practice and the implementation of the DL program.

Administrator focus group. Qualitative data analysis was used to analyze a transcription of an audio recording of the focus group with the leadership team. A dual qualitative coding procedure was applied to the transcripts. This procedure allowed the authors to view the data through multiple lenses to examine how the district incorporated DEC Recommended Practices within their first year implementing DL pre-K programming. To begin the

analysis process, the first author thematically coded the transcript using bottom-up coding. A combination of open coding followed by subsequent rounds of axial coding was used to identify salient themes within the transcript data.

Then, authors 1 & 2 used a top-down coding process as a second approach to further analyze the transcription. This method allowed the authors to better understand how the implementation of this Pre-K DL program created opportunities for the district to incorporate the DEC Recommended Practices in authentic ways. The analysis compared the parent codes from the bottom-up coding procedure with the DEC Recommended Practices and identified five of the DEC Recommended Practices (leadership, families, instruction, teaming and collaboration, and environment) that aligned with the parent codes. This integrated analysis provided the authors with an approach for determining whether the parent codes were sufficient to understand how the district provides instruction to young children with disabilities who also are DLLs, in inclusive learning environments. Parent codes were applied to the transcript for multiple reasons including implementing, not implementing, or reflecting upon practices aligned with DEC recommendations. The authors individually read through the transcripts and marked the parent code or codes that best represented the discussion articulated in the transcripts. Upon completion, the authors met and reviewed their codes. The authors initially agreed on 111/129 (86%) of their codes and through the review process came to 100% agreement on the remaining codes. Upon agreement on the parent codes, the authors then identified the child codes (leadership 1–14, families 1–10, instruction 1–13, teaming and collaboration 1–5, and environment 1–6) using the numbered recommended practices for five parent codes of the DEC Recommended Practices. In many instances, multiple parent codes and child codes were identified as being representative of the data being analyzed. References to specific codes are presented in the analysis. These codes are elaborated upon in the DEC Recommended Practices (see DEC Recommended Practices Commission, 2014).

Teacher focus group. Qualitative data analysis was also used to analyze the audio transcriptions

of each of the focus groups with the teachers and paraprofessionals. The authors began by pulling excerpts from the transcripts that included discussions of inclusive classrooms before starting the top-down coding procedure. Although the authors initially used the same dual qualitative coding procedure applied to the administrator focus group transcription, it became evident that families and environments were not adequately represented in the data from the teacher focus groups because of the nature of the questions. These focus groups focused primarily on the instructional aspects of implementing DL and drama for the first time. Although families and environments are important to discuss, because of the limited references to these areas in the teacher focus groups, the authors decided to focus on coding for the remaining three DEC Recommended Practices (i.e., leadership, instruction, and teaming & collaboration) instead. Again, parent codes were applied to the transcripts when teachers mentioned a practice that aligned with DEC Recommended Practices or needed improvement.

First, the authors thematically coded the transcriptions to identify excerpts in which participants discuss the DL program, students with disabilities, students with culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, or district PD. Next, the authors individually coded these excerpts for three of the DEC Recommended Practices: leadership, instruction, and teaming and collaboration. The analysis revealed many instances (123) of leadership, instruction, and teaming and collaboration. The authors initially agreed on 105/123 (85.37%) of codes and worked to come to 100% agreement on the remaining codes. Upon agreement on the parent codes, the authors then identified the child codes (leadership 1–14, instruction 1–13, and teaming and collaboration 1–5) using the numbered recommended practices for three parent codes connected to the DEC Recommended Practices (i.e., leadership, instruction, and teaming and collaboration).

BOTTOM-UP CODING

Bottom-up coding provided a method for analyzing the successes, challenges, new learning, goals, assumptions, and suggestions referenced in the focus group. These six themes became the parent codes which the authors then placed into five DEC

Recommended Practices categories: leadership, families, instruction, teaming and collaboration, and environment. Within these larger codes, additional child codes were constructed such as teacher factors (e.g., retention, recruitment, beliefs, and qualifications), district factors (e.g., communication, compensation, and sustainability), and policy factors (e.g., state ratings, language policy, and individual needs of students with disabilities). When the bottom-up codes were compared with the top-down codes, the authors found that the codes were closely aligned. Although the codes were not the same, the ideas were comparable. Sampling of the alignment between the bottom-up codes and the top-down codes can be found in Table 1.

TOP-DOWN CODING

For the top-down coding, the authors found that five DEC Recommended Practices were appro-

priate in describing the teacher and administrators' statements from the focus groups in which the participants reflected on the triumphs and challenges from their first year implementing an inclusive DL Pre-K program. See Table 2 for a breakdown of the parent and child codes from the DEC Recommended Practices that aligned with the transcript data for the administrators and Table 3 for the teachers. After a brief overview of each parent code, the authors highlight quotations that represent examples of how parent and child codes were applied to the data. In some instances, multiple parent and child codes were applied to the same data point. The parent codes appear in all caps after each quotation; child codes are shown in bold immediately after the parent code. This same procedure of parent and child codes will be used to label data in this section of the article for five DEC Recommended Practices. Specific examples of these codes will be described in more detail in the following sections.

Table 1

Alignment between Bottom-up and Top-down Coding, Examples

Bottom-up Codes	Top-down Codes
Professional Development: Continued PD for teachers before implementation and throughout about DL teaching and learning.	Leadership: L9. Leaders develop and implement an evidence-based PD system or approach that provides practitioners a variety of supports to ensure they have the knowledge and skills needed to implement the DEC Recommended Practices.
Family collaboration: Families of students with disabilities are given information to participate in DL program and are part of decision-making process for their child's education.	Families: F2. Practitioners provide the family with up-to-date, comprehensive, and unbiased information in a way that the family can understand and use to make informed choices and decisions.
Instructional strategies: Teachers identify benefits of strategies from PD to implement with DL program.	Instruction: INS12. Practitioners use and adapt specific instructional strategies that are effective for DLLs when teaching English to children with disabilities.
Teaming of educators: Teachers and paraprofessionals who can collaborate, work together, and have open communication.	Teaming & Collaboration: TC3. Practitioners use communication and group facilitation strategies to enhance team functioning and interpersonal relationships with and among team members.
Learning environment: Instruction is provided for each student in an environment that best meets the individual child's needs.	Environment: E1. Practitioners provide services and supports in natural and inclusive environments during daily routines and activities to promote the child's access to and participation in learning experiences.

Table 2

Top-down Coding Breakdown of Leadership Focus Group Using Parent Codes and Child Codes from the DEC Recommended Practices

Parent Codes	Number of Occurrences of Parent Codes	Child Codes	Number of Occurrences of Child Codes		
Leadership	45	L1	33		
		L3	23		
		L4	1		
		L6	7		
		L7	1		
		L8	4		
		L9	5		
		L10	2		
		L11	1		
		L12	4		
		L13	23		
		Families	20	F1	14
				F2	20
F3	8				
F4	10				
F6	10				
F8	16				
F9	1				
Instruction	24			INS1	2
				INS2	6
		INS3	4		
		INS4	8		
		INS5	10		
		INS6	10		
		INS10	3		
		INS11	17		
		INS12	17		
		INS13	3		
		Teaming and collaboration	32	TC1	12
				TC2	16
				TC3	24
TC4	1				
Environment	8	E1	7		
		E3	6		

Leadership. *Leadership* focuses on the policies, procedures, and support systems that state and local leadership, such as administrators, provide educators to aid in the implementation of DEC Recommended Practices (DEC Recommended Practices Commission, 2014).

Families. *Family* addresses three key components: “family-centered practices,” “family capacity-

building practices,” and “family and professional collaboration” (DEC Recommended Practices Commission, 2014, p. 10).

Instruction. According to the DEC Recommended Practices Commission (2014), *instruction* refers to the implementation of effective instructional practices and strategies to meet the diverse learning needs of students.

Table 3

Top-down Coding Breakdown of Teacher Focus Groups Using Parent Codes and Child Codes from the DEC Recommended Practices

Parent Codes	Number of Occurrences		Number of Occurrences of Child Codes
	of Parent Codes	Child Codes	
Leadership	10	L1	8
		L3	1
		L9	3
Instruction	90	INS1	2
		INS2	2
		INS3	1
		INS4	63
		INS5	23
		INS6	39
		INS7	3
		INS10	28
		INS11	76
		INS12	75
Teaming and collaboration	23	INS13	5
		TC3	23

Teaming and collaboration. *Teaming and collaboration* emphasizes the importance of adults working together to deliver effective and efficient programming to students (DEC Recommended Practices Commission, 2014).

Environment. This practice, *environment*, addresses the physical, social, and temporal environmental needs of individual students and emphasizes the importance of environment in student learning (DEC Recommended Practices Commission, 2014).

CASE STUDY FINDINGS

Leadership. The DEC Recommended Practice for *leadership* was applied as a parent code 45 times in the administrator focus group and 10 times in the teacher focus groups. The recommended practice L1, “Leaders create a culture and climate in which practitioners feel a sense of belonging and want to support the organization’s missions and goals” (DEC Recommended Practices Commission, 2014, p. 6) was the child code applied the most in the leadership focus group ($n = 33$) and the teacher focus group ($n = 8$). For example, the superintendent demonstrated leadership by stating:

To be able to build that teaching capacity, that learning capacity as a district and not put labels on people. You know, you’re the custodian. I mean you are this now, this is my seed, but this doesn’t define me, doesn’t define my potential. It defines my job at this point. [LEADERSHIP (L1)]

In this excerpt, the superintendent demonstrates her commitment to building a school culture in which all staff can feel a commitment to the district’s mission to provide quality programming to students while also thinking creatively about increasing staff capacity. Although the quote provides insight into how the district might continue to support staff in building capacity, interviews also revealed challenges in implementing a new DL Pre-K program when staff members are not yet prepared to handle the demands of DL implementation. With regards to staffing, the Director of Student Services identified that finding certified teachers that were bilingual was difficult. “Another piece that I think was HUGE [emphasis added]; finding qualified people. And then on top of it...it is probably THE [emphasis added] most difficult certification to get, because now we are talking special education, as well as early childhood.” [LEADERSHIP (L1)]

The district's drive to build staff capacity could potentially be in response to this concern about the lack of bilingual teachers.

Families. The DEC Recommended Practice for *families* was applied as a parent code 20 times in the administrator focus group. The majority of the child codes ($n = 20$) were for recommended practice F2, "Practitioners provide the family with up-to-date, comprehensive and unbiased information in a way that the family can understand and use to make informed choices and decisions" (DEC Recommended Practices Commission, 2014, p. 10). During the focus group, the superintendent reflected on the information the district provided to families during the first year of implementation. The superintendent suggested:

When a child comes in to be evaluated for the developmental preschool, the conversations need to begin right then. "Here are the options in our district. We strongly encourage you to consider this [DL] option." I think that dealing with parents who have children identified with a disability early on, I think more than anything, what I've heard from those parents is always wanting their child to be included as normal as possible...this [the ability of all students to participate in the DL program] is an option for parents and they are part of the conversation from the beginning. [FAMILIES (F1, F2, F3, F4, F8)]

Here, the superintendent examines the current practices for informing parents about the DL program and recognizes that families should be involved in making programming decisions for their child/children.

Instruction. The DEC Recommended Practice for *instruction* was applied as a parent code 24 times in the administrator focus group and 90 times in the teacher focus groups. The recommended practices INS11 and INS12 were the child codes ($n = 17$ for administrators and $n = 76$; $n = 75$ for teachers) used the most. INS11 reads, "Practitioners provide instructional support for young children with disabilities who are DLLs to assist them in learning English and in continuing to develop skills through the use of their home language" (DEC Recommended Practices Commission, 2014, p. 13).

INS12 states, "Practitioners use and adapt specific instructional strategies that are effective for DLLs when teaching English to children with disabilities" (p. 13). Multiple teachers expressed the importance of using drama techniques and multiple modes of response during instruction to support students in the language learning process. "I think that for the developmental pre-K, it helps get the other kids that aren't vocal involved." [INSTRUCTION (INS 4, 11, 12)] Another teacher said:

I think that any time you're trying to teach a second language, being able to act out or show pictures or add anything that will help the kids remember or cement it as singing a song or...anything that helps to cement that DL or vocabulary words. If you're acting out dig, if you're acting out in Spanish and English, then that helps them to remember some of the vocabulary words better [INSTRUCTION (INS 4, 6, 11, 12)]

A third teacher expressed:

I think my other student that also has a speech IEP, but she's very nonverbal, drama time gives her an opportunity to participate in the lessons and be active without being fearful or using her voice. Just getting to use her body and show her understanding through her actions. [INSTRUCTION (INS 4, 6, 11, 12)]

Teachers even acknowledge the excitement of the students as they learn a new language and incorporate multiple modes of response. They also demonstrate their understanding of the language learning process by recognizing that speaking is not the only way to express knowledge of content and language. "The kids love it. The ones who are nonverbal, just to see them open up and then they're getting receptive language and they're doing the motions, so you know they're getting it." [INSTRUCTION (INS 5, 6, 11, 12)]

Teachers also reflected on their changing view of DL and acknowledged the misconceptions they had at the beginning of implementation.

I think for a while I held onto that my kids couldn't get all the letters that I wanted, and all the components that I wanted them to take to kindergarten if I was splitting my time in that 50/50 [English Spanish Language model] or that they would learn something in Spanish and I wouldn't explain it to them in English

and they wouldn't get it and they wouldn't be ready for kindergarten, and now looking at all the data at the end of it, our students have learned everything, if not far exceeding, all expectations for kinder, except for, you know, a couple students. [INSTRUCTION (INS 3, 11, 12)]

Fears of a-lingualism were reevaluated. "And I think the ones that used to not talk, they're actually talking more now, both in Spanish and English." [INSTRUCTION (INS11, 12)]

Teaming and collaboration. The DEC Recommended Practice for *teaming and collaboration* was applied as a parent code 32 times in the administrator focus group and 46 times in the teacher focus group. The child code for TC3, "Practitioners use communication and group facilitation strategies to enhance team functioning and interpersonal relationships with and among team members" (DEC Recommended Practices Commission, 2014, p. 15), was used the most in both administrator ($n = 24$) and teacher ($n = 23$) focus groups. As mentioned earlier, although teachers and administrators spoke highly of many aspects of the DL program, implementation was not without some growing pains. The teaming and collaboration among lead teachers and paraprofessionals was often presented as a challenge. Most of the lead teachers were not bilingual, so the expectation was that lead teachers and paraprofessionals would co-teach and collaborate to support the implementation of teaching in two languages for the DL Pre-K program. According to the Director of Student Services:

The problem has come where we've asked paraprofessionals to take over the Spanish speaking portion on the days that they do Spanish, and that's been difficult for some of the teachers to let go of the fact that they have the teaching certificate and they are the teachers and they are turning over 50% of the classroom instruction to a Spanish speaker. So, I think THAT [emphasis added] has been one of the bigger challenges we've faced. [TEAMING & COLLABORATION (TC3)].

This change placed teachers and paraprofessionals into new roles which disrupted how their teams functioned previously. Some teachers identified that their lack of expertise in speaking Spanish

did not allow them to provide full instructional support to their students and paraprofessional during the Spanish time. One teacher commented, "It's hard for me because I'm not a native Spanish speaker, and then sometimes I can't think of what I have to do." [INSTRUCTION (INS 4, 11, 12)]

Still, teachers expressed the importance of openness to DL and willingness to learn from paraprofessionals who instruct in Spanish for half of the day.

In our classroom, she [the paraprofessional] does circle time in Spanish because I speak very little Spanish. I take the role of the assistant and I sit by the students who are more...I'm in the developmental pre-K so the students have more higher needs. I work with them. We just reverse roles. [TEAMING AND COLLABORATION (TC 3); INSTRUCTION (INS 10, 11, 12)]

These examples demonstrate that when teachers and paraprofessionals are willing to collaborate they can each draw on their individual strengths to best meet the needs of the students in the DL program.

Environment. *Environment* was the DEC Recommended Practice parent code applied the least amount of times ($n = 8$) in the administrator focus group. The child code E1, "Practitioners provide services and supports in natural and inclusive environments during daily routines and activities to promote the child's access to and participation in learning experiences" (DEC Recommended Practices Commission, 2014, p. 9) was used the most ($n = 7$). During the focus group, the superintendent emphasized the importance of reflecting on the environmental needs of individual students.

Individually let's look at these children [special education students]...Is this the best environment for that child, knowing what we know about THIS [emphasis added by speaker] environment? And if we can say it is, great, if we can't then we're going to be honest with the parents saying this is how your child learns best. This is the environment...So it's always going back to that child and not just arbitrarily putting a barrier up. [ENVIRONMENT (E1, E3); FAMILIES (F2, F6, F8); TEAMING & COLLABORATION (TC1, TC2); LEADERSHIP (L1, L3, L13); INSTRUCTION (INS2)]

This quotation promotes the need for flexibility in creating environments to meet the individual needs of students and families while also ensuring students with disabilities have access to the district's DL programming. This example also demonstrates how multiple codes might be applied to as single quote. Although we had single parent code examples for the other parent codes, we did not have any quotes that focused on environment that did not include other codes.

Multicodes. Many of the focus group discussions included references to several parent codes at the same time. The findings demonstrated that the teaching, learning, and supports being implemented for the DL inclusive program by the teachers and leadership team was not happening in isolation. The members of the school district were working together for the success of their students and the new inclusive DL Pre-K program. The multiple codes for sections of data were a reflection of their efforts on a combination of important factors, leadership, families, instruction, environment, and teaming and collaboration, which were necessary for the success of the program and students. Here, some of these quotes and a vignette are described further to show how multiple parent codes were applied to a single excerpt. The first multicode quotation provides a brief synopsis of the leadership team's goals and aspirations in implementing pre-K DL programming as an option for all students.

We are always willing to talk and come back and discuss your [families] concerns and make adjustments... We're talking about a child; we are not talking about a program [DL]... We're building frameworks, but they're frameworks for children and they don't come as a package. They come individually, so that's how they learn. [LEADERSHIP (L3, L13); FAMILIES (F1, F2, F3, F4, F6, F8); TEAMING & COLLABORATION (TC1, TC2)]

This quotation underscores the need to focus on the needs of the individual students and how decisions regarding a student's placement and programming cannot happen in a vacuum. Parents, teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals should all be involved in the decision-making process. However, for all parties to make informed decisions, quality information regarding programmatic options needs

to be shared. In the following paragraph, the superintendent reflects on ways that the district can support parents of early childhood students with examining their options for pre-K programs so that they can make an informed decision about their child's education.

On the parent choice side, I think it would be REALLY good to dive deep into 'What do parents need to know to make an informed choice?' Because if this is brand new to a parent, who's just learned that their child has a disability, and now they're going to be in pre-school, and...now we're asking them to do this [DL]. That's a lot. What would compact information? Maybe it involves other parents... when I was working with parents who gave birth to a deaf child, to connect them pretty early with another parent whose deaf child was now two years old... That voice I just needed to make it happen and step back. There's no way that I could be that voice. [LEADERSHIP (L3, L13); FAMILIES (F1, F2, F3, F4, F6, F8, F9); INSTRUCTION (INS1, INS2, INS11, INS12)]

This quote suggests that the district could do a better job informing families of their options. Still, parents were not the only ones in need of additional information and support. One teacher said, "We haven't started [implementing DL], so I'm not sure what it's going to look like. I've never done that [DL] before. Just a little confused." Another teacher said:

I don't really know what the actual plan is for this [DL program] so, but for me, I'm excited to see how it looks working with the special ed kids. Especially, we have so many kids that don't really speak to begin with, so seeing how that works to teach two languages, not to say that it can't be, but just how that looks in our classroom setting with kids at so many different levels. When you have some kids that their speech, mentally have the ability to do that, versus children that are maybe autistic that I use two words, just to keep it as simple as possible. Just seeing how the dynamics of that plays out and how the kids will respond to that. [INSTRUCTION (INS 10, 11, 12); LEADERSHIP (L1)]

The above quotation demonstrates a lack of communication or understanding about the district's

mission for DL and how DL would be implemented in their pre-K classrooms that contained students with disabilities when they were beginning implementation of the program. This concern was recognized in the reflections of administrators. The superintendent identified that supporting the teaming and collaboration of lead teachers and paraprofessionals was important for the implementation of the DL Pre-K model.

What does a co-teaching model look like? You're not really giving it [classroom/teaching] up. You're [lead teachers and paraprofessionals] working together, just like you always do, because you should be in sync if you are really going to meet the needs of all of the children all of the time. In the classroom you are more like partners than the teacher and the instructional assistant. So I think it's that whole idea of compensating somebody for teaching for the actual time that they are teaching and being able to budget for that and allow for that. [TEAMING & COLLABORATION (TC1, TC2, TC3); LEADERSHIP (L1); INSTRUCTION (INS4, INS5, INS6, INS11, INS12)]

In a similar vein, the language acquisition and curriculum specialist identified the lack of knowledge about implementation of DL as the biggest challenge with implementing the DL program.

What does it look like? Who's the lead teacher? Who's the language teacher? So we tried to break it up, having specific roles and responsibilities of what each teacher would be doing and then what DL actually looked like. Because I think there were a lot of assumptions made and there are so many different models of it. That's the biggest misconception I found with teachers...So that's where we [administrators and teachers] spent a lot of the first half of the year on this: roles and responsibilities of DL. [LEADERSHIP (L1, L10); INSTRUCTION (INS11, INS12); TEAMING & COLLABORATION (TC3)]

Addressing these concerns and misconceptions would behoove the district as they begin year two of DL implementation.

Even though there were some challenges during the first year of implementation, as one would expect, district leaders shared one particular vignette

as a classroom example of how the DL programming supported a child with a disability in accessing the curriculum and engaging with others. Julie was a passionate special educator who was open minded about implementing DL in her inclusive special education classroom. She was also open to collaborating with the paraprofessional in her classroom to co-teach to provide additional support in Spanish to implement the DL model. Julie had a pre-K student who was virtually nonverbal and withdrawn from others in the classroom. When the Spanish instruction was introduced, his face lit up and he became excited for the first time. Julie said that he became like a new child when he heard his home language, Spanish, being spoken in the classroom. Previously, he had been introverted and appeared frightened of his school environment. He came alive when the Spanish and English model became a part of his pre-K program. Julie identified that there were challenges, such as figuring out how to co-teach in two languages, but the payoffs, such as the inclusion of a student with disabilities in a DL program that supported him in growing and developing in English and his home language of Spanish, were ones that needed to be shared and remembered as they continue. [TEAMING & COLLABORATION (TC3); INSTRUCTION (INS2, INS4, INS5, INS6, INS11, INS12); ENVIRONMENT (E1, E3)]

The director of student services, who oversees all special education programming in the district, reflected on Julie's story, her teaching, and how her openness to collaboration and implementing a DL program made her hopeful for the possibilities of the DL Pre-K program. The director said:

I think in Julie's situation, her openness, her willingness. She said, 'I didn't know what this would look like, but I was interested in pursuing it to learn more about it.' And her openness to her paraprofessional taking the lead, and in giving her [paraprofessional] that opportunity. I'm hopeful. [TEAMING & COLLABORATION (TC3); INSTRUCTION (INS11, INS12)]

The superintendent emphasized that a teacher's openness to DL and willingness to learn from others is what is really important in supporting each student in being successful.

DISCUSSION OF CASE STUDY FINDINGS

The authors' research question was: How do administrator and educator discourses demonstrate DL leadership in the implementation of programming for culturally and linguistically diverse learners with disabilities? To answer this research question, the authors returned to DeMatthews and Izquierdo's (2018a) DL social justice leadership framework to examine how administrator and educator discourses demonstrated key aspects of DL social justice leadership and encouraged language-as-a-right and as-a-resource orientations while attempting to dispel notions of language-as-a-problem. The qualitative findings of the case of one urban district's first year implementing an innovative DL program for all pre-K students suggests that administrator and educator discourses promote five components of the DEC Recommended Practices (leadership, families, instruction, teaming and collaboration, and environment) as key components of a successful program. Table 4 shows how the DEC Recommended Practices align with the key aspects of DL social justice leadership. Through reviewing the data from both of these lenses, the authors concluded districts should develop a strategic plan using the DEC Recommended Practices (2014) for supporting teachers and paraprofessionals as they transition to the DL program model to implement best practices for teaching culturally and linguistically diverse learners with disabilities. This strategic plan needs to address the roles of all stakeholders (i.e., administrators, educators, families, community members, and students) and outline the implications for including all learners to promote improved outcomes for culturally and linguistically learners with disabilities.

One of the challenges mentioned earlier by the administrative team was that they needed to support co-teaching for lead teachers and paraprofessionals to provide teaching in both English and Spanish. Co-teaching is an effective practice for delivering instruction when all parties work together to support student learning (Cook & Friend, 1995; Rytivaara & Kershner, 2012; Pratt, 2014). The leadership team discussed the need to incorporate additional PD and programming options to assist teachers and staff in meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Through the focus groups, the authors identified a specific need for

PD in relation to co-teaching and second language acquisition.

Many paraprofessionals in the district were being asked to take on more of a lead instructional role during Spanish instruction to support the 50/50 language model. The administrative team identified that they needed to provide more coaching to support teaming and collaboration between teachers and paraprofessionals to support successful implementation of a true 50/50 DL model. Research shows that when teachers are open and willing to take on a leadership role in fostering paraprofessionals' skills and valuing their support, paraprofessionals respect the lead teacher. When administrators nurture the development of positive collaborative relationship between teachers and paraprofessionals, they can better meet the needs of students, including those with disabilities (Biggs, Gilson, & Carter, 2016). In this study, by valuing the role of the paraprofessionals in the implementation of the DL programming, the district and lead teachers leveraged the social and cultural-historical knowledge of the paraprofessionals and encouraged positive engagement among district leaders and school staff (Enciso & Ryan, 2011). Moreover, the leaders in the district recognized the important role paraprofessionals play in building capacity to implement DL effectively (cf. DeMatthews et al., 2017). As a result, the administrative team identified that paraprofessionals who were participating in co-teaching to support the DL Pre-K for All program needed to be compensated more based on the additional responsibilities they were being asked to do in the classroom.

The district also recognized the need for more training and communication in regard to the benefits of DL programs for all children, which is consistent with the literature (Hammer et al., 2004; Rinaldi & Samson, 2008; Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al., 2015). Multiple teachers also identified in the fall focus groups that they were unsure how the implementation of DL would look and work in their classroom for students with disabilities. These fears could be viewed as an orientation toward language-as-a-problem instead of a language-as-a-right or language-as-a-resource (cf. Ruiz, 1984), but their confusion really appeared to be rooted in the logistics and practical nature of implementing DL,

Table 4

The DL Social Justice Leadership Framework Aligned to DEC Recommended Practices

Key Aspects of DL Social Justice Leadership (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2018a)	Corresponding DEC Recommended Practices (2014) to Support DL Implementation
DL social justice leaders dialogue with stakeholders to assure programming is responsive to the needs of the community.	<p>L3. “promote shared decision making” (p. 6)</p> <p>L6. “establish partnerships across levels (state to local) and with their counterparts in other systems and agencies” (p. 6)</p> <p>L11. “collaborate with...stakeholders” (p. 7)</p> <p>F1. “build trusting and respectful partnerships with the family” (p. 10)</p> <p>F3. “responsive to the family’s concerns, priorities, and changing life circumstances” (p. 10)</p> <p>F9. “help families know and understand their rights” (p. 11)</p> <p>INS13. “use coaching or consultation strategies with primary caregivers or other adults to facilitate positive adult-child interactions” (p. 13)</p> <p>TC1. “Practitioners representing multiple disciplines and families work together as a team to plan and implement supports and services” (p. 15)</p> <p>TC2. “Practitioners and families work together as a team to systematically and regularly exchange expertise...and jointly solve problems” (p. 15)</p> <p>TC3. “Practitioners use communication and group facilitation strategies to enhance team functioning and interpersonal relationships” (p. 15)</p>
DL social justice leaders recognize that a program cannot be “pre-packaged” and must evolve based on the needs of the community.	<p>L13. “promote efficient and coordinated service delivery” (p. 7)</p> <p>E1. “promote the child’s access to and participation in learning experiences” (p. 9)</p> <p>E3. “modify and adapt the physical, social, and temporal environments to promote each child’s access to and participation in learning” (p. 9)</p> <p>F4. “develop individualized plans” (p. 10)</p> <p>INS1. “identify each child’s strengths, preferences, and interests” (p. 12)</p> <p>INS5. “provide contextually relevant learning opportunities” (p. 12)</p> <p>INS10. “implement the frequency, intensity, and duration of instruction needed to address the child’s phase and pace of learning” (p. 13)</p> <p>TC4. “discover and access community-based services and other...resources to meet family-identified child or family needs” (p. 15)</p>
DL social justice leaders create and implement plans to increase the school’s capacity to support DL.	<p>L1. “feel a sense of belonging and want to support” (p. 6)</p> <p>L8. “secure fiscal and human resources and maximize the use of these resources” (p. 7)</p> <p>L9. “develop and implement an evidence-based PD” (p. 7)</p> <p>L10. “ensure practitioners know and follow professional standards” (p. 7)</p> <p>F2. “provide the family with up-to-date, comprehensive and unbiased information” (p. 10)</p> <p>F6. “engage the family in opportunities that support and strengthen parenting knowledge and skills” (p. 10)</p> <p>F8. “information about the benefits of learning in multiple languages for the child’s growth and development” (p. 11)</p> <p>INS6. “use systematic instructional strategies with fidelity” (p. 12)</p> <p>INS11. “develop skills through the use of their home language” (p. 13)</p> <p>INS12. “use and adapt specific instructional strategies that are effective for DLLs” (p. 13)</p>

Table 4 (Continued)

Key Aspects of DL Social Justice Leadership (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2018a)	Corresponding DEC Recommended Practices (2014) to Support DL Implementation
DL social justice leaders evaluate DL programming to ensure on-going improvement, share finding with stakeholders, and enlist their feedback.	L4. “engage in on-going evidence-based PD” (p. 6) L7. “develop, refine, and implement policies and procedures that create the conditions for practitioners to implement the DEC Recommended Practices” (p. 7) L12. “collaborate with stakeholders to collect and use data for...continuous program improvement and to examine the effectiveness of services and supports in improving child and family outcomes” (p. 7) INS2. “identify skills to target for instruction” (p. 12) INS3. “gather and use data to inform decisions” (p. 12) INS4. “plan for and provide the level of support, accommodations, and adaptations needed for the child to access, participate, and learn” (p. 12)

especially when paraprofessionals were placed in lead teacher roles (cf. Bernstein et al., 2018). Thus, teachers needed more support with how to implement DL to overcome these fears. This information was shared with the district to inform them of the need for additional support for teachers on the implementation of DL, specifically for students with disabilities. The district responded when they received this information about the teachers’ uncertainty about the implementation of DL with some additional PD targeted at how to implement DL. Information needs to be provided to parents and explained about options for each individual child starting at the pre-K level, state language policies that may impact future instructional choices, and information about identifying the program that best meets the individual needs of each child. At the district level, there needs to be a sustainability plan for DL programming for all, continued PD and collaboration about DL with all stakeholders, and a shared belief that every child is welcome in DL programs starting in pre-K and beyond.

The administrator and educator discourses demonstrated DL leadership with a focus on collaboration and communication for the implementation of programming for culturally and linguistically diverse learners with disabilities. The leadership team identified that there must be a collaborative

belief in the DL for All Pre-K program students that focuses on the needs of the individual child. Collaboration must include parents, teachers, paraprofessionals, leadership members, and all school staff to foster an effective program designed to meet the individual needs of students in inclusive environments. DL instruction must be informed by evidence-based practices and continued PD needs to be brought in to support school employees in implementing innovative DL instruction and teaming and collaboration strategies. DeMatthews and Izquierdo (2018a) also emphasize the importance of providing on-going training for educators and parents.

Communication with all stakeholders is essential for supporting a successful and inclusive DL program at the pre-K level. When district stakeholders were mutually engaged in implementing DL programming for all students in pre-K, they collaborated within their communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) to identify areas that needed further support and to inform improved outcomes for students, families, and the district. Students of all ability levels succeed when there is effective collaboration and communication among administration, teachers, families, and the community at large (Epstein, 2011; Haines, Gross, Blue-Banning, Francis, & Turnbull, 2015). First, appropriate

supports must be in place for all stakeholders from the superintendent (cf. DeMatthews et al., 2017) and principals (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2018a, 2018b; DeMatthews et al., 2019; Morita-Mullaney, 2019b) on down to teachers and parents. Suggested supports include providing information about the benefits of DL including how language is both a right and a resource (cf. Ruiz, 1984), programmatic elements, and options available for each individual child in a form that best meets the needs of each stakeholder. These supports align with the components of a social justice leadership framework which encourage leaders to provide on-going training for both educators and parents about the benefits of DL (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2018a). For instance, in response to teacher feedback suggesting a need for more flexibility in the program model, the district-level leaders decided to have an English-only and a DL option for students with disabilities. After reviewing the information about all of the program options, then the child's parents, teacher, and district-level staff would collaboratively determine the program model that would best meet the needs of the individual child.

Implications for practice. The findings from this case study have implications for school districts interested in providing DL instruction to young culturally and linguistically diverse learners with disabilities. Reflective practices that include feedback from families, teachers, and paraprofessionals at the district level need to continue throughout program design and implementation to have a sustainable model that uses data to make informed decisions about instruction to support the individual needs of all learners. These reflective practices are necessary for supporting a community of engagement in a school district that encourages all stakeholders to be mutually engaged as they collaborate together on the DL Pre-K for All program (Wenger, 1998). To implement instructional practices for DL programs at the pre-K level, culturally and linguistically diverse learners with disabilities must remain at the center of the discussion to design effective strategies to ensure that all children develop and learn because there is no one-size-fits-all model. DeMatthews and Izquierdo (2018a) agree, stating, "DL is too complicated to be 'pre-packaged' at school" (p. 65). Administrators, educators, fami-

lies, and communities must communicate to share the benefits of DL for all in pre-K to support the view of language-as-a right (Ruiz, 1984) and recognize the larger societal benefits of DL learning not only for culturally and linguistically diverse learners with disabilities but the community at large. The DEC Recommended Practices identify key components that districts need to use daily to support all stakeholders to have an active voice in identifying each child's access to and participation in inclusive learning experiences.

Limitations and suggestions for future research.

One limitation of the study was that focus group data were not collected from the administrative team before implementation and mid-year to provide their reflections over time. Field notes were collected from monthly meetings with the administrative team, but most of the notes focused on logistics of program implementation. Also, no focus group data were collected from other school staff, such as speech pathologists, who worked in the pre-K classrooms or parents to get their impressions of the implementation of the DL model to add to the case study.

Another limitation was the focus group questions used with the teachers throughout the program. Most questions focused on their impressions of implementing the DL program, DL, and the drama PD that they were receiving, which excluded data on their feedback about working with families, leadership, and PD outside of the drama PD that was currently being provided. This PD focused on ways to implement drama practices into literacy, but teachers did not receive PD specific to how to support students in DL development or the research supporting DL. Data from the teacher focus groups were shared with the teaching artists and those who provided the drama PD to inform their future PDs and include teacher suggestions. Data were shared with the district that identified areas for other PD needs, such as DL and what implementation looked like in the classroom, but no data were collected on the implementation of additional training to address if the teachers' needs for additional training were being met.

Future research should expand to include the voices of all stakeholders in the implementation of

a new DL program for all pre-K students, such as families and school personnel, to begin to discuss and analyze how the programming is impacting all of those involved. This research should pay close attention to the support systems (e.g., PD, additional training, and research) provided to teachers, families, and staff before and throughout implementation of such programming. Future research should also examine the planning stages of implementation of a program and how the leadership supports school staff and families in understanding the new model and receiving the information necessary to make informed decisions. Once implementation is underway, research on teacher and student outcomes should be evaluated to see how students are progressing in their language and content knowledge in both languages over time.

CONCLUSION

This case study examined the role of the DEC Recommended Practices in year one of a Spanish/English DL Pre-K program that included students with disabilities in one urban school district. Focus group data suggest that leadership, families, instruction, teaming and collaboration, and environment (five DEC Recommended Practices) appropriately address how a leadership team and educators identified triumphs and successes from the first year of the inclusive DL program and provided clear implications for the future. The DEC Recommended Practices found in both administrator and educator discourses aligned with DeMatthews and Izquierdo's (2018a) proposed DL social justice leadership framework. We found that five of the DEC Recommended Practices (2014) were at the center of the administrative team's reflections and future plans for the pre-K DL program, but only three of the DEC Recommended Practices were prevalent in the teachers' reflections because of the types of questions that were asked in their focus groups. More specifically, identifying continued practices for supporting the students and their families, as well as the teachers and district staff, is essential in designing instruction and programs, such as the DL Pre-K for All students, which best meet the individual needs of each student.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the support of Helios Education Foundation Grant 9659174. The ideas presented in this paper are those of the authors and no endorsement from the funding agency should be inferred. We also thank the early childhood educators and administrators who participated in this study and our partner district.

REFERENCES

- Barac, R., Bialystok, E., Castro, D. C., & Sanchez, M. (2014). The cognitive development of young dual language learners: A critical review. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 29*, 699–714.
- Becker, G. I., & Deris, A. R. (2019). Identification of Hispanic English language learners in special education. *Education Research International, 2019*, 1–9.
- Bernstein, K. A., Kilinc, S., Troxel Deeg, M., Marley, S., Farrand, K. M., & Kelley, M. (2018). Language ideologies of Arizona preschool teachers implementing dual language teaching for the first time: Pro-multilingual beliefs, practical concerns. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 1*–24.
- Biggs, E., Gilson, C., & Carter, E. (2016). Accomplishing more together. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 41*(4), 256–272.
- Cheatham, G. A., & Barnett, J. E. (2017). Overcoming common misunderstandings about students with disabilities who are English language learners. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 53*(1), 58–63.
- Cheatham, G. A., Santos, R. M., & Kerkutluoglu, A. (2012). Review of comparison studies investigating bilingualism and bilingual instruction for students with disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 45*(3), 1–12.
- Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 2*(1), 1–20.
- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. *Focus On Exceptional Children, 28*(3), 1–16.
- Dai, Y. G., Burke, J. D., Naigles, L., Eigsti, I. M., & Fein, D. A. (2018). Language abilities in monolingual-and bilingual-exposed children with autism or other developmental disorders. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders, 55*, 38–49.
- de Jong, E. J. (2013). Policy discourses and US language in education policies. *Peabody Journal of Education, 88*(1), 98–111.
- DEC Recommended Practices Commission (2014). DEC recommended practices. Retrieved from <https://divisionearlychildhood.egnnyte.com/dl/tgv6GUXhVow>.

- DeMatthews, D., & Izquierdo, E. (2018a). The importance of principals supporting dual language education: A social justice leadership framework. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 17*(1), 53–70.
- DeMatthews, D. E., & Izquierdo, E. (2018b). Supporting Mexican American immigrant students on the border: A case study of culturally responsive leadership in a dual language elementary school. *Urban Education, 1*–32.
- DeMatthews, D., Izquierdo, E., & Knight, D. S. (2017). Righting past wrongs: A superintendent's social justice leadership for dual language education along the US–Mexico border. *Education Policy Analysis Archives/Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas, 25*, 1–32.
- DeMatthews, D. E., Izquierdo, E., & Kotok, S. (2019). A school leadership framework for dual language. In D. E. DeMatthews & E. Izquierdo (Eds.), *Dual language education: Teaching and leading in two languages* (pp. 181–193). New York, NY: Springer.
- Dyson, A. H., & Genishi, C. (2005). *On the case: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press/NCRL.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2013). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP® model* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Epstein, J. (2011). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Feltmate, K., & Kay-Raining Bird, E. (2008). Language learning in four bilingual children with down syndrome: A detailed analysis of vocabulary and morphosyntax. *Canadian Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, 32*, 6–20.
- Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. (2011). Language ideology dimensions of politically active Arizona voters: An exploratory study. *Language Awareness, 20*, 295–314.
- Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S., Palmer, D., & Henderson, K. (2015). Educator language ideologies and a top-down dual language program. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 1*–18.
- Gonzalez-Barrero, A. M., & Nadig, A. (2018). Bilingual children with autism spectrum disorders: The impact of amount of language exposure on vocabulary and morphological skills at school age. *Autism Research, 11*, 1667–1678.
- Gutierrez-Clellen, V. F., Simon-Cerejido, G., & Wagner, C. (2008). Bilingual children with language impairment: A comparison with monolinguals and second language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 29*, 3–19.
- Haines, S. J., Gross, J. M., Blue-Banning, M., Francis, G. L., & Turnbull, A. P. (2015). Fostering family–school and community–school partnerships in inclusive schools: Using practice as a guide. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 40*, 227–239.
- Hambly, C., & Fombonne, E. (2012). The impact of bilingual environments on language development in children with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 42*, 1342–1352.
- Hammer, C. S., Detwiler, J. S., Detwiler, J., Blood, G. W., & Qualls, C. D. (2004). Speech-language pathologists' training and confidence in serving Spanish-English bilingual children. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 37*, 91–108.
- Heineke, A. J. (2016). *Restrictive language policy in practice: English learners in Arizona*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kay-Raining Bird, E., Cleave, P., Trudeau, N., Thordardottir, E., Sutton, A., & Thorpe, A. (2005). The language abilities of bilingual children with down syndrome. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 14*, 187–199.
- Kay-Raining Bird, E., Genesee, F., & Verhoeven, L. (2016). Bilingualism in children with developmental disorders: A narrative review. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 63*, 1–14.
- Kay-Raining Bird, E., Lamond, E., & Holden, J. J. (2012). Survey of bilingualism in autism spectrum disorders. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders/Royal College of Speech & Language Therapists, 47*, 52–64.
- Kay-Raining Bird, E., Trudeau, N., & Sutton, A. (2016). Pulling it all together: The road to lasting bilingualism for children with developmental disabilities. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 63*, 63–78.
- Kilinc, S., Farrand, K., Chapman, K., Kelley, M., Millinger, J., & Adams, K. (2017). Expanding opportunities to learn to support inclusion through drama-enhanced literacy practices. *British Journal of Special Education, 44*, 431–447.
- Klinger, J. K., & Harry, B. (2006). The special education referral and decision-making process for English language learners: Child study team meetings and staffing. *Teachers College Record, 108*, 2247–2281.
- Kohnert, K. (2010). Bilingual children with primary language impairment: Issues, evidence and implications for clinical actions. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 43*, 456–473.
- Kotok, S., & DeMatthews, D. (2018). Challenging school segregation in the twenty-first century: How districts can leverage dual language education to increase school and classroom diversity. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 91*(1), 1–6.

- Lesaux, N. K. (2006). Building consensus: Future directions for research on English language learners at risk for learning difficulties. *Teachers College Record*, 108, 2406–2438.
- Li, J., Steele, J., Slater, R., Bacon, M., & Miller, T. (2016). Teaching practices and language use in two-way dual language immersion programs in a large public school district. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10(1), 31–43.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2016). Bilingualism and academic achievement in children in dual language programs. In E. Nicoladis & S. Montanari (Eds.), *Bilingualism across the lifespan: Factors moderating language proficiency* (pp. 203–223). Washington, DC: APA Books.
- Lindholm-Leary, K., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 43–60.
- Lipski, J. M. (2014). Spanish-English code-switching among low-fluency bilinguals: Towards an expanded typology. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 8(1), 23–55.
- MacSwan, J. (2013). Code switching and linguistic theory. In T. K. Bhatia & W. Ritchie (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism* (2nd ed.), (pp. 223–350). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Morita-Mullaney, T. (2019a). At the intersection of bilingual specialty and leadership: A collective case study of district leadership for emergent bilinguals. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 1–23.
- Morita-Mullaney, T. (2019b). Intersecting leadership and English learner specialty: The nexus of creativity, resistance, and advocacy. In L. C. de Oliveira (Ed.), *The handbook of TESOL in k-12* (pp. 423–440). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Paneque, O. M., & Rodriguez, D. (2009). Language use by bilingual special educators of English language learners with disabilities. *International Journal of Special Education*, 24, 63–69.
- Pratt, S. (2014). Achieving symbiosis: Working through challenges found in co-teaching to achieve effective co-teaching relationships. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 41, 1–12.
- Proposition 203 (2000). Sec. 1, findings and declarations. Retrieved from <http://apps.azsos.gov/election/2000/Info/pub pamphlet/english/prop203.htm>.
- Rinaldi, C., & Samson, J. (2008). English language learners and response to intervention referral considerations. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 40(5), 6–14.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15–34.
- Rytivaara, A., & Kershner, R. (2012). Co-teaching as a context for teachers' professional learning and joint knowledge construction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 999–1008.
- Steele, J. L., Slater, R. O., Zamarro, G., Miller, T., Li, J., Burkhauser, S., et al. (2017). Effects of dual-language immersion programs on student achievement: Evidence from lottery data. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(Suppl. 1), 282S–306S.
- Strand, S. & Lindsay, G. (2009). Evidence of ethnic disproportionality in special education in an English population. *Journal of Special Education*, 43, 174–190.
- Ware, J., Lye, C. B., & Kyffin, F. (2015). Bilingualism and students (learners) with intellectual disability: A review: Bilingualism and students with ID. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 12, 220–231.

AUTHOR BIO

Kathleen M. Farrand is an assistant professor in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. Her research examines inclusive settings found along the least restrictive environment continuum, with a focus on the use of active and dramatic approaches for learning.

Megan T. Deeg is a doctoral candidate in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. Her research interests include educational practices for diverse learners in pre-K-12 settings, emergent bilingual content development, and the use of dramatic approaches for content and literacy development.

Sultan Kilinc is an assistant professor in the Department of Teaching and Leadership at Syracuse University. Her research focuses on inclusive education policy and practices for diverse groups of students (i.e., students with dis/abilities, linguistic, ethnic, racial minorities, and girls), who are marginalized and excluded from educational opportunities.

Michael F. Kelley is an associate professor in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. His research interests lie in understanding the structural and process features related to high-quality professional development experiences for early childhood teachers that effectively impact child outcomes.

Copyright of Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners is the property of Division for Culturally & Linguistically Diverse Exceptional Learners and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.