Third National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues:
Focus on Middle and High School Issues

What Have We Learned from Research on Successful Secondary Programs for LEP Students?

A Synthesis of Findings from Three Studies

Tamara Lucas
Multifunctional Resource Center, Northern California

Abstract

This paper synthesizes findings from three studies which focused in whole or in part on successful secondary programs for language minority (LM) students: a study of six high schools in the Southwest which were effective with Latino LM students; a national study of exemplary special alternative instructional programs (SAIPs); and a national study of successful Title VII capacity building in 20 school districts. The author provides an overview of factors that characterized the schools and programs examined. Taken together, the studies offer school, program, and district perspectives on ways to serve secondary LM students and to maintain services over time. The author examines the role of context, features of school and program structures, and features of curriculum, instruction, and staff in effective secondary schools and programs. The paper provides a framework for educators and others engaged in designing, restructuring, implementing, and studying secondary programs for LM students.

Introduction

What do we know about secondary schooling for language minority (LM)[1] students? Until recently, not much. Since the passage of the Bilingual Education Act in 1965, little attention has been given to secondary issues in research or in the literature on the practice of secondary schooling for LM students. Secondary programs and practices for LM students have apparently been based on the neat and tidy but inaccurate perception that, like U.S.-born English speaking children, LM children enter U.S. schools at five or six years old and become fluent in academic as well as social uses of English in elementary school. If this perception were accurate, LM students would need little if any special consideration by the time they reached high school. Curriculum and instruction designed for U.S.-born, native English speaking students at the high school level should work just fine for immigrant children and children of immigrants, who would have developed their academic and social skills in English between kindergarten and high school.

Bilingual education is, in fact, a term generally taken to refer to one of several approaches to providing native language instruction and/or support to students from kindergarten to sixth grade. In its emphasis on transitional bilingual education programs designed to assist students in "transitioning" to English sometime between the third and sixth grades, depending upon the program, the federal government has focused its attention and funding primarily on elementary programs and students. Research too has followed this model. In an examination of *The NABE Journal* and *The Bilingual Education Review*, Faltis and Arias (1992) found

only four articles that directly addressed concerns of secondary LM students. They also point out that the three volumes published by the California Department of Education in the 1980s (1981, 1984, 1986) on the education of LM students give scant attention to secondary issues.

However, in the last few years, things have changed. Educators have recognized that many immigrants and refugees enter the U.S. after pre-school age and that many LM students who have attended U.S. elementary schools are more likely to succeed academically if programs and practices in secondary school are designed specifically for them. Adolescent immigrants enter the U.S. from many countries for economic and political reasons. Poor economic conditions, high foreign debt, and a high unemployment rate in Mexico and political upheaval, threat of war, and economic instability in Central America, Haiti, Southeast Asia, and more recently Eastern Europe lead many young people to move to the U.S. Even those LM students who do enter U.S. schools at elementary grades may not have had time and opportunity to develop their English abilities sufficiently by the time they reach the secondary grades. Approximately one-third (31 percent) of the limited English proficient students in California in the spring of 1991 were secondary students (California State Department of Education, 1991).

Students in U.S. secondary schools who are not proficient in English face serious challenges in their quest to succeed in school and beyond. In only a few years, they must learn the ins and outs of an unfamiliar educational system if they are to prepare appropriately for future schooling or employment, and they must develop their oral and written English abilities to be able to communicate complex concepts in various subject areas. For the most part, secondary LM students receive little support in this difficult undertaking. More than elementary students, secondary students are expected to fend for themselves in a system for which they are assumed to be already prepared.

Because so little research has focused on secondary education for LM students, we know little about the responses of schools and districts to their needs. One of the few such studies attempted to gain an understanding of "typical" programs and services for secondary limited English proficient (LEP) students in California (Minicucci and Olsen, 1991). The authors paint a bleak picture of the quality of secondary programs for California's LEP students, concluding that secondary LEP students are inadequately served because of the diversity and complexity of their needs, a shortage of trained teachers, lack of program planning, lack of materials, and the departmental structure of secondary schools.

Three other studies which have focused in whole or in part on successful secondary programs for LM students provide some of the only information available on such programs. The first study examined effective secondary schools; the second study examined exemplary programs, seven of which included secondary grades; the third study examined districts that had been successful at maintaining programs for LM students, including secondary programs.

In the first study (which I will refer to as the high school study), my colleagues and I identified and examined six high schools in California and Arizona which were taking concrete steps to promote the academic success of Latino LM students (see Lucas, Henze, and Donato, 1990). These schools were nominated by educators at state, county, and/or district levels and they provided quantitative evidence of their success (e.g., attendance rates, drop-out rates, post-secondary education attendance, and/or test scores). The second study (which I will refer to as the SAIP study) identified and examined nine exemplary programs in six states, including seven secondary programs, in which instruction was provided primarily through modified instructional approaches in English rather than in students' native languages (see Tikunoff et al., 1991a and b). Again, programs were selected through a process of nomination and subsequent collection of evidence of student success. The third study (which I will refer to as the capacity building

study) examined the efforts of school districts to build local capacity to continue programs for LM students after having received federal funding from Title VII to provide such services (see Kim and Lucas, 1991, 1992). As part of this research project, case studies were conducted of twenty school districts in sixteen states which had been successful at continuing such programs (see Lucas, 1992).

Taken together, these studies provide school, program, and district perspectives on ways to serve secondary LM students successfully and to ensure that services are maintained. Drawing from their findings, I will discuss the role of contextual factors in secondary programs for LM students, describe structural features of some secondary schools and programs serving LM students, and examine features of curriculum, instruction, and staff in such schools and programs (see Lucas, 1993, for another perspective on these factors). While these five critical aspects of secondary programs interact with and influence each other in various ways, I have chosen to consider them in the order listed above to reflect a narrowing in scope across these factors: context encompasses more than the school; structures as I am considering them exist within schools and programs; curriculum as I am considering it reflects specific school, program, and department decisions; instruction occurs inside individual classrooms; and staff is constituted of the individual people working with and in classrooms and programs for LM students. While this is by no means a comprehensive discussion of all factors that must be considered in developing successful secondary programs for LM students, I hope it will provide a more complete consideration of such factors than has previously been available.

The Role of Context in Successful Secondary Programs

In attempting to identify and implement instructional and support programs to meet the needs of LM students, educators have difficulty untangling the variety of contextual factors surrounding schools, programs, and districts. Most educators would like to find the one best approach that will work for all LM students. But experience and research tells us that what works in one setting may not work in another. Contextual factors exert significant influences on successful secondary programs for LEP students just as they do on secondary programs for other groups of students (see, for example, Fullan, 1990; Goodlad, 1984; Lightfoot, 1983; McLaughlin and Talbert, 1990).

Schools and programs exist within different and multiple contexts. Indeed, "...multiple embedded contexts...define the secondary school workplace and shape teaching and learning within them" (McLaughlin and Talbert, 1990, p.1). Features of international, national, state, community, district, school, and department settings influence the effectiveness of teachers and schools with individual students and with specific groups. At the broadest level, international events and trends influence priorities for and approaches to education. The perception that the U.S. is losing its competitive edge in world markets and political arenas has led to a renewed focus on mathematics and science education and on "accountability" in schools (i.e., national testing), for example. At the national level, the political climate of the country as related to ethnic and linguistic diversity and to immigrants helps to define secondary programs for LM students. The stronger the "English Only" movement becomes, for example, the less likely secondary programs are to offer courses which promote the use and development of students' native languages. The more people are told that immigrants are taking jobs away from people born in the U.S., the less likely people are to support "special" programs for the children of immigrants. Both national and state contexts influence secondary schools through laws and regulations as well as amounts and priorities for various types of educational funding.

Contextual factors closer to home may have more direct and clearly discernible impacts on their teaching

and administering of secondary programs for LM students. State curriculum requirements (called “Frameworks” in California, for example) mandate, with varying degrees of specificity, which topics must be taught in which grades and in which subject areas. These requirements pose special challenges to secondary teachers of LM students, who must struggle with making content accessible without seriously diluting it. The context of the local community was what Tikunoff and his colleagues (1991a) had in mind when reporting one of the key findings of the SAIP study: that is, "the form an Exemplary SAIP took and the nature of its success built upon and was influenced by its context" (p. 9). Contextual factors such as the following emerged in the SAIP, high school, and capacity building studies as determining what program elements are appropriate and effective in any given school. Effective programs for LM students are most likely to result when conscious attention is given to existing contextual factors within particular communities and schools such as these:

- the backgrounds and training of school and district staff;
- the nature, size, stability, educational and literacy backgrounds, countries of origin, and recency of arrival of the LM students and their families;
- the history of and attitude toward linguistic and cultural diversity in the community, the district, and the school; and
- the history of programs for LM students in the district and the school.

In order to provide effective secondary education to LM students, we must develop a "sophisticated understanding of the multiple embedded contexts" within which schools exist (McLaughlin and Talbert, 1990, p.1) and give up the dream of finding a "model" program which can simply be applied to schools and districts. We must consider a variety of factors in each specific situation in order to develop and restructure successful secondary programs for LM students.

Structural Features of Secondary Schools and Programs for LM Students

The current emphasis on "restructuring" at national, state, and local levels has led to a greater awareness of the rigidity and fragmentation in the way that secondary schools have traditionally been organized. They are departmentalized according to subject areas, and the school day is divided into short (usually 45- to 55-minute) time blocks in which students take classes focused on specific subject areas. The resulting superficial coverage of subjects, which works against serious learning for all students (see Sizer, 1985), is even more superficial for LM students, who have difficulty with English as well as with the content being presented. Just as the school is fragmented, so is the approach to educating LM students. Because, for the most part, different departments are responsible for meeting the needs of LM students in their subject areas, the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the approach in the different subjects may vary considerably; LM students may be well served in math and poorly served in science and social studies, for example (see Minicucci and Olsen, 1991).

More and more secondary schools have begun to break out of this rigid fragmentation and to organize schools according to different structural configurations. It is not yet clear which kinds of school and program structures work best for LM students. No research on this question has been reported, and practical experience has not been sufficiently varied and extensive to provide clear guidelines. Therefore, in describing some non-traditional school and program structures, I do not intend to assert that the success of the programs necessarily derives from their structures. The schools and programs were identified as

successful, but we cannot yet say how that success might be related to their structures.

The "Traditional" Dimension of Secondary School Structures

School restructuring "is not a destination; it is a process" (Garcia, 1991), a dynamic rather than static phenomenon, requiring constant monitoring and adjusting to changes in staff, students, goals, needs, problems, and successes. It is also not an either-or phenomenon; it occurs along a continuum encompassing programs that depart less radically from the traditional and programs that depart more radically from the traditional. Figure 1 shows this continuum and lists some of the adjustments that are being made in secondary school structure and organization so that schools can better meet the needs of LM students.

Figure 1

Continuum of More and Less Traditional Secondary School Structures

Traditional	**<========>**	**Untraditional**
(fragmented by subjects and daily schedule, no teacher collaboration, top-down decision making)		(integration of instruction across subjects, scheduling by longer time blocks, teacher teaming/collaboration, shared decision making)

Primary among the structural adjustments in secondary schools and programs serving LM students are[2]:

1. organizing schools according to groups called "families" or "houses" to facilitate integration of instruction and content and to provide more academic and nonacademic support for LM students;
2. promoting teacher collaboration and establishing teacher teams who work with the same group of students and are allotted a common preparation time so they can coordinate the curriculum. Faculty are usually affiliated both with a family or house and with their subject area department;
3. grouping LM students together for longer blocks of time rather than having them change classes every fifty minutes. In some cases these blocks are used to integrate the teaching of core subjects such as social studies and language arts/English, thus making the departmental structure less rigid; and
4. establishing some form of shared decision making among faculty and administrators.

Secondary programs for LM students in two Texas school districts that were examined in the SAIP study provide examples of ways these adjustments are manifested. Middle and high schools in a school-within-a-school program in one district in 1990 were organized according to interdisciplinary teams, with the LM program staff constituting one team which shared the same students. In addition to having their own preparation periods, they had a common planning period every day to discuss students and to coordinate their teaching. In one middle school, for example, four teachers and a paraprofessional taught the same one hundred sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students in a section of the school that had once been the science department and was separated from the main part of the second floor by double doors. In the morning, students were grouped according to four levels of English proficiency—novice (for students with weak literacy skills in any language as well as very little English ability), beginning, intermediate, and advanced. In the afternoon, they were grouped by grade level for their math, science, and social studies classes. The teachers were affiliated with their content area departments in the school and met with those departments as well as with their team. One of the teachers was the team leader, acting as a liaison with the principal and district administrators. The team, with the guidance of the team leader, made decisions about scheduling and

assigning students to the different program levels.

The second program would more accurately be described as a school-outside-a-school. This program had its own building separate from other schools, but it was not a comprehensive school and students did not attend it for a whole day. Teachers at this district center had students for blocks of time (two to three periods), which allowed them more flexibility in the types of activities they could do as well as giving them more extended time with students. Middle school LM students were bused to the center from their home schools and spent the morning there. High school students were bused to the center from their home schools in the afternoon. The center provided ESL classes for all students, social studies for middle school students, and fundamentals of mathematics, pre-algebra, and algebra I for high school students. At their home campuses students also received ESL and content ESL classes, depending upon their level of English proficiency, and students in some schools received Spanish for Spanish speakers.

The "Cohesiveness" Dimension of Secondary Programs

Another dimension along which to consider the structure of schools and programs is that of the cohesiveness of programs for LM students. Some schools have established cohesive programs for LM students with which all teachers of classes for LM students are affiliated in addition to their regular subject area affiliations. Figure 2 represents a second continuum which provides examples of this aspect of secondary programs for LM students.

Figure 2

Continuum of Cohesiveness of Secondary Programs for LM Students

Less Cohesive	<========>	More Cohesive
Special courses within traditional school structure	Special program within traditional school structure	Entire school devoted to LM students --- Entire school reorganized for LM students and non-LM students

The least cohesive organization for secondary schools serving LM students provides special courses within a standard school structure. In these schools, some combination of ESL classes, native language content classes, content ESL classes, and native language development classes (e.g., Spanish for Spanish speakers) for LM students are offered. LM students follow the same schedules as non-LM students, but they take classes designed specifically to address their language differences. LM students are usually integrated with other students for some portion of the day, the amount of integration depending upon such factors as students' levels of proficiency in English and the availability of specially trained staff. The number of special classes, the qualifications of the staff who teach them, the content areas covered, and the quality of instruction vary radically from school to school. The teachers of these special classes are affiliated only with their subject area departments and may not communicate with each other any more than they communicate with the mainstream staff. While many schools approach the education of LM students in this way (see Minicucci and Olsen, 1991), I know of no schools that have been identified as effective or exemplary that have this structure.

Other schools have more cohesive programs for LM students that exist within the larger school rather than simply providing individual classes. In this arrangement, someone is responsible for coordinating the program across subject areas and grade levels. The comprehensiveness of the program and the extent to which it is autonomous from the mainstream program varies. Some programs offer special courses in all subject areas and have their own full-time administrators and their own building or space within a building, and others offer courses in only some subject areas, are run by a part-time coordinator, and hold classes in various locations within a school facility. In all of these programs, however, the goal is to help LM students become proficient enough in English so that they can be mainstreamed as quickly as possible. Most of the programs that were examined in the high school, SAIP, and capacity building studies were organized as special programs within traditional schools.

In the first two program structures described above, classes or cohesive programs for LM students exist within larger school structures designed for non-LM students. The norm in these schools is the native English speaker even if, in fact, LM students constitute a very large proportion of the student population, and the goal is to see that LM students are "transitioned" into "regular" classes as soon as possible. More cohesive than these, the third type of program structure consists of an entire school designed just for LM students, a school in which the norm is to be a non-native speaker with limited proficiency in English. Within this category, there are two subcategories: (1) schools which LM students attend for a limited period of time before enrolling in a regular school; and (2) schools that LM students can attend for all four years of high school.

Most schools which LM students attend for a limited amount of time are designed specifically for newcomer students (i.e., LM students who have been in the U.S. for a short amount of time, e.g., two years or less).[3] Almost all of these programs provide English language development classes and orientation to U.S. schooling and culture. Many also provide some content classes in students' native languages and/or in English, and some provide native language development classes. The amount of time students may stay in such programs varies. However, since students in these programs are linguistically segregated from native English speakers, most school districts require that they be sent to a regular school after a period of time. This program organization, like the school-outside-a-school, makes efficient use of staff and gives recently arrived LM students a chance to become acclimated to U.S. schools and culture in a safe environment before being thrust into a regular high school.

For example, in 1991 LM students could attend one newcomer school in the San Francisco Bay Area (one of the schools in the high school study) for only six months before they had to enroll in a regular district high school, vocational school, or community college. To attend the school, students could not have been in the U.S. for more than two years. The school offered four levels of ESL classes and native language content classes in Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, and Cambodian. Pre-literate students with no proficiency in English took a two-semester orientation course which taught them about the school, the neighborhood, the city and the surrounding area as well as providing practice in basic communication skills and access to some information about U.S. culture.

I am aware of only one school devoted entirely to LM students which they can attend for all four years of high school. This school, located in New York City and one of the exemplary SAIPs, is a comprehensive high school specifically for LM students that was established in 1985. It is one of two alternative high schools located on the campus of a community college, the other school having been previously designed for students who were at-risk of dropping out. In 1990, when my colleagues and I visited the school, students were admitted based on length of U.S. residency (fewer than four years was required), low scores on a

standardized test (below the twenty-first percentile on the Language Assessment Battery), and/or recommendation by junior high school guidance counselors. The school's students had full access to all the facilities of the community college and could enroll in college courses if they were proficient enough in English. Since the entire school was designed and implemented only for LM students, the program was extremely cohesive in its attention to their needs.

Reorganizing an entire school for LM and non-LM students can also provide a high degree of cohesiveness for the LM program if the needs and interests of LM students are given equal consideration to those of non-LM students in planning the new structures. The process another high school in New York City went through in reorganizing and the outcome of that reorganization illustrate both this cohesiveness and an untraditional school structure represented in Figure 1.[4]

The school first established a special program for LM students within the larger school and then restructured the entire school for non-LM students as well as LM students. The first Title VII project that the school received had helped set up a bilingual program which took the form of a "mini school"—a smaller, more personal program within the larger high school similar to the school-within-a-school program in Texas described above. All LM students were placed in this program and all ESL and bilingual content area teachers taught within this department. The "mini school" provided the staff development and coordination for a wide variety of services for LM students. From the beginning, the bilingual program concerned itself with all aspects of a student's life—academic, emotional, and social—and developed an integrated approach to meeting the needs of LM students.

In fact, the "mini school" concept was so successful in meeting students' affective needs that it caught the attention of the rest of the school. As the school struggled to find solutions to its increasingly serious problem of student drop-out, the bilingual program became the model for a schoolwide restructuring effort aimed at developing more personalized, integrated programs for all students in the school. Known as "designated houses," these programs built on the nurturing and sense of identity which was evident in the bilingual mini school. This restructuring shifted services for LM students in the content areas to the academic departments in the school which, according to school staff, resulted in increased capacity for meeting the needs of LM students in the mainstream program. In 1990-91, staffing in the departments included six bilingual math teachers, six bilingual social studies teachers, four bilingual science teachers, two bilingual business teachers, and two bilingual/ESL aides. Bilingual materials were available in all subject areas. According to several people, LM students were among the top students in the school.

In addition to the organizational elements of program cohesiveness discussed above, there are other indications of the degree of cohesiveness within a program for LM students. Programs that are most effective with these students are embedded within larger environments that provide cohesiveness in their support of LM students' learning and achievement in a broad sense. The study of exemplary SAIPs found, for example, that the SAIPs were not isolated programs and were not the only support available to LM students. In fact, it proved difficult in most cases to determine where the SAIP left off and "regular" school programs began (see Tikunoff et al., 1991a, 1991b). Some of the activities and services which illustrate cohesive approaches to educating secondary LM students are as follows:

- LM students have access to counseling, tutoring, and other support services as needed.
- A variety of extracurricular activities are available to them (e.g., newspapers, sports activities, clubs).
- The non-bilingual and non-ESL classes in which LM students enroll incorporate modified instructional approaches, taking into account their linguistic and cultural diversity.

- Their families find extensive support networks in the schools, districts, and communities and specific steps are taken to insure their participation in their children's schooling.
- Value for their languages and cultures is evident throughout the schools and districts (see Lucas, Henze, and Donato, 1990, for a more complete discussion). This value is manifested in a variety of ways: learning about students' cultures, learning students' languages, hiring bilingual staff from the cultural backgrounds of the students, offering advanced as well as basic and lower division content courses in the students' primary languages, encouraging students to develop their primary language skills, and allowing students to speak their primary languages.

While most secondary schools are apparently maintaining traditional structures and providing fragmented programs for LM students, some are trying out new structures and designing more cohesive programs in an attempt to provide more effective and appropriate educational programs for all students. The structures of secondary schools and programs identified as successful with LM students exhibit great variety, as the examples above illustrate. While the least cohesive types of programs for LM students appear ineffective, the importance of the degree of cohesiveness and of the approach to providing it is still to be determined and may, in fact, depend upon the contextual factors surrounding individual schools and programs. We must also reserve judgment on which of the less traditional, more "restructured" organizational configurations are more effective for LM students. The variation in secondary school and program structures reflects exploration and experimentation which will offer new possibilities in the future.

Curriculum in Successful Secondary Schools for LM Students

One of the most disheartening findings of the recent study of secondary programs for LM students in California (Minicucci and Olsen, 1991) was that few secondary LM students in California's schools have access to the complete core curriculum, much less to a full and varied range of curricular offerings beyond the core courses. Large numbers of LM students with diverse backgrounds and needs in combination with small numbers of appropriately prepared staff make it impossible for most secondary schools to offer full subject area coverage through means that would make the content accessible for LM students. However, while few schools can offer full coverage every semester, some have made it a priority to provide a challenging and comprehensive curriculum for LM students. Our research suggests that LM students are more likely to achieve when a school's curriculum offers variety with respect to: (1) student skills, abilities, and knowledge that classes are designed to developed , (2) degrees of difficulty and sophistication among available classes, and (3) approaches to teaching content.

Schools that successfully address LM students' academic needs provide formal means through which LM students can develop abilities in English, abilities in their native languages, and skills and knowledge in different content areas. Having students postpone studying content while they concentrate only on learning English for a year at the secondary level does them a disservice by impeding their educational progress, which may in turn increase their frustration and ultimately lead them to drop out. The 1991-92 curriculum at an Illinois high school, presented in Figure 3, reflects the multiple skills development that we have seen throughout our research on effective secondary schools. At this school, the curriculum consisted of two hours of ESL per day for all LM students, content classes in Spanish and in Lao, content classes taught through modified (ESL) approaches, and native language development classes for Spanish speakers. To accommodate the two largest language groups in the school, all classes required for graduation at the high school were offered in Spanish and Lao, although not every class was offered every year. The particular classes offered each semester were those which the largest number of students needed and signed up for, so the course offerings were different each semester.

Although everyone agrees that LM students must have classes to help them learn English, the role of students' native languages in secondary programs for LM students is controversial, as it is at all educational levels. Even within schools in which formal and extensive native language development courses are offered, individual teachers may argue that it is unnecessary and even detrimental to students' mastery of English (appealing to what Cummins has called the insufficient exposure argument, 1989, p.18, 36). However, the evidence suggests that the opposite is true. It takes from two to three years to become proficient in basic communication skills in a second language and from four to ten years to approach grade-level competence in second language academic skills, depending upon a variety of factors (Collier 1989; Cummins 1981, 1984). Thus, if students enter school at any grade without having developed these skills, they will be at a distinct disadvantage if they are expected to function and learn only in English. When schools provide instruction and support in students' native languages, LM students have access to content while they are still developing their English skills and they see evidence that their linguistic and cultural heritages are valued (see Lucas, Henze, and Donato 1990).

Native language instruction and support varies considerably across secondary schools with respect to its extent and method of presentation. Like the Illinois high school discussed above, schools may provide native language development through formal classes (e.g., Spanish for Spanish Speakers) and/or through other less formal means (e.g., the use of instructional aides, peer tutoring, or community resources). In examining the data from the SAIP study, we were struck by the many ways in which teachers and aides facilitated the use and development of students' native languages inside and outside of classrooms even in these programs in which formal instruction was provided in English. Figure 4 (from Lucas and Katz, 1991) shows some of the ways students' native languages were used in the nine exemplary SAIPs.

Figure 3

Course Offerings at an Illinois High School, Fall 1991

Course	Lao Bilingual	Spanish Bilingual	ESL Approach
Mathematics		x	
Combination Pre-Algebra and Algebra	x		
Pre-Algebra		x	
Algebra		x	
Geometry 1-2	x	x	
General Science	x	x	
Health	x	x	
Biology	x	x	
Chemistry		x	
Civics	x	x	
Economics	x	x	
U.S. History	x	x	x
World History		x	

World Geography		x	
Reading		x	
Career Planning		x	
Drafting		x	x
Machine Shop			x
Typing			x
Home Economics			x
Study Skills			x
Spanish for Spanish Speakers Reading		x	
Spanish for Spanish Speakers Literature		x	
ESL I, II, and III			x
Freshman English			x
Sophomore English			x
Reading Skills			x
Writing Skills			x
Composition			x
Developmental English			x

Figure 4

Use of L1 by Students and Teachers Across Nine Exemplary Special Alternative Instructional Programs

Sites	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Students' use of L1:									
To assist one another	x	x	x	x	.	x	x	x	x
To tutor other students								x	
To ask/answer questions	x	x	x	x		x		x	
To use bilingual dictionaries		x	x	x				x	
To write in L1	x	x		x	x	x		x	
To interact socially	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Teachers' use of L1:									
To check comprehension	x	x				x		x	
To translate a lesson		x							

To explain an activity	x	x	x			x		x	
To provide instruction	x	x							
To interact socially	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	
L1 support in the larger school context:									
Content instruction in L1	x	x		x			x		x
Instruction in L1 culture, history, and/or language arts	x	x		x		x	x		x
Library books in L1	x	x			x			x	x
Communication to parents in L1	x	x	x		x	x			
Parents encouraged to read to Students in L1	x	x			x				

NOTE: x = Presence of this use of L1 in the site. Sites B and E do not include secondary students.

In addition to providing means through which students can develop multiple skills, successful secondary schools also offer variety in the degree of difficulty and sophistication among available classes. The curriculum presented in Figure 3 illustrates this type of variety as well. Spanish speaking students, for example, can take mathematics or geometry, general science or chemistry, developmental English or sophomore English for LM students, reading skills development in Spanish or Spanish literature. LM students are not trapped in low-level or "basic" courses; if they are capable of succeeding in advanced classes, they have access to them. Some high schools also offer Advanced Placement or Honors classes for LM students in various subject areas either in English or in students' native languages.

A final area in which successful secondary school curricula offer variety is in approaches to teaching content. When a school has qualified staff, offering a wide array of content courses in students' native languages can provide access to the curriculum for students with little English ability and allow students who do have some English ability the option of studying in their native language. However, many secondary schools have students who speak several different native languages and no qualified teachers to teach in those languages. Content classes taught through modified instructional approaches in English by teachers who have received training in those approaches can offer some access to the curriculum for all LM students. If more such courses had been offered at the high school represented in Figure 3, for example, students who did not speak Lao or Spanish would certainly have had more classes to choose from.

The primary lesson to be learned from curricula in successful secondary schools is that, since LM students constitute a heterogeneous group, a secondary school's curriculum should provide different means to meet their diverse needs. LM students should be able to develop their native language skills and to learn content as well as to develop their English abilities. Those who have strong backgrounds in some subject areas should have access to challenging, advanced classes in those subjects, just as students with weaker backgrounds need less advanced classes. Some LM students must have native language content classes in order to have access to content, while others can benefit from classes taught through modified approaches in English. In designing curricula, secondary educators must keep all of this diversity in mind and be especially vigilant to avoid relegating LM students to a narrow range of ESL and "basic" content classes.

Effective Instruction for Secondary LM Students

Instruction at the secondary level is notoriously teacher-directed and subject-focused. In reporting his research on schools, Goodlad (1984) described the "extraordinary sameness of instructional practices in the more than 1,000 [K-12] classrooms observed" in which "teachers lectured and questioned, students listened, [and] textbooks were the most common medium for teaching and learning" (p. 246-247). Anecdotal evidence suggests that this stultifying approach to instruction is prevalent in secondary classes for LM students as well as for non-LM students. Uninspiring for most students of any background, this approach is even more problematic for students whose command of English does not allow them to fully comprehend textbooks and lectures.

In order for secondary schools to provide more effective and appropriate instruction for LM students, they need teachers who are bilingual and/or have received extensive, high quality education and staff development. Teachers and paraprofessionals provide instruction, and how they provide it is determined by their training, philosophies, attitudes, and backgrounds. Minicucci and Olsen (1991) found that a shortage of teachers trained and willing to teach LM students was a major impediment to students' access to the curriculum in California secondary schools. Conversely, we found that the presence of strong staff development programs emphasizing instruction for LM students was a key feature of the effective secondary schools in both the high school and SAIP studies and, in the capacity building study, we found that knowledgeable, committed, bilingual teachers and other staff members were crucial to the continuation of programs for LM students.

In the high school and SAIP studies, we examined instructional practices of teachers deemed by administrators, other teachers and school staff, and students to be effective with LM students. We found that effective instruction at the secondary level is very similar to what is considered effective instruction at the elementary level. Some of the instructional practices of these successful teachers of secondary LM students (also presented in Lucas, 1993) are as follows:

- Rather than relying solely on language to facilitate learning, these teachers use a variety of activities and learning opportunities for students(e.g., visuals, physical activity, and nonverbal clues).
- When they do use language, they do not rely solely on English but allow and encourage students to use their native languages as needed to facilitate learning and participation.
- When these teachers use English, they modify its complexity and content so that students understand and can participate in classroom activities.
- They also do not rely solely on themselves as the sources of knowledge and learning but encourage interaction among students, bring in older and younger, more proficient and less proficient students from other classes, and involve paraprofessionals and community members in classroom activities.
- They encourage authentic and meaningful communication and interaction about course content among students and between themselves and students.
- They hold high expectations of their students, challenging them to tackle complex concepts and requiring them to think critically rather than eliciting a preponderance of one-word responses.
- In content classes, they focus instruction squarely on the content itself, not on English. At the same time, they build English language development into their instruction in all classes, including content classes.
- They recognize student success overtly and frequently.

This may sound like a tall order for teachers, and it is. However, some secondary teachers are using these instructional strategies, as the following vignette from a high school ESL class illustrates.[5]

Low-Intermediate ESL Class

This class took place in a room with traditional student desks facing toward the teacher's desk. The only unusual feature of the classroom was that there were more blackboards available than usual. Several small, portable blackboards stood in corners in addition to the permanent one in front. Twenty-four ninth and tenth grade students were present on the day of the observation; all were native speakers of Spanish. The teacher (who was a bilingual Latina herself) used only English, although students often spoke Spanish among themselves.

The lesson was structured around a kind of discovery/detective game in which students had to work cooperatively to find the answers. First students were divided into groups of three or four, and all groups were given a black and white line drawing of three men in athletic clothing. They were told to study the picture for four minutes. Then each group had to go to a separate blackboard space and cooperate to write down as many details and inferences about these men as possible. This activity took about ten minutes and involved lots of student-to-student interaction in both Spanish and English. Some of this talk centered on the inferences themselves, and some centered on the correct or best way to write these down in English.

When the groups had finished, they sat down again and one person was chosen from each group to read the details/inferences out loud. The teacher made a number of positive comments while this was going on, such as, "Oh, that's very interesting; you noticed that _____." She also questioned the inferences now and then in order to get the students to be more explicit (e.g., "Why would you think that?").

Then the teacher read some information about the three men and their history as friends (including introducing the character named Victor, who was not pictured), and students took notes. Each group was then given a form on which to write in answers to yes/no questions (and a space for reasons) which the teacher dictated slowly, with wait time in between for students to discuss their answers quietly. The culmination of this questioning was to discover, through clues, who must have killed Victor. After dictating all the questions and allowing time for students to decide on their group answers, the teacher read the correct answers out loud and students had a chance to discuss wrong/right answers. Each group got a score, and the group with the highest score was given a round of applause.

This description shows what a teacher of secondary LM students can do to facilitate student learning and participation. This teacher used many of the strategies listed above. She used visuals and hands-on activities, allowed the use of both English and Spanish among students while using only accessible English herself, provided opportunities for students to interact and collaborate with each other, designed activities that elicited meaningful and extended communication, pushed students to think about what they were learning, and recognized them for participating in classroom activities. Like other effective teachers of secondary LM students, her teaching departs from the predominant pattern of teacher lecturing and questioning, student listening, and textbook domination that Goodlad described.

Characteristics of Staff in Successful Secondary Schools for LM Students

For purposes of analysis, I have discussed program structures, curricula, and instructional strategies as separate features of secondary programs for LM students. However, in reality these features have substance only in relation to people who design and administer programs, who use the instructional strategies in their

classes, and who provide support inside and outside classrooms. No program, regardless of how innovative it might be as a program, will succeed unless key instructional, support, and administrative staff members support it and participate wholeheartedly (see Berman, 1981; Fullan, 1990; Minicucci and Olsen, 1991; Wilson and Corcoran, 1988). We have found some actions, attitudes, and characteristics of staff to be especially salient in successful schools and programs for secondary LM students (see Lucas, 1993, for a different analysis of staff characteristics in secondary programs for LM students). Staff members in various roles throughout these schools, not just those in the LM program:

1. are knowledgeable of various aspects of education for LM students;
2. are fluent in students' native languages and are members of their communities or are involved with those communities, or take steps to learn students' languages and to learn about their cultures;
3. show that they are committed to programs for LM students and to the students themselves;
4. actively promote programs and services for LM students in the school, district, and community;
5. use the instructional strategies described above, if they are teachers; and
6. actively support programs for LM students by taking stands and making decisions that facilitate effective programs and practices, especially if they are in leadership roles.

It is, of course, crucial that staff who are affiliated with special programs for LM students take such actions and have such attitudes and characteristics. But LM students interact with many other people as well, especially if they remain in a school for more than one year. We have found that, throughout successful schools, staff in various roles are knowledgeable of and interested in the education of the LM students and actively support the students and the programs. In fact, one of the key findings of the SAIP study was that students in the exemplary SAIPs found support and appropriate instruction throughout the larger school environments within which the SAIPs were embedded.

I will elaborate briefly on each of these six characteristics which, while not unique to secondary school staff, do appear to promote the success of secondary schools and programs for LM students.

1. Staff members are knowledgeable of approaches and strategies for educating LM students. Teachers and other school staff have to know how to provide the challenging curriculum and use the effective instructional approaches that facilitate students' development of multiple skills described above. Effective secondary teachers, for example, have broken out of their traditional subject matter focus to give equal consideration to their approaches to conveying content, and they organize instruction to facilitate active student participation. Decision makers understand the complex social, pedagogical, and political issues involved in educating language minority students and they take these factors into account in designing, implementing, and administering programs.

Schools acquire such knowledgeable staff by making it a priority to hire people who are already educated and experienced in working with LM students or who are willing to become so, and by providing ongoing staff development and educational opportunities for staff that focus on instructional approaches for teaching LM students, issues of cultural diversity, and other relevant topics. "The critical importance of ongoing staff development is one of the most consistent and significant findings in the effective-schools research" overall (Fullan, 1990, p.230). Because of the shortage of staff who are already fully qualified to work with LM students, staff development is of even greater importance in schools and districts with LM students. They must rely on staff development to insure that they have sufficient numbers of such staff. The attitude of the bilingual coordinator in a New Mexico school district reflects that of many others in districts with strong staff development components:

> Our primary goal [in the programs we have established] was to teach students, and our second goal was to teach the teachers. If you don't teach the teacher, nothing happens. You need to teach the teacher in order to [ensure a quality program for LM students].

2. As mentioned above, staff availability is a major problem for most school districts trying to provide programs for LM students. While school and district administrators may recognize that students benefit from contact with role models and staff members who can communicate with them in their native languages, there are simply not enough certified teachers who are bilingual and/or members of the ethnic/cultural groups of LM students enrolled in schools. This tends to be a greater problem at the secondary than at the elementary level because bilingual teacher training programs traditionally have been designed for elementary teachers.

Schools where LM students are succeeding have made it a priority to hire teachers who do have these characteristics and to provide financial support and incentives for others to become knowledgeable through staff development and educational programs, as mentioned above. For example, a California district made it a priority to hire role models for its large number of Hispanic students. District policy required that any Hispanic who applied for a job should be interviewed. If a Hispanic was among the top three candidates for a position and was not hired, the hiring committee had to justify its decision. The principal at an Arizona high school described that district's policy with regard to staffing:

> When we hire teachers, we try to look for the best teachers, number one, but number two and most importantly, we try to get teachers that relate to our type of kids, and number three, if we can get teachers that are from this area, that are teachers that have graduated from this high school, teachers that have had to go through these problems, the growing up problems, the educational problems from here and have gone out and have become successful, then we have provided role models for our kids that are essential.

Although there are obvious benefits in hiring people who share students' languages and cultures, it is not always possible to hire such staff in large numbers. We have also encountered many staff members who are not from students' ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds but who have learned about their backgrounds and studied their languages. It is not uncommon to find U.S.-born Caucasian staff members in programs for LM students who speak Spanish and have lived in Spanish speaking countries, for example. While it is less common for non-Asians to speak Asian languages, some have spent time in Asia or have become involved with students' communities in the United States. The Title VII project director in a Tennessee district, for example, was well-known in the large Lao community there, regularly attending weddings and holiday celebrations and organizing potlucks which brought community members to the schools. Students have made it clear to us in interviews that they notice and appreciate such efforts.

3. Staff commitment to programs for LM students and to the students themselves emerged in all three studies as key to program success. Consistent with Wilson and Corcoran's (1988) findings from their study of successful high schools, we have found that "the energy, commitment, and vision of the professionals working in these schools [where LM students are successful] are central to their success" (p. xi). Staff at the schools and in the districts show through their actions that they sincerely believe in the programs and want to do what they can to ensure that LM students succeed in school and beyond. They are eager to learn how to work more effectively with the students, and they put in many extra hours and participate in activities over and above what their jobs call for.

We collected reams of comments describing staff commitment such as the following:

- The ESL curriculum specialist in a district in North Dakota was described as doing "three people's work."
- A teacher in a district in Indiana said that for the program coordinator there, working for bilingual and multicultural education "is a belief, not a job."
- A principal in a Virginia high school said: “[One] aspect of [the LM program's] success, very frankly, has been the unusual dedication and commitment and creativity of the staff in these programs. I've never found another staff like them. . . The [bilingual/ESL] department here and in every school in the county spends more time together and individually preparing, reviewing, and working with kids than any department that I have ever found anywhere.”
- A high school English teacher, department chair, and Teacher of the Year in New Mexico asked the ESL coordinator to come into her class for nine weeks to show her how to work more effectively with LM students.

Staff commitment reaches beyond the regular school day and the school itself. School staff members give extra time and energy after school and during lunch or preparation periods to counsel and tutor students (see Lucas, Henze, and Donato, 1990, for a discussion of student empowerment). They sponsor activities that involve LM students outside of class and promote the development of leadership skills such as MECHA (Movimiento Educacional Chicano de Atzlan) chapters, Latino clubs, Spanish language newspapers/newsletters, soccer teams, Ballet Folklorico groups, and multicultural events and celebrations. They participate in various community activities and hold elected positions through which they act as advocates for LM students and communities. For example, a Latino assistant principal at an Arizona high school had been mayor of the town, and a teacher and MECHA advisor at a California high school was on the City Council. A Lao guidance counselor in a district in the Southeast had been instrumental in sponsoring Lao refugees to come to the area, had written a letter to the Office for Civil Rights which had resulted in more services for LM students in the district, had acted as the president of the national volunteer organization of Lao people in the U.S., and wrote a weekly newscast for local broadcast to the Lao community. Through activities such as these, school and district staff members "have critically examined and...challenged the educational (and social) structure within which they operate," thus contributing to students' "empowerment" (Cummins, 1989, p.6).

4. When staff members are committed to programs and services for LM students, they do what they can to ensure that the quality of those programs and services is maintained and that they continue. They garner support from other staff members, administrators, and community members by keeping them informed about program activities and successes that is, by promoting the programs within the school, district, and community. The superintendent in a Virginia district described the phenomenon very well:

> What I think is important is we keep the program in the public eye. We provide the board with...a constant flow of information. The overall strategy is keep people informed, keep the programs visible, take the heat so people don't think you're spending too much money. I guess the primary strategy is information, information, information. Just keep pounding away. And I think that builds understanding, the belief system that there's a real need, the sophistication that says you've got to do these things if you're going to make a constructive difference. All those things together go in to make for continuing support. . . You've established a strong awareness and information base that makes it possible to accept the responsibility to fund those programs after the feds cut and run [i.e., when federal funding is no longer available].

Instructional, support, and administrative staff make a constant effort to keep LM students in people's

minds. Teachers, counselors, paraprofessionals, principals, home/school liaisons, as well as parents bring issues relevant to the education of LM students to department, faculty, school board, PTA, and Chamber of Commerce meetings. Advocates, often program administrators, make sure that the media cover program activities and news. When visiting schools for these research projects, my colleagues and I were interviewed by several local newspapers at the instigation of program administrators, who urged us to explain why their school, program, or district had been selected for these studies that were examining various types of success. Some schools and programs send out newsletters to keep people informed. Some people organize and participate in community activities as representatives of the programs. These efforts at program promotion pay off in focusing attention on LM student issues and on the quality of programs and services they receive and in increasing the likelihood that such programs and services will not be overlooked in district and school decision making.

5. As discussed above, teachers and other instructional staff in secondary schools where LM students achieve use instructional strategies that engage students in hands-on activities, encourage the use of both English and students' native languages, provide opportunities for students to interact and collaborate with each other, design activities that elicit meaningful and extended communication, push students to think about what they were learning, and recognize them for participating in classroom activities. They also find ways to acknowledge and incorporate students' native cultures throughout the school and in classrooms. The focus on interaction and student participation is a departure from the way many, if not most, secondary teachers were prepared and expected to teach.

6. The support of administrators and others in decision-making roles is crucial to the success and maintenance of programs. They have to be willing to learn about issues in LM education and to consider the needs of LM students realistically and with conscience. To ensure that LM students receive needed and appropriate instruction and services, they may sometimes have to make decisions that depart from school and district tradition and are therefore controversial. Over and over in secondary schools that are having success with LM students, we have heard about the importance of this kind of support.

At the school level, principals have the power to make or break a program just as teachers do. As a supervisor for special programs in Tennessee said, "If you don't have the principal's support, you can write the most fantastic proposal or have the most wonderful program but it's going to just die on the vine because they're going to view it as just something else that you're asking their teachers to implement." Principals in schools that are successful with LM students are described as actively supporting programs for the students, as sensitive to their needs, and as valuing their native languages and cultures (e.g., by taking language classes to learn another language). Actions that show a principal's support include:

- hiring bilingual staff members from students' cultures;
- encouraging parents of LM students to participate in the school activities;
- encouraging staff to participate in staff development focused on LM students;
- participating in such staff development him/herself;
- including LM program staff on meeting agendas;
- promoting programs and services for LM students in district and community meetings;
- working with the district bilingual staff to design school curriculum; and
- allowing district bilingual staff to plan with school staff.

District-level administrators also have a great deal of influence on the success and maintenance of programs for LM students. The support of people who administer personnel departments, district staff development programs, secondary programs, and budgets, as well as bilingual/ESL programs can go far in determining

the quality and strength of district and school programs. Superintendents, of course, are especially influential. The efforts of one California superintendent reflect the type of support and advocacy that was described in many districts. He played a pivotal role in creating the structures leading to a successful and long-lasting program for LM students in the district. As a result of his efforts, Title VII was funded in the fourth year of his term as superintendent. He:

- initiated the networking that created a consortium of districts which collaborated to write a proposal for and then to administer a Title VII grant;
- recruited the project director;
- provided funding for additional costs connected with the project not covered by the grant;
- helped to generate support for the project throughout the district, including among members of the school board and school staff; and
- at the end of funding, ensured that project staff continued with the district.

School and district decision makers like these provide support that makes the existence of effective schools, programs, and classrooms possible.

Conclusion

A consideration of the five factors discussed above can provide a framework for educators and others engaged in designing, restructuring, implementing, and studying secondary programs for LM students. In three research projects that focused in whole or in part on successful secondary schools, contextual factors, curriculum, instruction, and staff characteristics influenced the success of the programs and the shapes those programs took. Although more research is needed to more fully understand how context influences school and program effectiveness and which particular features of curriculum, instruction, and staffing lead to greater success among schools and students, we are now more informed about these issues than before. We have less information, however, to help us determine the relationship of school and program structure to success for LM students. The schools studied are exploring different ways to organize schools and programs for LM students as well as for other students, some of which depart considerably from traditional secondary school structures. Future research will have to sort out how these variations relate to school and student success.

These five factors are interrelated in complex ways. Contextual factors and staff characteristics certainly influence all of the others and each other. The history of and attitudes toward linguistic and cultural diversity in the community, for example, influence the extent to which LM students' needs are taken into account when school structures and curricula are being designed. In addition, the context itself can be changed by individuals and groups in schools, the district, and the community—that is, by staff members and others. The commitment and level of expertise of the staff at individual schools and in the district as a whole influence school and program structures and curricula as well as instructional approaches used in classes. While it is necessary to discuss these and other aspects of schools separately, in attempting to adapt them to other schools we should keep in mind that "efforts at improvement must encompass the school as a system of interacting parts, each affecting the others" (Goodlad, 1984, p. 31).

I have not, of course, touched upon all of the "interacting parts" that go into making a secondary school successful with LM students. I have not discussed family involvement, the involvement of the language minority community and the broader community, student assessment, or the roles of paraprofessionals and counselors, for example, though all play important roles. Nevertheless, I hope that this analysis has

contributed to our nascent understanding of what we can do to ensure that secondary LM students have a chance to succeed in school and beyond. To that end, some educators are thoughtfully developing secondary programs and are adapting middle and high schools to address a variety of needs in ways that are appropriate within local contexts. They are examining ways in which school structures promote and hinder student success and adjusting organizational configurations accordingly. They are designing curricula that challenge LM students and provide them with access to skills, abilities, and content knowledge. They are using instructional approaches that engage students and challenge them to use and develop their minds. They are becoming knowledgeable of issues in the education of LM students, dedicating time and energy to educating LM students, promoting programs for LM students, and hiring bilingual staff members. People in various roles are providing leadership in different ways and at different stages in the process of developing and maintaining secondary programs for LM students. Practitioners can apply some of the approaches described here and researchers can take the cue from the issues raised to develop research agendas that will further increase our understanding of successful education for secondary LM students.

A few of the questions which future research might address are as follows:

- What is the relationship between various school and program structural configurations and LM student success?
- In what different ways have secondary schools that are "restructuring" incorporated the needs of LM students into their restructuring plans? How did they make their decisions?
- What are the elements of LM programs and school "cohesiveness," how do these different elements interact, and how do they relate to program and student success?
- What are the details of effective instruction for secondary LM students in various subject areas when taught in English and in students' native languages?
- What are the experiential and educational backgrounds of teachers, paraprofessionals, counselors, and others who work successfully with secondary LM students? What is salient to students about those backgrounds?
- What are the experiential and educational backgrounds of administrators and other decision-makers who actively support secondary programs for LM students? What are the outcomes of their attitudes and actions?
- How can schools successfully and productively involve the parents and other family members of LM students?
- How can secondary schools address the multitude of nonacademic needs that LM students bring with them to school?

While some research has addressed some of these questions, we need far more information in these areas than we now have. I am optimistic that the growing interest in education for secondary LM students will result in more research on these issues in the future.

Endnotes

[1] I will use the term *language minority (students)* throughout this article to refer to students in U.S. schools who are not native speakers of English. This group includes those who are officially classified as limited English proficient as well as those who have developed some proficiency in English but are less than fully fluent.

[2] Minicucci and Olsen (1991) also found the following structural changes in secondary schools: allowing students to attend high school for more than four years; coordinating with adult education programs; offering classes on days and during periods when the regular school is not in session.

[3] For more information on Newcomer Centers, see: Chang, H. N., 1990; Friedlander, 1991; Multifunctional Resource Center/Northern California, 1991.

[4] I am grateful to Timothy Beard of ARC Associates for the description of this school, which was visited as part of the capacity building study.

[5] See Henze and Lucas, forthcoming, for descriptions and analyses of this and three other high school classes.

References

Berman, P. (1981). *Educational change: An implementation paradigm. In R. Lehming and M. Kane (Eds.), Improving schools: Using what we know*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

California State Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office. (1981). *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Sacramento: CSDE.

California State Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office. (1984). *Studies on immersion education*. Sacramento: CSDE.

California State Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office. (1986). *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students*. Sacramento: CSDE.

California State Department of Education. (1991). *DATA/BICAL Report*. Sacramento: CSDE.

Chang, H. N. (1990). *Newcomer programs: Innovative efforts to meet the educational challenges of immigrant students*. San Francisco: California Tomorrow.

Collier, V. P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL quarterly, 23* (3), 507-531.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.

Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Faltis, C., and Arias, M. B. (1992, January). *Issues in bilingual secondary education*. Paper presented at the

International Conference of the National Association for Bilingual Education, Albuquerque, NM.

Friedlander, M. (1991). *The newcomer program: Helping immigrant students succeed in U.S. schools*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Fullan, M. G. (1990). Change processes in secondary schools: Toward a more fundamental agenda. In M. W. McLaughlin, J. E. Talbert, and N. Bascia (Eds.), *The contexts of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Garcia, C. (1991, October). *Restructuring education to meet the needs of all students*. Keynote address presented at the Northern California Institute on Latino and Other Newcomer Students, sponsored by the Multifunctional Resource Center/Northern California, Napa, CA.

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Henze, R., and Lucas, T. (Forthcoming, 1994). "Shaping instruction to promote the success of language minority students: An analysis of four high school classes." *Peabody Journal of Education*.

Kim, Y., and Lucas, T. (1991). *National survey of Title VII bilingual education capacity building efforts* (Phase I Report: Descriptive Analysis of Bilingual Instructional Service Capacity Building Among Title VII Grantees). Oakland: ARC Associates.

Kim, Y., and Lucas, T. (1992). *Final Report: Descriptive Analysis of Bilingual Instructional Service Capacity Building Among Title VII Grantees*. Oakland: ARC Associates.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1983). *The good high school: Portraits of character and culture*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Lucas, T. (1993). Secondary schooling for students becoming bilingual. In M. B. Arias and U. Casanova (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Politics, research, and practice*. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Lucas, T. (1992). *Successful capacity building: An analysis of twenty case studies* (Phase III Report: Descriptive Analysis of Bilingual Instructional Service Capacity Building Among Title VII Grantees). Oakland: ARC Associates.

Lucas, T.; Henze, R.; and Donato, R. (1990). "Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools." *Harvard educational review*, *60* (3): 315-340.

Lucas, T., and Katz, A. (1991, April). *The Roles of Students' Native Languages in Exemplary SAIPs*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

McLaughlin, M. W., and Talbert, J. E. (1990). The contexts in question: The secondary school workplace. In M.W. McLaughlin, J. E. Talbert, and N. Bascia (Eds.), *The contexts of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities* (pp. 1-14. New York: Teachers College Press.

Minicucci, C., and Olsen, L. (1991). *An exploratory study of secondary LEP programs* (Volume V: *Meeting the challenge of diversity: An evaluation of programs for pupils with limited proficiency in English)*. Berkeley: BW Associates.

Multifunctional Resource Center/Northern California. (1991). *Resource guide: Bilingual education for new immigrant and refugee LEP students*. Oakland: ARC Associates, Inc.

Rossman, G. B.; Corbett, H. D.; and Firestone, W. A. (1988). *Culture, change, and effectiveness*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sizer, T. (1985). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Tikunoff, W.; Ward, B. A.; van Broekhuizen, D.; Romero, M.; Castaneda, L. V., Lucas, T.; and Katz, A. (1991a). *Final report: A descriptive study of significant features of exemplary special alternative instructional programs*. Los Alamitos: Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Tikunoff, W.; Ward, B. A.; van Broekhuizen, D.; Romero, M.; Castaneda, L. V.; Lucas, T.; and Katz, A. (1991b). *Final report: A descriptive study of significant features of exemplary special alternative instructional programs (*Vol. 2: *Report for practitioners)*. Los Alamitos: Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Wilson, B. L., and Corcoran, T. B. (1988). *Successful secondary schools: Visions of excellence in American public education*. London, England: Falmer Press.