A Year-Round Professional Development Model for World Language Educators

Tracy M. Steele
Stanford University

Margaret D. Peterson
Stanford University

Duarte M. Silva
Stanford University

Amado M. Padilla
Stanford University

Abstract: *The Bay Area Foreign Language Program (BAFLP), one of nine regional sites of the California Foreign Language Project, offers ongoing, year-round professional development programs for world language educators. In addition, its leadership program prepares selected educators to assume leadership positions at their school sites, building capacity for sustainable change. Demographic data from the program reveal increased opportunities for educators to strengthen their standards-based instructional practices. Findings also indicate that the leadership program is successful in terms of participant experience, allowing educators to gain leadership skills and lend their expertise back to improving the program. Aligned to the Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century, BAFLP's model can offer guidance to school districts in crafting effective and sustainable professional development programs.*

Tracy M. Steele (PhD candidate, Stanford University) is a research associate at the School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Margaret D. Peterson (MA, University of Texas at Austin) is Site Director for the Bay Area Foreign Language Program, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Duarte M. Silva (EdD, University of San Francisco) is the Executive Director of the California Foreign Language Project, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Amado M. Padilla (PhD, University of New Mexico) is Professor of Psychological Studies in Education at Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Introduction

How do we nurture and shape educators and educator leaders who can improve foreign language instruction in their own classroom and work collaboratively among and across disciplines to help strengthen student performance in our increasingly diverse schools? The Bay Area Foreign Language Program (BAFLP), located in the Stanford University School of Education (SUSE), provides ongoing professional development programs for foreign language educators in the Bay Area. It is designed to strengthen foreign language instruction and student learning of foreign languages within California's educational system. BAFLP's model of professional development incorporates national standards for foreign language education into effective programs that support educators in the development of their academic content knowledge and pedagogical skills to promote student achievement. In addition, BAFLP's design and implementation of professional learning communities prepare participants to assume leadership roles in schools while also allowing them to lend their expertise back to improving the program. BAFLP can be a model for school districts in helping them to design effective professional development programs.

Background

BALFP offers ongoing, professional programs for educators, including summer institutes and follow-up workshops during the school year. Educator participation is voluntary, and the comprehensive model enables educators to pursue professional development to the extent that they desire. BAFLP is one of nine sites of the California Foreign Language Project (CFLP), a California legislated and funded program that provides content-specific professional development programs for language educators. It is designed to improve and expand foreign language teaching in California at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels. All CFLP sites provide a series of core programs aimed at strengthening educators' knowledge of the languages and cultures they teach as well as their pedagogical skills. The authors have worked or are currently working with the CFLP program.

To examine educator implementation of strategies emphasized in the professional development activities, portfolios are required to be submitted annually to CFLP. These portfolios include sample lesson plans created by participants and videotapes (accompanying lesson plans) of participants teaching in their own classrooms. Several years ago, the CFLP evaluation team developed a protocol to examine how well the lesson plans and videotaped classroom teaching samples reflect aspects of proficiency-oriented instruction. Evaluation results indicated that participants increased their knowledge of proficiency-oriented instruction and incorporated their learning and workshop materials into their classroom teaching (Lozano, Padilla, Sung, & Silva, 2004).

In addition, each of the CFLP sites sponsors leadership development programs that prepare project participants to assume leadership roles in their schools, districts, and the language teaching profession at large. Participants often become members of the "leadership team" for each of the CFLP sites and assume a major role in the planning and the delivery of sites' professional development activities for their colleagues. The BAFLP leadership team consists of a principal investigator, a site director, a project assistant, and eight teacher leader presenters, all dedicated to promoting quality language teaching and learning. The leadership team participates in reflective educator learning communities (Ferraro, 2000; Schon, 1987), supports research-based best practices, provides technical assistance to schools and districts,

and offers leadership opportunities for foreign language educators.

Review of Literature on Professional Development for Educators

Two distinct waves of reform over the past 50 years have shaped much current knowledge regarding professional development. The first wave, beginning in the 1960s, emphasized educator-centered practices, including using class time effectively, grouping students, and assessing student comprehension of educator presentations. Educator enhancement training, as it was referred to, was delivered by content area experts outside the field of education. They focused on what they felt educators needed to know and provided scripted, "educator-proof" curriculum to be transferred to the classroom in a one-size-fits-all type of package (Frechtling, Sharp, Carey, & Vaden-Kiernan, 1995). More recently, beginning in the 1990s, researchers delved more deeply into student learning (Fishman, Marx, Best, & Tal, 2003; Loucks-Horsey & Matsumoto, 1999), examining how professional development can improve educators' classroom practices and lead to increased student achievement by concentrating on how students learn the subject (Ball, 1996; Resnick, 2006). Professional development shifted from educator-centered practices to a focus on subject matter and student learning by explicitly introducing instructional practices related to the particular subject and how students understand it, and by strengthening educators' content knowledge (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999; Lieberman, 1995).

Along with a shift from educator-centered practices to student learning, professional development has also been evolving in its delivery of knowledge and practices (Guskey & Huberman, 1995). The National Staff Development Council (NSDC) formed in the late 1970s as a nonprofit organization of educators whose primary responsibility included staff development in their schools and large urban districts. The focus of the NSDC has expanded over nearly four decades. Initially, professional development consisted of one-day workshops or in-school staff training by outside parties concerning general pedagogical practices, irrespective of the distinct needs of each school. This practice, often referred to as one-shot staff development training, has been routinely criticized in the professional literature. Experts have argued that the practices do not take into account the particular needs of each school, fail to acknowledge and build upon the skills and talents that educators already possess, and lack coherence and continuity (Little, 1993; Miles, 1995).

Currently, the NSDC's purpose is ensuring student success through continued and sustained educator development. More than 40 states now have professional development standards, more than half of which were adopted directly from the NSDC, with the others being closely related to NSDC standards. According to Mizell (2007), "Researchers and education change agents acknowledge the importance of professional learning among strategies essential for reforming schools and raising teacher and student performance" (p. 19). Increasingly, professional development programs have worked to disseminate knowledge and build upon educator skills through the use of these learning communities.

Rather than a top-down approach toward educator development, the use of professional learning communities recognizes the inherent skills and experiences that educators bring to the learning environment. Building upon these skills helps create effective and sustainable change among and across schools and districts (Hord, 1997). For example, Little (2006) asserted that "teachers who experience frequent, rich learning opportunities have in turn been helped to teach in more ambitious and effective ways" (p. 1). In addition, professional development programs that create "communities of learners" from which educator leaders emerge hold several potential advantages for schools. These include improved classroom practice, satis-

faction emerging from personal dignity, and collective responsibility for student learning (Kruse & Louis, 1999). Professional communities can allow educators to engage in the process of formulating their educational mission and defining specific learning goals through appropriate and effective evaluations of student performance in the classroom.

The accountability reform movement in education has also resulted in new ideas of leadership. Beliefs regarding leaders are much broader and acknowledge that all educators are leaders in the classroom and can support each other's abilities through collaboration. Lambert (1998) defined leadership as the "reciprocal learning process that enable participants in a community to construct meaning toward a shared purpose" (p. 18). She argued that schools and districts must work to build and sustain leadership capacity to improve student learning. Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson, and Haan (2002) proposed that educational leadership for a postindustrial world must embrace the leadership of educators. Like Lambert, they believed that the act of educational leadership transforms teaching and learning in a school. In the current climate of restructuring and educator empowerment, educators are assuming leadership in ever-widening circles. Professional development programs such as BAFLP that infuse leadership into their model build capacity for sustained improvements to both educator practice and improved student outcomes.

There is an increasing need for districts, schools, and universities to offer comprehensive professional development that meets national standards for foreign language education and builds capacity for sustained learning and teaching (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995). Unfortunately, the literature on professional development specifically aimed at world language educators proves scant; what does exist tends to focus on a single aspect of teaching, such as classroom management (Horwitz, 2005). Peyton (1997) highlighted the challenges that world language educators face in acquiring the skills and knowledge needed to provide quality instruction to students. However, the small body of literature concerning the development of world language educators' knowledge and skills lacks descriptions of sustained and continuous models of professional development programs for schools and districts to emulate. Instead, it lays out a smorgasbord of program options from travel abroad to week-long summer workshops that interested educators can attend (Kuntz & Michaels, 2001; Phillips, 1991). While undoubtedly beneficial to the individual educator, the programs highlighted prove to be isolated learning opportunities. Schools and districts interested in providing ongoing professional development models aligned to the standards for foreign language education can benefit from descriptions of successful models (Bott Van Houten, 2000).

BAFLP provides an effective, ongoing, professional development model based on the most recent research, with educator learning and leadership for student achievement as its goal. Schools and districts can benefit from replicating this model, developing more experienced and knowledgeable educators to improve student achievement in world languages. In addition, BAFLP's model provides opportunities to create educator leaders who can use their own expertise to help in all aspects of school leadership and build capacity for sustaining effective change.

Addressing Issues of Educator Quality

BALFP provides professional development activities related to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Education Act of 2001 through the implementation of its specific learning strands and through its collaboration with other schools and districts. BAFLP specifically addresses the goals derived from NCLB designed to strengthen educator competence. For example, four programs related to NCLB's first goal, improving educator quality, were offered from 2003 to 2005 and

attracted a total of 54 participants. The largest number of programs, attracting the highest number of participants, focused on the second of the four NCLB goals: strengthening educator content knowledge and pedagogical skills. From 2003 to 2007, BALFP offered a total of 16 programs that attracted 197 participants related to that goal. Meanwhile, BAFLP offered 5 distinct programs that attracted 56 participants related to the third goal of improving educator practices to better meet the needs of English language learners. To meet the fourth and final goal of providing technical assistance to schools and districts in terms of program improvement, BAFLP has taken an active role in coaching educators and advising school district administrators, school principals, and department head educators in meeting NCLB requirements.

In addition, BAFLP works closely with the California Subject Matter Project (CSMP), a collaborative network for K–16 educators and institutions seeking to improve student achievement across all content areas and all grade levels. For example, BAFLP has formed partnerships with other CSMP sites to provide comprehensive professional development programs for schools, districts, and county departments of education throughout the greater Bay Area. Nearly all these districts are identified as "program improvement" districts, indicating that they have not met specific benchmarks developed by the California Department of Education for two consecutive years or more. The purpose of this partnership is to create and implement a detailed plan for professional development to increase educator knowledge and student learning within standards-based curricula. This collaboration supports content area educators with specific methodology to implement differentiated instructional strategies in the curricula with the purpose of increasing student achievement.

While BALFP has succeeded in attracting increased participation from low-performing schools and districts, more work needs to be done. In 2003–2004, two low-performing schools had registered participants for BAFLP's professional development activities, in comparison to 38 high-performing schools. From 2006 to 2007, the number of low-performing schools attending BAFLP's professional development activities increased to 15; however, participation from high-performing schools also increased to 48. While BAFLP has experienced increased participation of low-performing schools by 650% over the past three years, high-performing schools still disproportionately attend the professional development activities by more than 3 to 1.

Description of BALFP

BALFP provides a structure of professional development that encourages educator engagement and supported reflection. The model also includes avenues to build effective leadership and to ensure sustainability of these critical processes over time. BAFLP offers a tiered professional development program series of three levels followed by an invitational leadership strand, with the intent that educators participate in long-term professional development in a deep and meaningful way (see Table 1). Each of these programs is designed to meet the NCLB goals to support educators in the development of their academic content knowledge and pedagogical skills. The programs are also in alignment with national content standards for foreign language education to promote student achievement. The strategies and practices utilized in BAFLP's programs incorporate five different models of effective staff development identified by Sparks & Loucks-Horsey (1989), including individually guided staff development, observation/assessment, involvement in the development/improvement process, training, and inquiry.

The first level is Strand A, "Effective Strategies for the Foreign Language Teacher." The content is intended for new educators or those who may need to have a review of the basic principles and practices of language teaching and learning. The

TABLE 1

Overview of BAFLP

Levels	Summer	Academic Year
Strand A: Effective Strategies for the Foreign Language Teacher	Instructional staff conduct needs assessment and program revisions based on evaluation of academic year program	40-hour program (5 days) September–March Content: • National Standards • Assessment • Lesson design • Class management • Class procedures • Engagement strategies
Strand B: Unit Design for the Foreign Language Teacher	Instructional staff conduct needs assessment and program revisions based on evaluation of academic year program	40-hour program (5 days) September–March Content: • Backwards planning • Course of study • Assessment • Unit plan • Technology • Critical thinking skills • Engagement strategies
Strand C: Academic Literacy and Assessment	Instructional staff conduct needs assessment and program revisions based on evaluation of academic year program	40-hour program (5 days) September–March Content: • Academic literacy • Assessment • Critical thinking skills • Analysis of student work to inform instruction • Technology • Strategies to prepare students for AP Spanish Language exam
Technology Strand	40-hour program (5 days) June Content: Integration of foreign language instruction and the following: • collaborative units online • My eCoach • podcasting • blogs/Web 2.0 • collaborative docs • wikis • Flickr • Voicethread • Ning	20-hour program (3 days) April–May Content: Integration of foreign language instruction and the following: • collaborative unit development • My eCoach • podcasting • blogs/Web 2.0 • wikis

TABLE 1 *continued*

Levels	Summer	Academic Year
Invitational Leadership Development Strand	20-hour program (3 days) June Content: • Second language acquisition theory/methods • Presentational skills • Technology to support language/leadership • National, state, and local language policy	60-hour program (7 days) September–May Content: • Second language acquisition theory/methods • Presentational skills • Leadership skills • Technology to support language/leadership • National, state, and local language policy • Professional growth

focus is on lesson planning and design in alignment with national foreign language standards, classroom management and procedures, student engagement strategies, and student assessment and evaluation (see Table 1). The BAFLP leadership team members present each language teaching principle through carefully modeled instructional activities that can be duplicated in the classroom. This powerful "modeling technique" allows educators to immediately see the relevancy of what they are learning in the program and how they can implement both the concepts and teaching practices in their own classrooms. With visuals, authentic cultural texts/music, and realia, the presenters demonstrate the research-based instructional sequence. The participants also observe and participate in model lessons conducted in the target language(s).

The activities and practices embedded in Strand A work to "support both reformers' visions of practice and teachers' professional growth," as identified by Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995), of the requisites for effective professional development in the new era of reform (p. 597). For example, educator participants create their own activities, based on those that were demonstrated, and pilot them with their students. At the subsequent meeting, in a reflective format session, participants share their experience and receive feedback from their peers as well as members of the leadership team. By the end of the series, the participants have developed an entire instructional sequence, taught it to their students, examined student data, and reflected with other colleagues on how to continuously improve their teaching practices to enhance student learning. The presenters also infuse techniques for classroom management, essential professional skills for new educators, into their model-lessons, as well as interactive and direct instruction.

Strand B, "Unit Design for the Foreign Language Teacher," builds upon what participants learned in Strand A. The goal is to enable participants to use an understanding of second language acquisition and pedagogical content knowledge to plan thematic units. Presenters begin with the backwards-design planning model (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005) to guide educators into formulating their own essential questions and core understandings for the instructional unit they will develop in this strand. The presenters illustrate units they have created. In addition, they teach and demonstrate to other participants how to design assessment strategies that measure what students know and are able to do in the target language and culture to assess the

impact of the unit on their students. In order to accomplish this, participants learn how to analyze student data and refine their instruction so that they are constantly moving students into higher levels of linguistic proficiency and higher order thinking (see Table 1), practices shown to lead to improved student performance (Wenglinsky, 2000). Technology is also integrated into the unit design so that the participants can collaborate online through Wikis and e-coaching sites. Over the five sessions, participants teach their unit plan, share key aspects of their planning and teaching processes, and reflect on their own teaching with their colleagues. These practices work to construct effective professional communities in support of educator learning and have been shown to increase educator efficacy for meeting student needs (Rosenholtz, 1989).

In Strand C, "Academic Literacy and Assessment," the participants are in their third year of the BAFLP professional learning community. The core focus of this strand is on developing students' academic literacy skills, examining roadblocks to literacy, and using assessment data to guide instruction. This type of sustained professional development focuses on content-specific pedagogy that integrates higher level skills into educators' curriculum—strategies shown to benefit student achievement (Wiley & Yoon, 1995). The seminars are interactive and engaging, and challenge educators to expand their content and pedagogical knowledge. The primary goal of this strand is to support educators to design and implement an articulated program that will enhance the academic literacy and cognitive abilities of their students and give them the tools they will need to assess student gains in proficiency (see Table 1). Included within this strand are strategies to prepare students for the Advanced Placement (AP) Spanish Language exam. At the end of the program, these participants share the unit they have created and taught with special attention paid to how to improve student achievement in the target language and culture.

BAFLP also sponsors distinctive strands for educators of Mandarin and Japanese specifically designed to address the needs of the Asian language educators in the region. The strand focuses on Standards-aligned instructional design, class management and procedures, engagement strategies, and assistance in preparing students for the AP exams either in Chinese or Japanese beginning in level one. Asian Language strands follow the same sequence of development as Strands A–C in the traditional BAFLP model; however, the content of each program is presented in the target language. First, the participants study and implement the instructional sequence, then move on to unit development. As in the other strands, the presenters take into account the needs of the participants and adjust the program to meet their needs. Compared to the more commonly taught languages (e.g., Spanish, French) there are fewer materials and curricular resources in the Asian languages, so it is necessary to devote more time within the strands to developing and sharing materials.

Although technology is infused into each of the strands, BAFLP offers a separate technology strand in the spring and summer for educators who want a more in-depth focus on the integration of technology within the world language curriculum. Educators collaborate to develop units online. Web 2.0 tools such as podcasting, blogs, Flickr, Voicethread, Ning, and wikis, among others, are utilized to help educators achieve their goals of engaging students and increasing student proficiency in the foreign language (see Table 1). The technology strand draws many educators because of the educators' self-perceived need to stay up to date with students' learning styles and preferences. Educators understand that students are digital natives, and they are, as Prensky (2001) pointed out, "struggling to teach a population that speaks an entirely new language" (p. 2). These educators are increasingly attending programs such as the BAFLP 2007–2008 series, Language Teaching in the Digital Age.

BAFLP's Leadership Development

In order to sustain a highly effective program, BAFLP invests in the development of educator leaders who have successfully completed all the strands in the program. Utilizing a professional learning community model, successful educators—intimately familiar with the challenges and opportunities present in today's world language classrooms—are trained for future leadership posts in the program. In this model, educators share a vision, work and learn collaboratively, view and discuss others' instructional practices, and participate in decision making. The benefits include a reduced isolation of educators, better informed and committed educators, and academic gains for students (DuFour, 2004).

The Invitational Leadership Development (ILD) strand, by contrast with Strands A–C, is an invitation-only seminar series held in the summer and throughout the academic year. The leadership team selects exceptional participants who have demonstrated leadership potential from the previous years' programs. These participants are invited to apply to the leadership strand. They submit a statement of intent to participate, an application form, a self- and a peer evaluation on their teaching and leadership skills, and a letter of reference. The participants in the ILD program form and participate in an educator learning community to research second language acquisition theory and methods, instructional best practices, national/state/local language policy, and learn how to utilize student data to inform instruction (see Table 1). By the end of the ILD strand, the leadership participants:

1. demonstrate a deep understanding of theoretical principles related to teaching and learning a second language;
2. demonstrate an ability to teach their peers how to improve upon their teaching of a second language;
3. employ technology to support teaching, learning, and leadership activities in foreign language education;
4. develop a willingness to promote proficiency-oriented language learning and policy; and
5. focus on a topic of choice related to the teaching and learning of a second language.

The three areas of focus for the leadership strand are teaching and learning, leadership skills, and continued professional growth. Educators actively participate in the development of their leadership skills. The series begins with a reflective self-evaluation, and the educators create their own leadership development plan. In this plan, participants identify their strengths as well as areas of growth, establish goals, and write an action plan with a timeline for completing milestones. In this approach, the presenters are able to nurture and differentiate the content, process, and product of the leadership course of study. The final product of the leadership strand is a professional presentation on the topic of their choice made to an audience of peer educators. The participants have the opportunity to reflect on their presentations with colleagues and discuss ways to continue to improve both their teaching and leadership practices.

Teacher Participation in BAFLP: 2001–2007

BAFLP collects demographic data on attendees after every event. From 2001 to 2007, BAFLP provided professional development services for approximately 400 participants. Nearly 85% of the participants were female. By ethnicity, non-Hispanic whites were the most represented group, comprising roughly 46% of the participants. Nearly a quarter of the participants were Asian; of those, 13% were Japanese and 12% were Chinese. Hispanics were 20% of the attendees, with nearly half of those identifying as Mexican and the other half identifying as Latino, including Cuban, Puerto Rican, and Central and South American. Less than 5% of the participants were from other ethnic backgrounds, including

African American, Native American, East Indian, Filipino, and Pacific Islander.

While the ethnic backgrounds of the participants remained relatively similar over these six years, the demographic data indicate a shift in the teaching background of BAFLP's participants. While more than 90% of the participants consistently reported their primary professional role as "teacher," BAFLP's professional development events are increasingly attracting those with less experience. The number of educators who reported three years or less of teaching experience increased by 31% from 2002 to 2006, to an average of 48% in 2006. Meanwhile, the largest decreases in participation at BAFLP events were from participants with between 4 and 6 years teaching experience. Veteran educators, or those with more than 10 years of experience, decreased in participation by only 3% from 2004 to 2007, while educators who had between 4 and 6 years of experience decreased in participation by 12%. The increasing bifurcation in the teaching experience of participants may be a result of BAFLP's recent efforts to increase professional development services to educators from low-performing schools and districts. Research has pointed to the connection between high poverty and low-performing schools, which often lack the resources to hire more experienced educators (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2001; Gándara & Maxwell-Jolly, 2000).

Another important finding reveals an overall increase in the number of hours that BAFLP offered its professional development services. In 2001–2002, BAFLP offered a total of 1,469 contact hours of instruction. By 2006–2007, the number of instructional hours offered by BAFLP more than doubled, to a total of 3,880 contact hours. Increasingly, researchers have argued that professional development must be both intensive and continuous to produce positive results and effect sustainable change in teaching practices (Holland, 2005). For example, Supovitz and Turner (2000) found in a national sample of educators that

"[D]ramatic results emerged when the [professional development] experiences were deeper and more sustained. Both teaching practices and classroom cultures were affected most deeply after intensive and sustained staff development activities" (p. 975). In keeping with this, BAFLP has provided significantly more opportunities for educators to engage in continuous and sustained professional development through year-round program series and follow-up summer institutes and workshops.

The average number of hours participants spent attending BAFLP professional development activities has vacillated due to the fluctuations in attendees over 2001–2007. Nevertheless, findings show similar patterns of increase; participants have spent longer amounts of time attending BAFLP activities. For example, in 2001–2002, 91 participants attended events with an average of 16 contact hours of instruction per person, increasing by 150% over the next five years. By 2006–2007, 91 participants spent an average of 40 hours attending professional development activities. Rather than offering one-shot reform efforts, BAFLP's year-round model provides continuous and sustained professional development. Furthermore, it encourages educators to apply their new learning directly to the classroom and uses subsequent student performance data to measure the effectiveness of educators' new practices on student achievement by having workshops and sessions held concurrently during the school year.

Program Evaluation

Researchers have identified the need for professional development programs to focus on the critical link between design and implementation of the program, educator learning, and student outcomes (Borko, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Guskey & Sparks, 2002). BAFLP uses multiple methods of evaluations to address these links, based on proximal rather than distal measures of learning. We focus our attention on how educators interpret and use student

data in their own classroom to make informed decisions about their teaching practice instead of depending heavily on student achievement tests, which vary among schools and districts. For example, in our program strands, participants have homework assignments for each session that engage them in an iterative process of applying their learning in their own classroom and evaluating their instructional processes using student performance data, essential skills needed to improve student outcomes (Osterman & Kottkamp, 2004). Educators are provided the opportunity to implement what they have learned in the seminar into their lesson plans, teach the material to their students, and use student performance data to reflect on what worked and what they could do differently in future lessons. The team leader facilitates these collegial discussions, nurturing a professional learning community by assessing educators' ability to use student data to make informed decisions about their practice. The team leader, an integral part of this holistic process, uses these discussions as a formative assessment to make his or her own adjustments to future workshop sessions.

Another important method of evaluation that BAFLP uses to cultivate and sustain its professional learning community is direct and timely feedback on participant experiences. For example, participants provide feedback and reflections on the seminar at the end of each session. Immediately after the seminar, team leaders read the reflections, answer questions, and provide comments, advice, or suggestions for the participants. The "reflection journal" acts as an informal formative assessment of how well the educators are acquiring the content as well as a gauge for how well the program is meeting the needs of the educators. In addition, participants engage in practices that cultivate and sustain a professional learning model of educator development. For example, they make an oral presentation and submit a final written project during the last seminar, creating an

opportunity to share their learning with colleagues. Team leaders grade the projects and provide feedback and comments to the educators. This final project allows the team leaders to determine if the participants have acquired the knowledge and content of the program. The projects also guide our planning for the following year based on which areas the educators appear to need more support in.

At the end of the final seminar, the participants complete a program evaluation of the full workshop series (see Appendix). BALFP administers surveys to all participants in the program after every activity. Because they are foundational for building a professional learning community, we acknowledge the educators as skilled and experienced constituents in our program and ensure that they have opportunities to rate their satisfaction with the program and areas in need of improvement. We utilize the survey questions as indicators to monitor and assess the progress of BAFLP's goals, serve as our summative assessment, and guide our program planning and revisions for the following year.

The leadership program is highly selective, and we work with a small number of participants each year. Similar to the other programmatic strands, BAFLP administers surveys to leadership participants after each workshop, inquiring about their learning experiences. Results from consecutive evaluation surveys show that the leadership strand is highly successful in terms of participant experience. For example, in the most recent 5-Day Seminar (2008), BAFLP administered the final evaluation survey to its five leadership participants (see Appendix). Using a Likert scale, the survey asked the five participants to rate from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) the following statement: "The content that I have learned at BAFLP has made a difference in the way I think about teaching." All the participants rated the statement as 5, strongly agree. One participant explained, "I now understand the limitations for beginning learners and the progression of language acquisi-

tion." All participants also identified at least two specific strategies, such as the use of graphic organizers or guided inquiry, to improve student learning. A participant noted, "I have learned how critical it is to give structure and organization to content in order to enable learning." In addition, qualitative comments revealed that participants demonstrated a deeper understanding of special learners: "I have acquired a shift in the attitude that LD stands for 'learning different' rather than 'learning disabled.'"

BAFLP's success in preparing professional leaders in world languages education from the "bottom up" lies in its commitment to the leadership strand. When asked whether or not they would recommend that a colleague attend BAFLP, a leadership participant replied, "Definitely: BAFLP gives the teacher not only an opportunity to become a better teacher by examining their own practices, but also provides new learning and a chance to develop a new professional community." The leadership strand provides an opportunity for successful participants to gain leadership experience and lend their expertise back to improving the program, thereby helping BAFLP to continue to provide quality professional development service to world language educators throughout the Bay Area.

While we acknowledge the limitations of self-reported data, our professional learning community thrives from the continuous feedback and suggestions from the very participants who are engaged in professional practice in their school site and within our program. However, more distal measures are important as evidence of the positive effect of BAFLP on student outcomes. A major dilemma of most (if not all) educator professional development is that obtaining independent measures of student learning is extremely costly because it requires at least a quasi-experimental design. For BAFLP, this difficulty is compounded by the fact that California does not have a uniform, standardized test of achievement in any of the world languages. In fact, only 10 states have foreign language as a graduation requirement, which serves to minimize the need to create uniform assessments; this holds true even though there were more than 5 million students enrolled in Spanish classes during the 2000 academic year in the United States (Draper & Hicks, 2002, p. 2). The AP tests that are administered nationally are taken by a relatively small number of students at the highest levels of instruction, limiting the usefulness of the assessment for these purposes. However, the CFLP is currently working with the state on developing content standards for world languages in California, a necessary first step toward the design of uniform assessments. In the future, we plan to use an analysis of students' performance on standardized assessments in world languages as an additional measure of BAFLP's effectiveness.

Implications

The success of professional development programs rests on what educators learn and are able to do in the classroom that benefits student learning. Large-scale studies have revealed positive effects of effective professional development programs on improving educator knowledge and practices (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001). Effective professional development programs in the area of world languages can improve educators' knowledge of their target language and culture and provide them with explicit strategies and techniques to help students understand and utilize the language. Quality professional development programs provide opportunities for educators to continually improve instructional practices, leading to increased use of those practices in the classroom to improve student achievement (Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, & Birman, 2002). Year-round professional development programs, such as BAFLP, offer intensive and sustained opportunities for development that are found to be associated with positive educator learning and change in classroom practices (Hawley & Valli, 1999).

Along with improving educator practices in the classroom, BAFLP also focuses on developing exceptional educator leaders. World language educators bring unique leadership qualities to a school. Along with successful classroom practices, they also bring to the school knowledge of diverse cultures. Given the right preparation, language educators can lead workshops and work collaboratively with educators in other disciplines to improve student achievement, especially in diverse school settings. For example, world language educator leaders could present school- and district-wide workshops on second language acquisition and introduce teaching methods that value the cultural backgrounds of students. However, a clear distinction must be made between educators and instructor leaders.

Not every educator is a leader *outside* his or her classroom, and most have not acquired the skills and abilities to assume those complex and critical roles. According to Barth (2001), educators who assume and enact a leadership role at school will not only be involved in their day-to-day teaching responsibilities, but will also help develop the curriculum, choose textbooks, set standards, design staff development and in-service programs, and assist in evaluating educator performance. Educators who have acquired these leadership skills can be instrumental to school improvement initiatives. Rather than using a top-down reform model, educator leaders have the unique ability to "scale up" effective classroom practices that work at creating high achievement and decreased behavior problems for their students, on a school-wide and district-wide level. Furthermore, by helping to create effective school-wide practices, educator leaders are more committed to the success of those practices in the day-to-day achievement of their students. The need for successful world language educators and leaders will become increasingly necessary over this next century.

The importance of world languages is not diminishing. In fact, the increasing participation of emerging powers such as India and China in the global economy as well as a changing political landscape requires that Americans learn to speak other languages in addition to English. Furthermore, scholars have seen the inclusion of world languages among academic subjects in the National Education Goals and have experienced an increased enrollment in world language courses over the past decade (Branaman & Rhodes, 1998; Draper & Hicks, 2002; Furman, Goldberg, & Lusin, 2007). Therefore, it is important that schools and districts ensure that they have the capacity to provide quality educators to an increasing number of students. Models such as BAFLP provide a blueprint useful to assist in the development of effective and sustainable professional development programs for world language educators.

Further Research

BAFLP's model engages educators in practices that have been shown to have significant, positive influences on student learning and achievement. BAFLP's ongoing professional program is designed for educators to engage in an iterative process of applying new teaching practices in the classroom and evaluating subsequent student performance data to improve student achievement. Moreover, educators' self-reported survey data reveal that they are successful at applying their newly acquired instructional practices in their classroom. However, additional research and empirical studies are needed to show the positive relationship that exists between professional development and student outcomes. It is important to note that the fiscal responsibility of implementing an evaluation process linked to student achievement cannot be entirely placed on entities such as BAFLP that receive no monies from the state, but should be shared across participating schools and districts. Professional development programs must work collaboratively with districts to develop and implement studies that link professional development with educator effectiveness

measures and school-wide performance data in world languages. Our previous work has examined this link (Lozano et al., 2004), and our future plans include data collection in the classroom and at the school and district levels to verify student gains.

Acknowledgments

References

Ball, D. L. (1996). Teacher learning and mathematics reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77, 500–509.

Barth, R. S. (2001). Teacher leader. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82, 443–449.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33, 3–15.

Bott Van Houten, J. (2000). *Teacher academies: Providing professional development to a community of learners*. The Kentucky Department of Education. Retrieved August 14, 2008, from http://www.e-archives.ky.gov/

Branaman, L. E., & Rhodes, N. C. (1998). *A national survey of foreign language instruction in elementary and secondary schools. Final report*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED449120).

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.) (1999). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Crowther, F., Kaagan, S. S., Ferguson, M., & Haan, L. (2002). *Developing teacher leaders: How teacher leadership enhances school success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching*. Kutztown, PA: National Commission on Teaching & America's Future.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). The challenge of staffing our schools. *Educational Leadership*, 58, 12–17.

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 597–605.

Desimone, L. M., Porter, A. C., Garet, M. S., Yoon, K. S., & Birman, B. F. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24, 81–112.

Draper, J. B., & Hicks, J. H. (2002). *Foreign language enrollments in public secondary schools, fall 2000*. Retrieved July 23, 2008, from http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3389

DuFour, R. (2004). What is a "professional learning community"? *Educational Leadership*, 61, 6–11.

Ferraro, J. (2000). *Reflective practice and professional development*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED449120).

Fishman, B. J., Marx, R. W., Best, S., & Tal, R. T. (2003). Linking teacher and student learning to improve professional development in systematic reform. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 19, 643–658.

Frechtling, J. A., Sharp, L., Carey, N., & Vaden-Kiernan, N. (1995). *Teacher enhancement programs: A perspective on the last four decades (NSF Contract No. SED 92-55369)*. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation, Directorate for Education and Human Resources.

Furman, N., Goldberg, D., & Lusin, N. (2007, November 13). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, fall 2006*. Retrieved June 23, 2008, from http://www.mla.org/2006_flenrollmentsurvey

Gándara, P., & Maxwell-Jolly, J. (2000). *Preparing teachers for diversity: A dilemma of quality and quantity. Teaching and California's future*. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED458201).

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 915–945.

Guskey, T. R., & Huberman, M. (Eds.). (1995). *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Guskey, T. R., & Sparks, D. (2002, April). *Linking professional development to improvements in student learning*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Hawley, W. D., & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of effective professional development: A new consensus. In G. Sykes & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 127–150). New York: Teachers College.

Holland, H. (2005). Teaching teachers: Professional development to improve student achievement. *AERA Research Points*, *3*, 1–4.

Hord, S. (1997). *Professional learning communities: Communities of continuous inquiry and improvement*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED410659).

Horwitz, E. K. (2005). Classroom management for teachers of Japanese and other foreign languages. *Foreign Language Annals*, *38*, 56–69.

Kruse, S. D., & Louis, K. S. (1999). Professional communities and learning communities: What school leaders need to know. *Orbit, 30*. [Electronic version]. Retrieved July 6, 2008, from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/orbit/core7_class_manage.html

Kuntz, P. S., & Michaels, J. M. (2001). *In search of professional development: North American immersion programs for teachers of French*. Retrieved August, 15, 2008, from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/19/8d/98.pdf (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 459626).

Lambert, L. (1998). How to build leadership capacity. *Educational Leadership*, *55*, 17–19.

Lieberman, A. (1995). Practices that support teacher development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *76*, 591–597.

Little, J. W. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *15*, 129–151.

Little, J. W. (2006). *Professional community and professional development in the learning-centered school*. Retrieved December 5, 2007, from http://www.nea.org/research/bestpractices/images/pdreport.pdf

Loucks-Horsey, S., & Matsumoto, C. (1999). Research on professional development for teachers of mathematics and science: The state of the scene. *Science and Mathematics*, *99*, 258–271.

Lozano, A. S., Padilla, A. M., Sung, H., & Silva, D. M. (2004). A statewide professional development program for California foreign language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, *37*, 268–277.

Miles, M. (1995). Foreword. In T. R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices* (pp. vii–ix). New York: Teachers College Record.

Mizell, H. (2007). Narrow the focus, expand the possibilities: Educate teachers, administrators, policy makers, and system leaders on what high-quality professional learning is—and isn't. *Journal of Staff Development*, *28*, 18–22.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2002).

Osterman, K. F., & Kottkamp, R. B. (2004). *Reflective practice for educators: Improving schooling through professional development*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Peyton, J. K. (1997). *Professional development of foreign language teachers*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No 414768).

Phillips, J. K. (1991). *Upgrading the target language proficiency levels of foreign language teachers*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 328082).

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, *9*, 1–6.

Resnick, L. B. (Ed). (2006). Foreign language instruction: Implementing the best teaching methods. *Research Points*, *4*, 1–4.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Working conditions that affect teacher quality and commitment: Implications for induction programs. *The Elementary School Journal*, *89*, 421–439.

Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco: The Jossey-Bass Higher Education Series.

Sparks, D., & Loucks-Horsey, S. (1989). Five models of professional development for teachers. *Journal of Staff Development*, *10*, 40–57.

Supovitz, J. A., & Turner, H. M. (2000). The effects of professional development on science teaching practices and classroom culture. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 37, 963–980.

Wenglinsky, H. (2000). *How teaching matters: Bringing the classroom back into discussions of teacher quality.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wiley, D. E., & Yoon, B. (1995). Teacher reports on opportunity to learn: Analyses of the 1993 California Learning Assessment System (CLAS). *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 17, 355–370.

APPENDIX

Bay Area Foreign Language Program (BAFLP) Final Evaluation Survey, Five-Day Seminar
Your Group (circle one):   A   B   C   Mandarin Chinese Leadership

Please consider the entire five-day experience and respond to the following:

1. The content that I have learned at BAFLP has made a difference in the way I think about teaching.
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

2. Has the knowledge that you have gained regarding the Framework and the Language Learning Continuum increased your understanding of the organizing principles for learning and teaching languages?
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

If you agree, please write a sentence or two stating how such knowledge has increased your understanding and organization of teaching a world language.

3. Please list at least two strategies that you have learned at BAFLP that positively impact the special learners in your classroom (e.g., English learners, special education students, gifted and talented students, academically under-prepared students). Please identify for which group the strategies have worked best.

4. What is one concrete example of classroom practice that you have acquired as a result of participating in BAFLP that has impacted student performance?

5. Has the communication and administrative procedure with regard to registration, academic credit, and participant support been helpful?
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

6. Would you recommend that a colleague attend BAFLP?
definitely   probably   not likely   definitely not

Please explain why or why not.

In the BAFLP Five-Day Seminar, how much opportunity have you had to do the following:

7. Develop strategies for planning and carrying out instruction that support the acquisition of the target language?
a. None

b. Touched on it briefly
c. Spent time discussing or doing
d. Explored in some depth
e. Extensive opportunities

8. Develop strategies for organizing patterns of interaction in my classroom that pro-mote students' verbal participation and provide opportunities for students to communicate in the target language.
a. None
b. Touched on it briefly
c. Spent time discussing or doing
d. Explored in some depth
e. Extensive opportunities

9. Develop strategies for assessing students' oral language skills (listening & speaking) within the classroom context.
a. None
b. Touched on it briefly
c. Spent time discussing or doing
d. Explored in some depth
e. Extensive opportunity

10. Develop strategies for assessing students' literacy (reading & writing) skills in the target language within the classroom context.
a. None
b. Touched on it briefly
c. Spent time discussing or doing
d. Explored in some depth
e. Extensive opportunity

11. Develop classroom strategies to increase students' cultural awareness by addressing cultural aspects associated with the language being studied.
a. None
b. Touched on it briefly
c. Spent time discussing or doing
d. Explored in some depth
e. Extensive opportunity

12. What could BAFLP do better or improve upon for next year?