

# 11 A Case of DLBE Gentrification and Tools for Engaging Stakeholders in How to Do Better

Ivana Espinet, Kate Menken and Imee Hernandez

I was literally sideswiped. It was never brought to the PTA. The way it was introduced was literally, every October the PTA, we would have a potluck and we invited all the parents to come and get to know us and bring a dish... And I'll never forget, I found out about this at this PTA gathering that we always have and I found out that a new Dual French program was going to happen and I was just taken aback because I didn't know about it.

(Joffe-Walt & Hernandez, 2021)

## Introduction

This chapter examines how the introduction of a new French dual language program in a New York City (NYC) public school affected the existing school community. We focus on the experiences of Imee Hernandez, who was the president of the parent–teacher association (PTA) when the school opened the new program with the intention of attracting white families to enroll their children in the school. Imee's experiences were also featured in the podcast 'Nice White Parents', produced by the *New York Times* and reported by Chana Joffe-Walt (2020). The podcast examines the 60-year relationship between white parents and public schools in NYC, the most racially segregated school district in the nation (Cohen & Orfield, 2021; Kucsera & Orfield, 2014).

Our work is grounded in a language activism framework that understands that linguistic inequalities are products of larger societal inequities connected to political and economic issues between different communities (Flores & Chaparro, 2018). It is essential to examine and critique the power relations between language majoritized and language minoritized communities within schools and classrooms. In this context, researchers have documented how dual language programs have affected school

communities as gentrifying forces, often giving voices to those with privilege and silencing the voices of racialized communities (in addition to the other chapters in this volume, see Burns, 2017; Cervantes-Soon *et al.*, 2017; Delavan *et al.*, 2021; Flores & Chaparro, 2018; Freire *et al.*, 2022; Valdez *et al.*, 2016). Based on the lessons learned from this case, we provide a blueprint for school leaders and families to engage in a process of collaborative decision-making that critically examines the needs of school communities before starting new bilingual programs and/or examines existing programs through a social justice lens.

The three authors of this chapter are NYC public school parent leaders and advocates. Imee, a Black Latina, was the PTA president at the time that the DLBE program started at the school featured in this chapter, and she is currently a Spanish–English bilingual social worker at a public school in Brooklyn. Ivana is a white Latina who has taken a variety of parent leadership positions at her children’s schools, including school leadership team (SLT)<sup>1</sup> parent representative and PTA president, as well as community education council member<sup>2</sup> in her district; she is currently an assistant professor at Kingsborough Community College. Kate is white and Jewish, has been a member of the SLT at two of her son’s schools and has worked closely with parents in her community who advocate for bilingual education and school integration; she is currently a professor at Queens College. All authors are bilingual and believe in the possibilities of DLBE and multilingualism for all, but not when only privileged students benefit from them.

We begin by providing some historical context for the school and for bilingual education in NYC. Then, we share Imee’s experience as a parent leader to illustrate how deficiency narratives played a role in the development and rollout of the French DLBE program, and the inequitable parent dynamics that followed. In addition to the podcast, both Imee and Chana Joffe-Walt gave a plenary presentation at the 2021 Conference of the New York State Association for Bilingual Education (NYSABE) where they were interviewed by Kate Menken and Ivana Espinet. The quotations from Imee and Chana in this chapter come from the podcast, the plenary and Imee’s input as co-author of this chapter. We conclude the chapter with recommendations for administrators and parent/family leaders to engage in a collaborative inquiry process to promote dual language bilingual education (DLBE) programs that prioritize multilingual learners (MLLs) and benefit existing school communities.

## **Bilingual Education in NYC**

Bilingual education in the United States has its origins in the civil rights movement of the 1960s, and was part of broader struggles by minoritized communities for racial justice. In the mid-1960s, Puerto Rican activists in NYC pressed for more equitable education for their

youth, demanding instruction in their home language. This was tied to a broader agenda of political and economic self-determination (Baker & Wright, 2021; García & Sung, 2018). Their demands, along with those of other linguistic minoritized groups across the country, resulted in the federal Bilingual Education Act of 1968. Although this policy did not require bilingual education, it did provide funds for school districts like NYC that enroll large numbers of language minoritized students to start bilingual programs or to create bilingual instructional materials (García & Kleifgen, 2018). NYC's first bilingual elementary school, P.S. 25, opened in 1968 in response to community demands. In 1972, the organization ASPIRA of New York filed a federal lawsuit to demand Spanish bilingual instruction in NYC public schools for struggling Puerto Rican students. As a result, the ASPIRA Consent Decree was signed into law in 1974, requiring the implementation of transitional bilingual educational (TBE) programs (Reyes, 2008; Santiago, 1986). In the years that followed, bilingual education – particularly TBE – grew in NYC schools.

However, by the mid-1980s bilingual education came under attack (for a historical account of this period, see Baker & Wright, 2021; García & Kleifgen, 2018; García *et al.*, 2018). Many bilingual education programs in NYC segregated bilingual teachers and students from the rest of the school (Flores & García, 2017), so educators and activists began to seek bilingual education programs that were neither remedial nor segregated. For example, P.S. 84 had offered TBE, and by 1989 began permitting students to remain in bilingual education throughout elementary school in a developmental approach, and changed the name of the program model to 'dual language', which then Principal Sidney Morison described as an integrated, enrichment approach (Morison, 1990).

Although more DLBE programs opened over time, by 2012 they still enrolled only a very small proportion of MLLs/English language learners (ELLs),<sup>3</sup> so the NYC Department of Education (NYC DOE) began offering funding for schools to create new DLBE programs in a targeted program expansion effort. However, this effort has not succeeded in significantly increasing the enrollment of MLLs in DLBE. While the number of bilingual education programs has grown since then, the vast majority of MLLs are still enrolled in English as a new language (ENL) programs where instruction is only in English. In 2020–2021, 80.14% of MLLs were in ENL programs, while only 17% were in bilingual programs: 9.91% were in TBE and 7.12% were in DLBE programs (NYC DOE, 2021). Many city schools systematically eliminated their TBE programs as these programs fell from favor in public opinion (García *et al.*, 2018; Menken & Solorza, 2014), and enrollment of MLLs in TBE declined from 37.4% in 2003 to 9.91% in 2021. While there has been a slight increase in enrollment of MLLs in DLBE programs, from enrolling 2.3% of MLLs in 2003, to 4.1% in 2012 when the city began efforts to expand these programs, to 7.12% today, this growth has not

been enough to curtail an overall decline in the enrollment of MLLs in bilingual education. What is more, the enrollment of MLLs in DLBE programs has failed to keep pace with the city's efforts at program expansion (for further discussion see Menken *et al.*, 2023).

Dual language bilingual programs have grown in popularity; however, as Valdés (1997) predicted, this has created new issues as the programs have gentrified (Blanton *et al.*, 2021; Valdez *et al.*, 2016; Williams, 2017). Specifically, the gentrification of DLBE has impeded growth in citywide enrollment of MLLs in these programs. This chapter focuses on the Boerum Hill School for International Studies (SIS), which was featured in the acclaimed *New York Times* 2020 podcast titled 'Nice White Parents'. The podcast documented how SIS sought to entice white parents to enroll their children in schools in the district in which SIS is located, and how the creation of a French DLBE program was one of the mechanisms used to accomplish this. This is the school where co-author Imee Hernandez sent her daughter. As we document below, the case at Imee's school exemplifies certain forms of DLBE gentrification worth briefly naming here (for a more detailed overview of the literature on DLBE gentrification, see also the introduction to this edited volume). One of the forms of DLBE gentrification is *demographic gentrification*, meaning that the students whom these programs are intended to serve are pushed out. As Valdez *et al.* (2016) argue, students with white racial privilege, socioeconomic privilege and/or English language privilege are the students who are most likely to benefit from DLBE. *Attention gentrification* refers to the ways that privileged students and their families receive more positive attention from educators within DLBE programs and schools. Attention gentrification describes when, for instance, white English monolinguals are positioned as models within DLBE classrooms and dominate class discussions, and their parents' concerns are more readily heard and centered by educators and school leaders.

### **The School for International Studies and the Introduction of a DLBE Program**

The Boerum Hill SIS is a NYC public school serving students from Grades 6 to 12. In the school year 2014–2015, the principal announced that the school would be opening a new French DLBE program the following year. The school had for years served a predominately Black and Latinx student population. However, school enrollment was in decline. In NYC, a school with low enrollment faces the possibility of being closed down, and shrinking enrollment means a shrinking budget that limits what a school is able to offer to students, such as their ability to hire specialized teaching staff in a variety of subject areas.

In NYC, parents rank their choices for middle and high school admissions. While white students lived in the school district where SIS

is located, at the time many did not choose to attend it. Instead, many middle school families attempted to get their children enrolled in three middle schools often locally referred to as ‘The Big Three’, all of which had screened admissions. (In NYC, this means that a student’s admission to a school is based on student grades, test scores, attendance, an exam or admissions interview, or some combination of these factors.)

Privileged parents often paid private consultants to help them navigate the admissions process. The fact that white parents with higher income in the district did not choose the school was not unique to SIS. A 2016 article in *The Atlantic* described the dynamics of the district:

In practice, the schools are dominated by a subset of families: At the Big Three, over 50 percent of students are white, and less than 30 percent come from low-income families. At the other nine middle schools, just 10 percent of students are white, and more than 80 percent are poor. That divide highlights a harsh truth about the sources of school segregation in New York City.

In 2014–2015, before SIS opened the French DLBE program, the incoming sixth-grade class had only 35 students. In 2015–2016, the year the school opened the program, the incoming sixth-grade class had 103 students (NYC DOE, 2018). Chana Joffe-Walt described how this came about:

[A] parent came to the principal and said, ‘We can’t get our kids into the three schools that all the white families always send their kids to for middle school. There just isn’t enough space and there’s too many of us. And we are looking outside of those three schools now and we’re looking at this school and we’re considering it but we’re not sure. But you know, what would make it a lot better is if it had a dual language program’. Because some of those families had come from an elementary school that had a French dual language program so that was appealing to those families... and I think French dual language is seen as an elite, exciting thing. And I also think for a lot of the families to even consider SIS as a school that they would attend, they needed to know that there were going to be other families like them, white families, upper middle class families, in the same sort of social set. (NYSABE presentation transcript, 5/22/21)

This sudden increase in the population also brought a change to the demographics of the school. The overall student population grew wealthier; in 2014, 74% of students received free or reduced price meals; by 2020 that number was 45%. The percentage of white students increased dramatically, comprising from 11% to 39% of the school’s population between the school years 2014–2015 and 2019–2020, while the proportion of Latinx students decreased from 41% to 22% and the

Black student population decreased from 44% to 26%. The proportion of Asian students within the school did not change much, increasing from 3% to 3.9% (Menken *et al.*, 2023). If a school opens a new dual language bilingual program, the obvious expectation is that it will serve a larger percentage of MLLs, as these are the students for whom DLBE programs were developed in NYC and elsewhere. However, MLLs comprised 10.3% of the school population in 2014–2015, and the majority of MLLs spoke Spanish or Arabic, but by 2019–2020 the percentage of MLLs had dropped to just 6.5% of the overall student population. In addition, it would have made sense to start a program in the home languages of existing students at SIS who were classified as MLLs – Arabic or Spanish – to serve their educational needs. Instead, the decision was made to open a DLBE program only in French at SIS, making clear that its purpose was not to serve students already in the school but rather to bring new students into the building.

At the beginning of this chapter, we shared a quote from Imee, who was the PTA president at the time, in which she shared her shock when she found out about the plans for a new French DLBE program during a public event that the PTA was hosting. The announcement was made by one of the white parents who had approached the school to start the program. Neither Imee nor the other parents whose children attended the school prior to opening the French DLBE program were informed.

Imee had chosen the school for her daughter because it was a small diverse school. Schools in NYC are mandated to have a PTA. When Imee came to the school, it was out of compliance because it did not have one. Imee and another parent began to organize: they invited parents to join them, ran elections and set up a bank account so they could fundraise to support the school. Imee became one of the co-presidents in 2014, and the PTA focused on building a community and organizing schoolwide events for families and students.

Given that there are formal structures set up for parent/family leaders and administrators to work collaboratively, it was surprising that the PTA as well as the rest of the families in the school community had not been included in the preliminary discussions leading up to the decision to start a French DLBE program. There was also no consideration about the home languages of the students already in the building, which was astonishing, since 41% of the students came from Latinx families.

### **‘We Came to Turn the School Around’: A Tale of a Fractured Community**

The introduction of the dual language program transformed the nature of the whole school community. Telling excerpts from the podcast ‘Nice White Parents’ reveal this:

**Chana Joffe-Walt narrates:** In the cafeteria, I'd hear [students who had originally been at the school] saying, the French kids could kill someone, and they'd get away with it. Upstairs in the high school, I'd hear kids complain, all the attention has shifted to the new middle schoolers. We're being pushed aside.

Later on in the podcast, she shares a dialogue between two white sixth-grade boys, newcomers to the school, who had absorbed the messages that SIS was not so good before they arrived:

**Boy:** The kids wouldn't pay attention (...) And I bet they learned very little. And now, this generation, with us, I think we're doing a lot better, and I think that we're learning at a much faster pace.

**Chana Joffe-Walt:** He and his friends, they've turned the school around. That's what he's learning.

**Boy:** It's going to be one of the top choices...  
(Nice White Parents' transcript, Episode 1)

These excerpts illustrate the tension between the racialized students who had been at the school and the new students coming into it. On the one hand, students who had been part of the school community described attention displacement to the more privileged students who were new to the school and who they perceived as taking advantage of their privilege, a form of attention gentrification. On the other hand, the newcomers had absorbed the narrative that they, as the new white wealthier population of the school, were 'improving' the school. They echoed parents' narratives that were mirrored in the news media which described the school as 'struggling' and reported how the white 'professional' families pushed to make it a 'better place' to which they could send their children.

This white savior rhetoric is not uncommon in school gentrification narratives (Mayorga & Picower, 2018). This discourse presents a clear disregard for the families and students who had historically been part of the community, who did not see the school as a place that needed to be fixed and did not feel that they needed to be rescued; in fact, most of them, like Imee, had chosen the school because they viewed it as a small, vibrant community.

### Whose money? Whose community?

One of the ways in which tensions between divergent visions for school communities often become visible is around fundraising. The new parents focused on fundraising for the new DLBE program so they created a non-profit foundation that would allow them to collect and use the money without having to go through the PTA. In NYC, PTAs are mandated

to vote during membership meetings on a budget for the distribution of funds. To ensure transparency, a democratic process and accountability for how funds are used in a school, each parent has one vote. But with a separate non-profit, the overall parent body did not have a vote, and were effectively shut out from having any input or control. These fundraising efforts provided funds solely to the French DLBE program. However, due to community outrage and advocacy by Imee and other parents of children not in the new French program, the funds ultimately had to be shared with the rest of the school.

Imee described how this fractured vision played out: ‘I wanted to build community and I don’t think anybody else had the same idea when they came in. Because they didn’t look at the existing community, they wanted to create another community that had nothing to do with the community that was already there. So, I think that’s where it started getting difficult, at least it felt hurtful when they were doing that’ (NYSABE presentation transcript, 5/22/21). Unfortunately, Imee’s experience is not unusual in light of the gentrification of dual language programs. Other research has documented the dynamics of how minoritized communities are marginalized, and how their experiences and histories in school communities are erased and ignored (Chaparro, 2017; Freire *et al.*, 2021; Hernandez, 2021) even when one of them, like Imee, is officially in charge of the PTA (Blanton *et al.*, 2021).

### Whose bilingualism do we value?

There is consistent research documenting how the language practices of minoritized communities are often devalued or ignored (Chaparro, 2017; Henderson, 2019; Hernandez, 2021). The ‘Nice White Parents’ podcast shares an interaction between Imee and a woman at a fundraiser, who lectures Imee on the benefits of becoming bilingual in French, speaking with the clear assumption that Imee did not know what it means to be bilingual. In this interaction, Imee’s Spanish bilingualism was not recognized. In the same episode, Joffe-Walt shares a dialogue with a Spanish/English bilingual child (Maya) who is learning French as she participates in a theater program, and reflects on how languages are valued at the school:

This is a kid who is multilingual, who speaks two languages, who speaks three languages and who goes to a school that has chosen to teach her in English and yet another language that has sort of nothing to do with her. Which just raised this question for me of, why French? Which I had sort of the whole year. These families have chosen French because they have the most power in this situation coming into the school and saying, ‘We’re going to bring money and we’re going to bring funds and we’re going to re-make the school’.  
(NYSABE presentation transcript, 5/22/21)



As Imee and Maya's experiences show, the bilingualism of children and families of minoritized communities was overlooked and marginalized at SIS while French bilingualism was celebrated. This transcript excerpt highlights the asymmetrical power differences between the racialized students and families who were originally part of the school and the white wealthier newcomer families as French was chosen for the DLBE program instead of the languages of the school community. As such, the language practices of students at SIS prior to the new French DLBE program continued to be undervalued or rendered invisible. This dynamic is a reflection of the larger social inequities between these two communities and how they played out in a context in which there are systemic incentives for schools to market themselves to whiter and wealthier populations.

As a result of these experiences, Imee left the board of the PTA that she had helped to create a few months later. However, she continued to work and support the teachers in the school, but did so outside of the PTA board structure thereby maintaining distance from the new PTA leadership and the families in the French DLBE program. The principal of the school left shortly after the new program started. Imee's daughter went on to graduate from the school, and during the graduation ceremony the new principal highlighted Imee's support and contributions to the school and thanked her publicly.

### **How Do We Move Forward? Suggestions for Parent Leaders and Administrators**

As DLBE programs gentrify, experiences like Imee's and Maya's have become more common. We believe in the social justice potential of DLBE programs, but it is essential that families, teachers and administrators work together to critically examine the power dynamics between different stakeholders in the community.

Palmer *et al.* (2019) proposed a framework for centering DLBE programs in critical consciousness in order to increase equity and social justice, which includes interrogating power, critical listening, historicizing schools and embracing discomfort (also see Chapter 12 of this volume for further discussion). Tian *et al.* (2022) suggest that families who benefit from white racial privilege, English language privilege and/or socioeconomic privilege and join a school community in the context of a DLBE program enter these spaces as 'guests' who need to respect the existing community. For white parents who are thinking about how to engage with schools that have existing DLBE programs or who want to participate in developing a dual language program, Nelson Flores (see Chapter 12, this volume) suggests that they: leave their savior complex at the door, respect the existing leadership structures of the school, consider the existing languages of the school, recognize the many students who are not in the dual language program,

and understand that as new members, they need to prove themselves to the school community.

The work of these scholars has inspired us to create the blueprint and action steps below.

### **Blueprint for Parent Leaders and Administrators Who Want to Start a New Bilingual Program or Change an Existing Program**

It is important for school administrators and parent leaders to partner as they consider starting a new bilingual program in their school or changing/improving an existing program. At the core of this process is to use existing school leadership structures to engage students, families and educators in critical listening (Palmer *et al.*, 2019). This must be done using protocols for these discussions that provide a space in which those with more privilege recognize when to refrain from speaking and when to stop others from dominating the discourse. The broad blueprint for this work is as follows:

- (1) Begin by historicizing bilingual education and your school: First, start by engaging the entire school community in understanding the history of bilingual education and its roots in the civil rights movement. Second, learn about the history of your own school: who has historically been part of the school, and specifically which racial, linguistic and socioeconomic communities has it served? What do we know about the families and educators in the school today?
- (2) Engage all stakeholders (families, leaders, educators and students) in using a culturally sustaining, assets-based perspective (Paris & Alim, 2017) to research and catalog what the school community has already built and is offering (e.g. school enrichment opportunities, after-school programming, programs and events for families, PTA activities and budget priorities). Discuss explicitly the values and history of the community. In Imee's school, the new families came in with a deficit perspective, approaching the school with what Flores calls 'a savior complex' (see Chapter 12, this volume), the presumption that they are coming to the school to 'save it' from failure and that there was nothing positive in it before they arrived. In order to prevent this, it is essential to create a space where the new 'guests' and the existing families engage in learning together.
- (3) Learn about the languages that are already part of the school community and allow that to inform your decision about the languages of the DLBE program. If you are in a school with an existing DLBE program, think about how the school can leverage and build on the existing bilingualism of the students and families through pedagogy, curriculum, as well as extracurricular activities that engage students and families.

- (4) For schools interested in starting a DLBE program or for those with an existing DLBE program: assess the goals of the DLBE program to help MLLs grow and develop their bilingualism and biliteracy, and consider how the DLBE program would impact the entire school community. Ask difficult and uncomfortable questions such as, will our program privilege one group over others?

In the next section, we offer practical strategies and procedures for this engagement. Imee's experiences unveiled how the failure of the school leadership to engage students, families and educators in critical discussions about starting a DLBE program hurt the existing school community and exacerbated inequalities. It also highlighted the disregard for the social justice goals of bilingual education as a means to empower MLLs and address their educational needs, which we described at the beginning of this chapter. While the school was facing the challenge of dwindling enrollment, the process of finding solutions should have been collaborative, starting with an inward gaze that engaged families, educators and students in examining the history of the school and the population it served. This inward examination would have shed light, for example, on the home languages of the students and families who were already at the school (mainly Spanish and Arabic).

In addition, many of the new privileged families entered SIS without the intent to learn about the practices that family leaders had built as a community before they arrived. The school leadership should have been prepared to create a space in which the new families were engaged in critical listening.

We hope that in sharing and analyzing the process in Imee's school, we can inspire school administrators and parent leaders to approach the work of supporting bilingual education through an equity lens. For this purpose, we are including the following resource guide that can be used toward this goal.

## **A Collaborative Inquiry Resource Guide for Bilingual Program Stakeholders**

Collaborative inquiry<sup>4</sup> is a process that can provide a structure for a school community to examine the goals of a bilingual program and its impact. It enables the school's stakeholders to approach their work together from a perspective rooted in openness and curiosity. It provides the space and time to reflect, think and plan together. This work can begin with a small group that represents all stakeholders in the school. It is essential that the process is driven by collaboration between all members of the group at every stage. However, we recommend that at some point, the larger school community also be involved in the process of critical listening.

In order to foster a space in which everyone feels safe and can have a productive discussion, it is essential to establish protocols that ensure that everyone has a chance to be heard. To begin with, the group needs to choose facilitators. We recommend that this task be shared between a school leader and a parent/family leader. The facilitators' role is to make sure that everyone in the group has an opportunity to share their ideas.

This resource is organized into three 'actions' that can guide the collaborative inquiry. They are designed for groups considering a new DLBE program or for groups who want to interrogate existing programs.

### **Action 1: Looking inward**

Before envisioning a new program or making efforts to make programming more socially just, it is crucial that all stakeholders in the school develop a vision that begins with the process of looking inward, by taking stock of who is in the school and how the school is serving the students and families that are part of the community. We recommend that the leadership of the school share with the group data that includes: demographic information about the school population, home languages of students and families and classroom settings (general education, special education, etc.). It is useful to have a breakdown of the school population and home language by classroom settings too. Each participant should have their own copy of the data and spend some time reviewing it, highlighting information that is new or that elicits questions, and taking notes.

After everyone has had a chance to review the data, the facilitators can use the following questions to guide the discussion:

- Who is in our school? What do you notice about the populations of students in terms of demographics and home languages?
- How does the school's educational programming serve different populations of students? Is this fair and just, particularly for minoritized students?

- If you are considering offering DLBE:
  - In what languages will DLBE be available and for whom?
  - Who will enroll in the DLBE program? Is this fair and just, particularly for minoritized students?
  - Will the DLBE program serve the majority of MLLs?
  - How can you ensure that MLLs are prioritized in admissions to DLBE in their home language?
  - Will the DLBE program serve the existing student population?
  - In what ways might providing a new dual language program change the composition of the school?
- For schools with an existing DLBE program:
  - In what languages is DLBE available and for whom?
  - Who is enrolled in the DLBE program? Is this fair and just, particularly for minoritized students?
  - To what extent does the DLBE program serve the majority of MLLs?
  - To what extent does the school ensure that MLLs are prioritized in admissions to DLBE in their home language?
  - Did offering the DLBE program change the composition of the school as a whole? If so, what are the equity issues this raises, if any?

You can use the following handout to guide your work:

**Action 1 handout: Looking inward**

Number of multilingual learners in your school: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of all students in your school who are multilingual learners:  
\_\_\_\_\_

Number of students who are multilingual learners and have an individualized education plan (IEP): \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of students who are multilingual learners and have an IEP: \_\_\_\_\_

Using the following table, list the languages spoken by multilingual learners and by all students in your school. Try to list these from most commonly spoken languages to least, with the percentage of MLLs and of all students who speak the language in your school.

Language	Percentage of MLLs who speak it in your school	Percentage of all students who speak it in your school	Country of origin of students (or their families) who speak it

**Overall student demographics**

- (1) What is the racial breakdown of students in your school?
- (2) What percentage of all students are labeled as special education and have an IEP?
- (3) What is the socioeconomic status of your students (e.g., what percentage of all students are eligible for free and reduced price meals)?
- (4) Have the school demographics changed over the past 5–10 years? If so, how? Please share the school's demographic data for the past 5 years to show these changes.

*Demographic information by program/classroom setting*

Fill in the following table with the classroom settings/programs that your school offers (e.g. general education, integrated co-teaching, self-contained special education, gifted and talented/advanced placement or other honors track classes, DLBE and transitional bilingual education). Then, add demographic information about the students in each setting/program.

Setting/program	Number and percentage of multilingual learners	Students receiving free or reduced meals	Demographic information by race and ethnicity

After completing these tables, share the results with the group in preparation for the the Looking Inward discussion.

## Action 2: Thinking about the school's bilingual program in context

- (1) View the first five minutes or so of this presentation about the history of bilingual education and current issues related to bilingual education. (<https://rb.gy/dw915b>)
- (2) Read pages 4 and 5 from the NYC Alliance for School Integration and Desegregation's (2018) report, *Dare to Reimagine Integration*, on the Five Rs designed in collaboration with students from IntegrateNYC.

Racially integrate schools through admissions.

Resource schools through fair distribution of resources and opportunities.

Relate through supportive relationships and culturally responsible curriculum.

Restore through appropriate responses to conflicts and justice.

Represent diverse communities.

You can find this resource at <https://rb.gy/9o7v9q> (see pages 4–5).

The facilitators can use the following prompts to guide the discussion:

- Given what you learned about the history of bilingual education and current issues related to bilingual education, what are things that you think your community should consider?
- How does the five Rs framework apply to your school? (See handout below.)
- For schools interested in opening a new DLBE program: what policies and/or actions would the school have to put in place if they start a new DLBE program with an equity lens in mind?
- For schools with an existing DLBE program: what new policies and changes do we need to put in place with an equity lens in mind?

You can use the following handout to guide your work:



Action 2 handout: How do the five Rs apply to our school?

How do the five Rs apply to our school?	Before DLBE	After DLBE
Representation: What are the school's admission policies and practices?		
Representation in DLBE: Who is enrolled in the DLBE program and how are DLBE admissions determined? How could it be more equitable?		
Resources: How are resources and opportunities distributed?		
Relate: How does the school build relationships across different demographic groups? How does the school curriculum reflect culturally responsive/sustainable practices?		
Restore: How does our school respond to conflicts?		
Represent: To what extent do the faculty and leaders in the school reflect the culture, identities and languages of students and families?		

### Action 3: Listening in order to build an equitable community

Listen to Episode 1 of the *New York Times* podcast ‘Nice White Parents’. It is one hour long, so we recommend doing this as homework before your group meets. You can find it using the link: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/30/podcasts/nice-white-parents-serial.html>

After you listen, come together to meet. During the meeting, ask each member of the group to take a minute and reflect individually on the following two questions:

- How would you have felt if you were Imee?
- What could the school’s leaders have done differently? What could new families who entered as ‘guests’ have done differently?

We recommend that people take time to jot down some notes before sharing. The facilitators should ask each member of the group to listen actively and to wait to respond or make any comments. They can encourage members of the group to take notes as they are listening to their peers with their reactions or questions, while allowing each member to share without interruption. Each person takes a turn talking without interruption, then there are questions for the speaker, then once everyone has a turn there is a whole-group discussion. The questions need to be clarifying questions, descriptive and non-judgmental. Make sure that each member of the group has a chance to share before opening the floor for comments and discussion.

After this initial discussion, the next step is for the group to draft an action-oriented plan that describes how the school community will engage with new community members.

#### *Additional work for privileged parents (who benefit from white racial privilege, English language privilege and/or socioeconomic privilege)*

Read Nelson Flores’s blog post ‘Nice White Parents and Dual Language Education’ (see Chapter 12 of this volume, or online at <https://educationallinguist.wordpress.com/2020/08/26/nice-white-parents-and-dual-language-education/>) and discuss.

- How might you use these tips?
- How can these tips help to ensure that the school’s DLBE program centers equity?
- How could these tips inform how you engage with schools that have a DLBE program or when you advocate for the development of one?
- How might these tips inform how you engage with school staff and other parents/families?

### Action 3 handout: Creating an action plan

You can use the following chart to document what ‘guests’/new community members need to learn when they join the school community.

The history of the school	
History and goals of the dual language bilingual program	
The students and families	
Parent leadership structures (e.g. parent–teacher association/ organization or school leadership team)	
The educators in the school	
The leadership of the school	

## Notes

- (1) In New York City, in addition to the PTA, schools have a school leadership team composed of the principal, teachers and parents/guardians (including the PTA president). The SLT develops educational policies for their school and aims to make sure there are resources to support those policies (NYC DOE, 2021).
- (2) NYC is divided into geographical school districts. Each district has a community education council (CEC) which acts as an education policy advisory body. Each council has parent representatives from the district.
- (3) New York State and New York City use the terms multilingual learners/English language learners. For the purposes of this chapter, we will use the term multilingual learners, which is a more assets-based term that recognizes how students become bi/multilingual when they add English to their already dynamic linguistic repertoire.
- (4) For more information on school-based inquiry groups and protocols, see Carini (2001) and McDonald *et al.* (2015).

## References

- Baker, C. and Wright, W.E. (2021) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (7th edn). Multilingual Matters.
- Blanton, A., Kasun, G.S. and Gambrell, J.A. (2021) A Black mother's counterstory to the Brown-White binary in dual language education: Toward disrupting dual language as White property. *Language Policy* 20, 463–487. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-021-09582-4>
- Burns, M. (2017) 'Compromises that we make': Whiteness in the dual language context. *Bilingual Research Journal* 40 (4), 339–352.
- Carini, P.F. (2001) *Starting Strong: A Different Look at Children, School, and Standards*. Teachers College Press.
- Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R. and Choi, J. (2017) Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education* 41 (1), 403–427.
- Chaparro, S. (2017) Language and the gentrifying city: An ethnographic study of a two-way immersion program in an urban public school. Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. See <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1939994586?pq-origsite=primo>
- Cohen, D. and Orfield, G. (2021) *NYC School Segregation Report Card: Still Last, Action Needed Now*. University of California Los Angeles. See <https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/nyc-school-segregation-report-card-still-last-action-needed-now> (accessed 10 August 2021).
- Delavan, M.G., Freire, J.A. and Menken, K. (2021) Editorial introduction: A historical overview of the expanding critique(s) of the gentrification of dual language bilingual education. *Language Policy* 20 (3), 299–321.
- Flores, N. and García, O. (2017) A critical review of bilingual education in the United States: From basements and pride to boutiques and profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 37, 14–29. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190517000162>
- Flores, N. and Chaparro, S. (2018) What counts as language education policy? Developing a materialist anti-racist approach to language activism. *Language Policy* 17 (3), 365–384.
- Freire, J.A., Gambrell, J., Kasun, G.S., Dorner, L.M. and Cervantes-Soon, C. (2022) The expropriation of dual language bilingual education: Deconstructing neoliberalism, whitestreaming, and English-hegemony. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 16 (1), 27–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2021.1929762>

- García, O. and Kleifgen, J. (2018) *Educating Emergent Bilinguals: Policies, Programs and Practices for English Learners* (2nd edn). Teachers College Press.
- García, O. and Sung, K. (2018) Critically assessing the 1968 Bilingual Education Act at 50 years: Taming tongues and Latinx communities. *Bilingual Research Journal* 41 (4), 318–333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1529642>
- García, O., Menken, K., Velasco, P. and Vogel, S. (2018) Dual language bilingual education in NYC: A potential unfulfilled? In M.B. Arias and M. Fee (eds) *Profiles of Dual Language Education in the 21st Century* (pp. 38–55). Multilingual Matters.
- Henderson, K.I. (2019) The danger of the dual-language enrichment narrative: Educator discourses constructing exclusionary participation structures in bilingual education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 16 (3), 155–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2018.1492343>
- Hernández, S.J. (2021) Centering raciolinguistic ideologies in two-way dual language education: The politicized role of parents in mediating their children’s bilingualism. In N. Flores, A. Tseng and N. Subtirelu (eds) *Bilingualism for All? Raciolinguistic Perspectives on Dual Language Education* (pp. 111–131). Multilingual Matters.
- Joffe-Walt, C. (2020) Nice White Parents (No. 1). *New York Times* podcast. See <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/30/podcasts/nice-white-parents-serial.html> (accessed 25 October 2021).
- Joffe-Walt, C. and Hernandez, I. (2021) Nice white parents and the gentrification of dual language bilingual education. Plenary presentation at the New York State Association for Bilingual Education on 21 May 2021.
- Kucsera, J. and Orfield, G. (2014) New York State’s extreme school segregation: Inequality, inaction, and a damaged future (p. 160). The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, UCLA.
- Mayorga, E. and Picower, B. (2018) Active solidarity: Centering the demands and vision of the Black Lives Matter movement in teacher education. *Urban Education* 53 (2), 212–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085917747117>
- McDonald, J.P., Mohr, N., Dichter, A. and McDonald, E.C. (2015) *The Power of Protocols: An Educator’s Guide to Better Practice*. Teachers College Press.
- Menken, K. and Solorza, C. (2014) No child left bilingual: Accountability and the elimination of bilingual education programs in New York City schools. *Educational Policy* 28 (1), 96–125.
- Menken, K., Espinet, I. and Avni, S. (2023) ‘There was nothing here’: School leaders using dual language bilingual education programs as a formula to re-engineer student populations for school turnaround. *Educational Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08959048231159919>
- Morison, S.H. (1990) A Spanish-English dual-language program in New York city. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 508, 160–169.
- New York City Department of Education (2018) 2013–2018 Demographic snapshot. See <https://data.cityofnewyork.us/Education/2013-2018-Demographic-Snapshot-School/s52a-8aq6> (accessed 3 November 2021).
- New York City Department of Education (2021) Division of multilingual learners. 2020–21 english language learner demographics at-a-glance. See <https://infohub.nyced.org/reports/academics/ELL-demographic-report> (accessed 18 April 2022).
- Palmer, D.K., Cervantes-Soon, C., Dorner, L. and Heiman, D. (2019) Bilingualism, biculturalism, and critical consciousness for all: Proposing a fourth fundamental goal for two-way dual language education. *Theory into Practice* 58 (2), 121–133.
- Paris, D. and Alim, S. (2017) *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning for Justice in a Changing World*. Teachers College Press.
- Reyes, L. (2008) The Aspira consent decree: A thirtieth anniversary retrospective of bilingual education in New York City. *Harvard Educational Review* 76 (3), 369–400.

- Santiago, I. (1986) *Aspira v. board of education revisited*. *American Journal of Education* 95 (1), 149–199. <https://doi.org/10.1086/444296>
- Tian, Z., Garcia-Mateus, S. and Wong, J. (2022) Centering critical consciousness and translanguaging in Mandarin/English dual language education programs. Paper presentation. American Education Research Conference, San Diego, CA.
- Valdés, G. (1997) Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review* 67 (3), 391–430. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.67.3.n5q175qp86120948>
- Valdez, V.E., Freire, J. and Delavan, G. (2016) The gentrification of dual language education. *Urban Review* 48 (4), 601–627.
- Williams, C. (2017) The intrusion of White families into bilingual schools. *The Atlantic*, 28 December. See <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/12/the-middle-class-takeover-of-bilingual-schools/549278/> (accessed 11 August 2020).