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Catholic schools in the United States today are welcoming a burgeoning number of students from a myriad of cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and we are witnessing our population of English learners (ELs) or Emergent Bilinguals (EBs) growing significantly. These students and their families have a unique opportunity to enrich, grace and transform our Catholic schools, and they are tremendous assets to our learning communities. With a particular focus on English learners, the goal of the following white paper is to support readers in gaining a better understanding of who these students are, how to best serve them, and how the field of Catholic education’s response to serve is deeply rooted in the tradition of Catholic schooling in America. Through encounters with students whose lives are grounded in multilingualism and cultural traditions, Catholic schools have a greater opportunity to embrace, educate and empower students to meet the challenges of modern society. The success of all students in our schools, regardless of their cultural and linguistic backgrounds, is both our great legacy and our bright future.
What follows is a white paper designed to provide a solid rationale for our Catholic schools in serving and supporting linguistically and culturally diverse students, a discussion around the potential challenges in executing this mission, and a roadmap for future implementation and success. The text is rooted in exploring three essential questions, and each of the three sections that follow aim to speak to these inquiries.

**Guiding Questions**

- What is the mission of the Church and Catholic schools in service to culturally and linguistically diverse students? What does it look like to fully encounter this mission in our schools?

- To fully embrace this mission, what is known about this student population and what graces and challenges might be experienced?

- With our end goal of forming the whole child, how might we best educate culturally and linguistically diverse students in our Catholic schools?
Encountering Our Mission

Let us begin with the questions posed above: What is the mission of the Church and Catholic schools in service to culturally and linguistically diverse students? What does it look like to fully encounter this mission in our schools? In order to answer this call, we have narrowed it to three primary acting factors: Church history and guidance, a demographic imperative, and the need for equitable educational opportunities.

Our Historical Call

During the last two centuries, thousands of Catholic schools were established throughout the U.S. territory to serve immigrant and marginalized communities in a Gospel-centered environment that honored the inherent God-given dignity, gifts and culture of each child. It is our aspiration that linguistically and culturally diverse students continue to benefit fully from a legacy of Catholic education serving their unique academic, cultural and linguistic needs. As people of faith, we have a historically and biblically-rooted calling to serve the immigrant and our culturally diverse Church. We believe that Catholic schools should be at service of all Catholics, and today millions of school-age Catholics in the U.S. come from families that speak many languages than other English at home.

With the rich historical legacy established in American Catholic schools serving as a firm piece in the rationale for this mission, visionary leaders of our Church such as bishops, theologians and academics have also provided extensive documents emphasizing the significant role of the Catholic school in realizing the evangelizing outreach of the Church through the ministry of education. Pope Pius XI (1929) in his encyclical on Christian education entitled, Divini Illius Magistri, established that any person working for Catholic schools was a person participating in Catholic Church action (Hunt, Heft, & Nuzzi, 2013). The Second Vatican Council in 1965, noted in its Declaration on Christian Education, Gravissimum Educationis, that “this vocation [teaching] demands special qualities of mind and heart, very careful preparation, and continuing readiness to renew and to adapt” (Second Vatican Council, 1965, p. 5). Out of the significant document Gravissimum Educationis, the right to universal education is defined:

All men of every race, condition, and age, since they enjoy the dignity of a human being, have an inalienable right to an education that is in keeping with their ultimate goal, their ability, their sex, and the culture and tradition of their country, and also in harmony with their fraternal association with other peoples in the fostering of true unity and peace on earth. For a true education aims at the formation of the human person in the pursuit of his ultimate end and of the good of the societies which, as man, he is a member, and in whose obligations, as an adult, he will share. (Gravissimum Educationis, 1965, Section 1).

This document named the importance for all schools to “develop with special care the intellectual faculties but also to form the ability to judge rightly, to hand on the cultural legacy of previous generations, to foster a sense of values, to prepare for professional life” (Gravissimum Educationis, 1965, Section 5). Additionally, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB, 1975) proclaimed the Catholic schools’ responsibility to delineate their progress in “educating those who have suffered economic deprivation or experienced discrimination because of racial, cultural or linguistic differences” (Nuzzi & Hunt, 2012, p. 103). Church leadership further elaborated on the prevalence of cultural pluralism within the United States and the world, and added relevant perspectives on the manner the Catholic school should participate in the discourse of culture (Nuzzi & Hunt, 2012). Dynamic interaction and enrichment for all people occurs when there is a plurality of ideas and themes derived from various cultural conditions, languages and customs (Congregation for Catholic Education, 2013).
Cultural pluralism, diversity and globalization challenge Catholic schools to meet and serve the needs of linguistically diverse students and their families. Embracing an openness to one’s own culture and that of others is essential to the pedagogical vision of the Church and necessary for cultivating a peaceful civilization (Congregation for Catholic Education, 2013, Section 13).

One way to conceptualize and encounter our mission to serve this particular population is to frame the call in terms of our past, present and future. The Congregation for Catholic Education stated that, “if the communication of culture is to be a genuine educational activity; it must not only be organic, but also critical and evaluative, historical, and dynamic” (1982, Article 20). In keeping with our historical roots in serving those students on the periphery, and this population is sometimes viewed as being on the margins of our classrooms – families who encounter difficulties communicating with school, cultural traditions, and challenges associated with immigration and racism, we need to resolve to embrace the demographic shifts and realities of our schools and parishes. As noted in the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) letter, *Open Wide Our Hearts*, Hispanic and African Americans often endure discrimination concerning educational opportunities (2018). The bishops affirm that racism is an injustice to human life and dignity and are calling all Catholics to end racism and promote unity (USCCB, 2018).

**Demographic Imperative**

As has been stated, the demographics of our classrooms, schools and parishes are changing, and there exists a demographic imperative for our schools to open wide their doors to culturally and linguistically diverse students for the benefit of these students and the benefit of our schools. And in the case of schools and regions of the country where working with emergent bilinguals is and has been the norm, we are calling for a renewed focus on routinized identification procedures and consistent language supports in the classroom. Herein lies two distinct and not totally unrelated demographic shifts: an increase in the cultural diversity of our students, specifically Latino students, and the rising number of English learners. We will explore both groups, but want to be clear that not all culturally diverse students are English learners, not all English learners would be considered to be members of minority groups, and in various parts of the United States, Euro-American Catholics are a numerical minority.

To encounter the mission of serving this specific population is to acknowledge the unique story of each child and family, while acknowledging the demographic trends generally. Broadly, the racial and ethnic diversity within Catholic schools has increased significantly over the past 40 years (McDonald & Schultz, 2017). U.S. Catholic schools serve a diverse population including Vietnamese, Filipino and Latino students among many other language groups, but the largest growth has been seen among Latino children. Currently, 40% of all U.S. Catholics identify as Latino, and 60% of all Catholics under the age of eighteen claim Latino heritage (Ospino & Weitzel-O’Neill, 2016). Families identifying as possessing Latino origins may be of any race and are “viewed as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or ancestors before their arrival in the United States” (McDonald & Schultz, 2017, p. 22). Latino children currently account for one-fourth of U.S. children under the age of 18, and by 2050 they are projected to comprise nearly one-third of the child population (Mather, 2016). Of the 18.2 million Latino children (ages zero to 18) currently living in the United States, 95% are U.S. born citizens (Mather, 2016). Specific to Catholic schools, in 2014-2015, 15.3% (296,903) of students enrolled were of Latino heritage (McDonald & Schultz, 2015), a group that represents 2.3% (296,903) of the total Latino school-age population (approximately 12.4 million nationwide). In 2017-2018, 17.4% (319,650) of students enrolled were of Latino heritage (McDonald & Schultz, 2018), up 2.1%. In sum, encountering the call to serve in this area is to embrace a hopeful and dramatic increase in the number of Latino children in our Catholic Church and schools.

While the overall number of children in Catholic schools has declined in the past 50 years, the opportunity to increase Latino enrollment is boundless and a potential source of rebirth for our schools. In a report
published by the University of Notre Dame and released on the feast day of Our Lady of Guadalupe in 2009, this population of students was described as “roses” shed by Our Lady - signs of hope, a call to work diligently and with zeal, and a promise of fruitfulness for our schools (Alliance for Catholic Education). We firmly believe that Catholic schools are one of the most powerful institutions for human formation and societal transformation, and they stand as institutions that can make a major difference in the lives of Latino Catholic children. While not a particular focus of this white paper, extensive and impressive work is being conducted to increase Latino enrollment in Catholic schools (Alliance for Catholic Education, 2009; Ospino & Wetzel-O’Neill, 2016).

While the most significant change in student demographic profiles has been with Latino children, Catholic schools are experiencing increased growth with a number of other races and ethnicities from first- and second-generation non-native English speakers. The specific data around ELs will be addressed in the next section, embracing the mission. Overall, our call to serve culturally and linguistically diverse students is undergirded by the historic apostolate of Catholic education, a demographic opportunity to serve more students in this population, and the resolve to provide equitable educational opportunities to all students.

Equitable Educational Opportunities

The National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools (NSBECS), provide “the entire Catholic community a common framework of universal characteristics of Catholic identity and agreed upon criteria for Catholic school excellence” (Ozar & Weitzell O’Neill, 2012). As such, nine defining characteristics of Catholic schools, “which flow directly from the Holy See’s teaching on Catholic schools as compiled by Archbishop J. Michael Miller, CSB (The Holy See’s Teaching on Catholic Schools, 2006), and from statements by Pope Benedict XVI and the American bishops” are identified within the NSBECS; one of which is for Catholic schools to be accessible to all students. As noted:

*By reason of their evangelizing mission, Catholic schools should be available to all people who desire a Catholic education for their children. (Gravissimum Educationis, 6; Code of Canon Law, Canons 793 #2; Renewing Our Commitment to Catholic Elementary School in the Third Millennium, Introduction). Catholic schools in concert with the Catholic community should do everything in their power to manage available resources and seek innovative options to ensure that Catholic school education is geographically, programmatically, physically, and financially accessible.*

Given this call to action, the NSBECS (Ozar & Weitzell-O’Neill, 2012) further identified thirteen standards that are divided into four domains, one of which is Academic Excellence. Four of the benchmarks contribute to the rationale for serving ELs within Catholic schools. Benchmark 7.6 states, “Classroom instruction is designed to engage and motivate all students, addressing the diverse needs and capabilities of each student...” Benchmark 7.9 states, “Faculty and professional support staff demonstrate and continuously improve knowledge and skills necessary for effective instruction, cultural sensitivity, and modeling of Gospel values.” Benchmark 9.2 states, “Guidance services, wellness programs, behavior management programs, and ancillary services provide the necessary support for students to successfully complete the school program.” Finally, Benchmark 10.3 states, “Financial plans define revenue sources that include but are not limited to tuition, tuition assistance/scholarships, endowment funds, local and regional partnerships, public funding, regional cost sharing, (arch)diocesan and/or religious communities’ assistance, foundation gifts, entrepreneurial options and other sources not listed.”
An additional call to action was communicated through the results of a national research study conducted by the National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA) and Foundations and Donors Interested in Catholic Activities (FADICA). The key national research findings showed that among parents’ top priorities for their children is their desire for a diverse learning environment that includes racial, economic and cultural diversity (2018). Overall, our Catholic schools are being called to make a quality Catholic education accessible, affordable, and academically sound for all children, including English learners.

Another piece to the educational equity component is recognizing the unique academic needs and strengths of bilingual and biliterate students. Additional thought on this topic is outlined in the third section, educating culturally and linguistically diverse students; however, it is to be noted here that there is increasing emphasis in schools across the nation on bilingual education. For example, the state of California has initiated the “Global California 2030” to better prepare their students for 21st century demands. A significant part of encountering the mission to serve in this space is to value language acquisition, home language development, academic achievement and equitable services for ELs in schools.

All in all, our Catholic schools are faced with a grace-filled opportunity to encounter culturally and linguistically diverse families as they enter through our doors. Our schools’ rationale for welcoming and serving these students and families is deeply rooted in a rich Church history and guidance, a growing demographic imperative and a desire to provide equitable educational opportunities.
Embracing the Graces and Roadblocks

Section two addresses the following questions: To fully embrace this mission, what is known about this student population and what graces and challenges might be experienced? What follows first is a discussion about EL descriptors, EL definitions, and demographic data. Having a deep knowledge of this data is at the heart of knowing who we serve in our schools. Second, we will speak to common challenges often expressed in the processes of enrolling, instructing and involving ELs and their families. It is our sincerest hope that a clear case has been made for why ELs have a home in Catholic schools and that this section further builds upon this idea.

Demographic Description

To begin, there are numerous titles used to refer to this student population – English learners (EL), English language learners (ELL), Emergent bilinguals (EBs), and Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. There is also a host of terms to describe programs designed to support these students, as well as professional organizations and specialized fields – English as a New Language (ENL), Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), English as a Second Language (ESL), English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), English as a Foreign Language (EFL), English as an International Language (EIL), Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), English for Academic Purposes (EAP), and English as an Additional Language (EAL). For this publication, this group of students will be referred to as ELs. When this term is used, it denotes children whose native tongue (first or primary language) is a language other than English and, more specifically, to those who are not yet proficient at grade-level academic English due to their limited proficiency in this language. Additionally, when referring to educators and programs that specifically instruct or support ELs, the term English as a New Language (ENL) is used to capture the multi-lingual backgrounds of this diverse group of students.

ELs possess the skill of bilingualism or multilingualism, the term used for the acquisition of two or more languages. Simultaneous bilingualism is used to describe a child who learns two first or native languages at the same time generally at home, while sequential bilingualism refers to acquisition of a second language after age four or five generally at school, the point generally considered when the first language is acquired (Dormer, 2016). It is to be noted individuals can move along the bilingual and biliterate continuum (Hornberger, 2004). Bilingualism refers to the ability to speak and understand two languages, whereas, being biliterate refers to the ability to read and write two languages. Generally, ELs tend to be stronger on the bilingual continuum as opposed to the biliterate continuum. This is an important distinction that has implications for instruction and support models. Program models will be discussed in section three. Overall, statistical data varies somewhat around EL enrollment and services, however, one fact remains clear from available data – the number of ELs in U.S. schools is growing significantly (Goldenberg, 2008).

ELs represent the fastest growing population in U.S. schools (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition [NCELA], 2013). For the 2015-16 school year, public school programs for English learners enrolled 4.85 million students, accounting for about 10% of enrollment (OELA, 2018), and in one prediction, ELs might represent 50% of the U.S. school population in the next 25 years (Dormer, 2016). Additionally, the number of ELs in U.S. schools tripled between the years 1979-2008 (Jackson & Ash, 2012). More recently, the number of ELs identified increased from 4.3 million in 2002-2003 to nearly 4.9 million in 2015-2016. Similarly, the number of K-12 EL identified students who were served by federally funded Title III programs for English proficiency increased by 22.4% from 2002-2003 to 2009-2010 (NCELA, 2013). English learners are present in all 50 states (Hill & Flynn, 2006), and 44% of all ELs are in grades Pre-K through 3rd grade (Education Market Research Corner Archives, 2004).
It is largely understood due to low self-reporting, that ELs are underrepresented in the data. The U.S. Census Bureau has acknowledged that nearly 1 million children under the age of five were not counted in 2010, and anticipates the undercount of children to be even greater in 2020, especially with children of color, low-income or immigrant families (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2018). Low counts can be attributed to families’ living arrangements - high mobility, homelessness, or lack of an adult fluent in English (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2018). Additionally, it is understood that due to privacy concerns and legal status in some cases, EL families might choose to not report information in regard to language for fear of future implications. In the same vein, many EL parents see English acquisition, academic success and peer acceptance as paramount goals for the student, and thus, parents very frequently shy away from programs relying on the instructional use of students’ primary languages. A significant part of embracing this population in our schools is to conduct our due diligence in getting to know each child and family deeply.

In U.S. schools, ELs speak a multitude of first languages with Spanish being the majority (NCELA, 2013). For the 2014-2015 school year, more than 75% of English learners in public schools spoke Spanish as their first and only language (McFarland, Hussar, Wang, Zhang, Wang, Rathbun, Barmer, Forrest Cataldi, & Bullock Mann, 2018). While Spanish speaking students account for the largest percentage of ELs, over 400 languages are spoken by ELs in American schools (Goldenberg, 2008). The expansive linguistic diversity of ELs is reflected in other primary languages including the most commonly reported home languages: Arabic, Chinese, Vietnamese, Somali, Hmong, Russian, Kurdish, Haitian or Haitian Creole, Tagalog, and Korean (McFarland et al., 2018). The next highest ethnic/racial population is Asian students who account for 11% of ELs throughout the nation and represent an array of different languages including Native American indigenous languages (McFarland et al., 2018).

In addition to the various different languages, the U.S. Department of Education (2015) reports that there are ELs who also present learning challenges and disabilities. As of the fall of 2015, approximately 713,000 ELs were also identified as having a disability, comprising 14.7% of the total EL population enrolled in U.S. public elementary schools. Overall, as the number of ELs in classrooms increases and as these students acquire the language, content knowledge, culture and norms of U.S. mainstream schools (Lee, 2005), the question of how to best serve this growing population academically, socially, emotionally, linguistically and spiritually is pertinent (Dees, Lichon, & Roach, 2017).

As outlined, our Catholic schools have a compelling narrative to welcome, serve and learn from EL students and families. Regrettably, English learners are some of the most vulnerable students in America’s schools. In public schools, the academic performance of English learners is significantly below those of their peers in nearly every measure of achievement as evidenced by the 2005 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Only 29% of ELs scored at or above the basic level in reading, compared with 75% of non-ELs. And, whereas high school graduation rates in America are at a 40-year high, graduation rates for ELs are falling. We believe that Catholic schools can offer a bright future for these students by providing an excellent academic foundation and an environment centered on forming the whole child. We are now beginning to collect data on this population of learners, but we know that students who attend Catholic schools are 42% more likely to graduate from high school and two and a half times more likely to graduate from college (Benson, Yeager, Guerra, & Manno, 1986; Evans & Schwab, 1995; Neal, 1997; Sander & Krautman, 1995). As outlined by the Alliance for Catholic Education (2009), “the educational attainment rates, as well as a broad range of advantageous holistic outcomes connected to Catholic schools, is what we refer to as the Catholic school advantage . . . there are many dimensions to the Catholic school advantage, including higher graduation rates, demonstrated academic achievement, character formation, civic engagement, and a variety of prosocial and pro-ecclesial effects.” The graces in embracing this call are overflowing, but challenges are also present. What follows is a discussion around common obstacles faced by schools serving EL and welcoming diverse students.
Embracing the Graces and Roadblocks

This brief section relates to the processes of enrolling and instructing ELs and the common challenges encountered. While the challenges might be significant, they are often outweighed by the graces that these students and families bring to our schools. The third section of this paper addresses how some of these challenges might be met head on.

The process of enrolling ELs in Catholic schools: Financial barriers

As reported by Child Trends (2017), children living in households where a language other than English is spoken are more likely to be classified as low-income as are children in English-only households (28% versus 19% in 2013). In an examination of language subgroups, child poverty rates are highest in Spanish-speaking households (33%), followed by Indo-European languages other than Spanish (17%) (2017). With a substantial portion of our EL population experiencing poverty, the cost and accessibility of a Catholic education is a reality. It is also to be acknowledged that the cost of tuition is a challenge to many of our students looking to benefit from a Catholic education.

As articulated in section one, our schools are facing a demographic imperative that magnifies our call to find ways to enroll more Latino children in Catholic schools. A specific challenge here is that Latino youth, in particular, continue to lag behind other racial and ethnic populations on many key social and economic indicators (Mather, 2016). In 2015, more than three-fifths of Latino children (62%) lived in low-income families (2016). It is estimated that the number of Latino youth at the poverty level could increase by 45% within the next twenty years (2016). This data is consistent with the Child Trends Hispanic Institute’s 2014 report, America’s Hispanic Children, which reports that 62% of Latino children live in low-income families, one third live in poverty, and one in eight in deep poverty (Murphy, Guzman, & Toros, 2014). In sum, the socioeconomic status of our students, specifically our Latino students, is a factor that must be considered in how we structure our financial aid, scholarship and philanthropic efforts.

The process of instructing ELs in Catholic schools: Pedagogical challenges

The school administrator, in his or her role as a leader, holds positional and often expert power within the school setting (Johnson, 2016). Through their positional power, principals or school leaders exert direct influence on school conditions, teacher quality and instructional effectiveness (Clifford, Behrstock-Sherratt, & Fetters, 2012). Therefore, it follows that leadership through informed decision-making exercises influence in establishing the organizational structure to promote an inclusive environment for serving ELs. The school leader’s sense of efficacy determines his/her belief in his/her abilities to establish organizational structures, institute new instructional programs, or to follow a course of action in response to an educational dilemma to achieve desired outcomes (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2007; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). Tschannen-Moran and Gareis found little empirical evidence that school setting or socioeconomic status of the school had any bearing on principals’ self-efficacy in performing leadership competencies (2007). Professional development and focused preparation, however, played a significant role on principals’ self-efficacy beliefs (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2007). Principals who felt supported by higher-level leadership (i.e. superintendents, pastors, or district/arch/diocesan level leadership) also had greater levels of self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2007). With this in mind, it is incumbent upon (arch) diocesan leaders and Catholic programs training teachers and administrators to support school leaders and pastors in understanding the challenges in serving ELs, so they might make informed organizational decisions concerning EL program service delivery models in the schools, instructional personnel, funding and professional development.

Establishing a school environment conducive to serving ELs must include intentional consideration of instructional quality and teacher preparation. Quality teacher preparation and professional development
have been widely held to be essential for effective instruction. According to Dormer (2016), ENL expertise is often ranked as teachers’ top professional development need.

Evidence in educational research literature has demonstrated that teachers have the greatest direct impact on learning (Heck, 2009; Pollock, 2007; Sanders & Horn, 1994; Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997). Teacher formation in ENL best-practices has been outlined as a barrier to service, for the current reality is that in spite of the increase of ELs, only about half of the teachers in the field have received teacher preparation or training in teaching English as a new language (Dormer, 2016). Whereas researchers in language acquisition, deJong and Harper (2013), report that less than 25% of teachers have ENL formation, and underscore that forming teachers prepared to address the unique challenges of language learners is key to their academic success, only 20 states require teachers have training for teaching ELs (Fenner, 2014) as part of their teacher certification requirements. As more Catholic schools look to comply with state licensure requirements, this is quickly becoming a reality in Catholic schools.

The need for teachers formed in ENL best practice in Catholic schools is urgent. While the number of ELs is sharply rising, the number of teachers and leaders formed and prepared to teach and care for them lags. Catholic schools are faced with an urgent moral imperative to form teachers to affect student retention, motivation, confidence and academic outcomes -- all challenges faced by ELs. Part of our schools’ mission is to provide teachers the pedagogical tools, training and resources to ensure that English learners are thriving in Catholic schools.

In conclusion, to fully embrace our mission of serving culturally and linguistically diverse students and families, it is vital that we know our constituents well and that we prepare to embrace both the graces and challenges. What follows is a roadmap for future implementation and success.
**Educating Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students**

*Every human being is created in the image of God and redeemed by Jesus Christ, and therefore is invaluable and worthy of respect as a member of the human family.*

—Reflections of U.S. Catholic Bishops
Sharing Catholic Social Teaching: Challenges and Directions, 1998

We acknowledge that every child is worthy of respect and that our Catholic schools are an extension of the family in the sense that home languages and cultures are celebrated and enhanced in our presence. This section focuses on establishing educational environments in which our English learners are thriving. Here, the text will address the following question: With our end goal of forming the whole child, how might we best educate culturally and linguistically diverse students in our Catholic schools?

Our discussion here is rooted in a Framework for Serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students (Figure A). This framework is intended to equip (arch)diocesan and school leaders, educators, Catholic higher education formators, and all Catholic education stakeholders with the knowledge, skills and dispositions to serve ELs. The framework is grounded in five essential tenets: teacher efficacy, leadership, fiscal resources, programming options and family engagement. All five components are vital in our call to ensuring that ELs and their families are embraced, educated and empowered.

*Figure A: Framework for Serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students*

---

**Teacher Efficacy**

*“The life of a teacher, as I know from personal experience, is very challenging and demanding, but it is also profoundly satisfying. It is more than a job, for it is rooted in our deepest convictions and values. To be intimately concerned in the development of a young person, of hundreds of young people, is a highly responsible task. As teachers, you kindle in your students a thirst for truth and wisdom. You spark off in them a desire for beauty. You introduce them to their cultural heritage. You help them to discover the treasures of other cultures and peoples. What an awesome responsibility and privilege is yours in the teaching profession.”*

—Address of Saint Pope John Paul II to the Council, Staff and Students of the Institute of Catholic Education, Melbourne, Australia, November 28, 1986, #2.
The vocation of teaching is certainly a call of service to enlighten and form young people. As Saint Pope John Paul II stated eloquently, it is an extremely gratifying ministry, but it is not without challenges. Because such an awesome responsibility has been entrusted to our teachers, it is essential leaders provide the necessary support for efficacious behaviors to flourish so our students can reap the full benefits. With regard to ELs, accomplished, competent teachers with high levels of confidence in their abilities and skills still require specialized training in language acquisition, instructional strategies and culturally relevant pedagogy (Dees, Lichon, & Roach, 2017) to successfully teach ELs and advance their academic success (Prater, 2019).

Teacher preparation programs also revealed minimal implementation of multicultural curriculum and pedagogical theory or perspectives related to cultural competency (Jang-Tamanaha, 2014; Cochran-Smith, Shakman, Jong, Terrel, Barnatt, & McQuillan, 2009). However, recent legislation through Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) has increased the requirements for initial teacher preparation programs to include at least one course in theories and methods for teaching English learners. In addition to knowledge about language acquisition, teachers need preparation in the three interrelated elements of culturally relevant pedagogy, academic learning and achievement, sociopolitical consciousness and cultural competence (Milner, 2011). Casciola (2014) found once teachers had a better understanding and proficiency of culture, they were more capable of implementing culturally responsive pedagogical practices in the classroom.

With a clear increase in ELs in America’s schools, public and private, as well as more states requiring training in this area, developing teacher competencies to improve efficacy and better serve EL students is needed. Increased emphasis in legislation on teacher quality and teacher preparation has prompted 41 states to establish specific teaching standards in teacher preparation programs regarding bilingual education or English as a second language education (King & Mahaffie, 2016). We are hopeful that a focus upon professional development and formation can strengthen teacher efficacy in regard to proving ELs’ excellent academic formation.

**Leadership**

There are many forces at play in how ELs learn and impact our school communities and a pivotal component to success is a strong leader with a clearly articulated vision. For our school leaders, the authors put forth the following framework for serving ELs in Catholic schools. This three-strand approach incorporates language acquisition, instructional techniques and culturally sustaining practices (Dees, Lichon, & Roach, 2017). The authors believe deeply that highly effective schools and educators of ELs execute the following well and intentionally:

1. understand the process of language acquisition,
2. practice and share current, research-based instructional strategies, and
3. commit to creating culturally dynamic and sustaining schools.
Additionally, it is vital that educators and schools ground themselves in common root beliefs about ELs, their families, their culture, and their performance in the classroom. Dees, Lichon, & Roach (2017) noted the following description of the nine possible beliefs regarding ELs.

- “ELs bring a distinct richness to our schools because of their knowledge of and lived experience in multiple cultures, their linguistic capacities, and their diverse encounters with the Church. It follows that ELs are not a problem or challenge to be solved, but a population to be welcomed, served, learned from, and celebrated” (2017, p.5).

- “An additive language learning approach, not a deficit model, should be embraced in Catholic schools. Our goal is to add English to a child’s linguistic skill set, not replace any of his or her other languages (Dormer, 2016), especially the language of the home” (2017, p.5).

- “The process of acquiring English fluency takes years (a lifetime in fact!), and this process must be accounted for by all educators, not just language arts or elementary teachers, in daily planning and instruction (Hill & Flynn, 2006)” (2017, p.6).

- “We believe that language acquisition can be facilitated with compassionate, dedicated and skillful educators, and is influenced by the unique realities of individual classrooms (Hill & Flynn, 2006). Highly effective classrooms should blend theory, practice and local expertise” (2017, p.6).

- “ELs represent a myriad of backgrounds, experiences, languages, heritages and interests. We must avoid homogenizing this group of learners (Hill & Flynn, 2006)” (2017, p.6).

- “Every child brings unique gifts with him or her to the classroom and educators should focus on leveraging these strengths. This perspective, often associated with the Funds of Knowledge approach (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 2001), acknowledges that students bring to the classroom ‘historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills’” (p. 133)” (2017, p.6).

- “Parents are the first educators of their children, and every effort should be made to involve families in the school. Research supports the educational value of encouraging students to develop linguistic and
literary skills in their first language (L1), and parents should be encouraged to share with their children the gift of their home language, culture, and faith” (2017, p.6).

• “Very often Catholic schools do not have the resources for a stand-alone ENL teacher, so this white paper emphasizes the important role that each and every teacher plays in developing English language skills in their students” (2017, p.7).

• “EL instruction is nuanced and aimed at serving a unique learning population. Thus, we avoid the generic rhetoric of ‘it is just good teaching’” (deJong & Harper, 2015; Hill & Flynn, 2006)” (2017, p.7).

An excellent starting place for school leaders is the establishment of a common vocabulary around approaches and beliefs to educating English learners. We encourage your team to adapt a three-strand approach, determine root beliefs and formulate a mission statement for the (arch)diocese. The goal of this step is to facilitate buy-in from faculty and staff and to ground your practices in shared vision.

**Fiscal Resources**

The third tenet of the framework focuses on the development and dissemination of fiscal resources. As was previously outlined, funding can be a real obstacle for Catholic schools and families in serving ELs. As such, a variety of funding options are necessary to address not only the needs of the families, but also limited school budgets and the priority for ongoing professional learning for Catholic school teachers and leaders. Four areas are explored: federal programs, tuition assistance, school choice and funds and additional funding sources.

**Federal Programs**

Catholic schools can benefit from equitable services through federal Title programs directed at economically, academically at-risk students and students with limited English proficiency. The ESSA was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Obama in December 2015 (U.S. Department of Ed., 2018).

With the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), this law continues programs such as Title I for services to the economically disadvantaged and academically at-risk, Title II for professional development of teachers and administrators and Title III for the linguistically diverse population of English learners. The reauthorized ESEA continues the requirement of equitable participation of private school students, teachers, administrators and other education personnel, and their families in some of its major programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2016).

Title XIII of ESSA contains uniform provision that details how equitable services are provided to private school students in Title I, IIA, II, III, IVA, and IVB. Title I, designated for improving the academic achievement of the disadvantaged, has its own equitable services provision concerning residency. Title II, allocated for training of high-quality teachers and administrators, provides funds for professional development activities designed to improve teacher and administrator expertise in pedagogy. Title III allocates resources and services for language instruction for English learners and immigrant students and helps schools ensure equity by addressing English language proficiency. Title III also stipulates mandatory assessment of English proficiency of limited English proficient students. In order to receive these allocations and services, the Catholic schools must comply with the federal guidelines outlined for the non-public school and overseen by the local school district in which the Catholic school resides. Securing these federal funds have proven to be an excellent way to meet some of the financial obstacles experienced.

While data is not available for the number of participating Catholic schools receiving services through Title III, the majority of Catholic schools participate in Title II professional development to enhance professional
competencies of teachers, administrators and other educational personnel, and their families. According to the National Catholic Educational Association, more than 118,000 students in 3,334 Catholic schools receive services under ESSA’s Title 1 (McDonald and Schultz, 2018). Unfortunately, recent research (Schmitt, 2012) findings indicate that more than $500 million in services earmarked for Catholic schools are not utilized or even accessed by the schools.

**Tuition Assistance and Scholarships**

In *Catholic Schools in an Increasingly Hispanic Church: A Summary Report of Findings from the National Survey of Catholic Schools serving Hispanic Families*, Ospino and Weitzel-O’Neill (2016) reported additional funding sources used by Catholic schools. The first funding source identified was Tuition Assistance. They found that the schools they surveyed were in line with NCEA data that 93% of Catholic schools provide tuition assistance. The challenge expressed by respondents was that Latino families still hold the perspective that Catholic schools are exclusive; so they either do not apply to Catholic schools or enroll and fail to access tuition assistance programs. It was noted that 47% of US-born families and 49% of foreign-born families receive some type of assistance. Two types of tuition assistance were identified: need-based tuition assistance and qualifying scholarships (non-need-based tuition assistance).

**School Choice Options**

Ospino and Weitzel-O’Neill (2016) highlighted a second source of funding that, when available, can provide much needed financial support. Tax credit scholarships are funded by individuals or corporations who receive a tax credit for donating to the non-profits that manage and distribute scholarships for private school tuition. There are 23 tax-credit scholarship programs in 18 states (EdChoice, 2018).

EdChoice (2018) identifies several other types of school choice programs and defines them as follows:

- **Vouchers** give parents a portion of the public funding set aside for their children’s education to choose private schools. State funds typically expended by a school district are allocated to families in the form of a voucher to pay partial or full tuition at a private school, including religious and non-religious options.” There are 26 operating voucher programs in 15 states and Washington D.C.

- **Education Savings Accounts (ESA)** allow parents to withdraw their children from public district or charter schools and receive a deposit of public funds into government-authorized savings accounts. Those funds can cover private school tuition and fees, online learning programs, private tutoring, educational therapies, community college costs, and other higher education expenses.” There are active ESA programs in five states.

- **Individual Tax Credits** allow parents to “receive state income tax relief for approved educational expenses, which can include private school tuition, books, supplies, computers, tutors, and transportation. Tax credits lower the total taxes a person owes. There are individual tax credit programs in five states.”

- **Individual Tax Deductions** allow parents to “receive state income tax relief for approved educational expenses, which can include private school tuition, books, supplies, computers, tutors, and transportation. Tax deductions reduce a person’s total taxable income.” There are four individual tax deduction programs in four states.

Ospino and Weitzell-O’Neill (2016) noted school choice options are better positioned to meet the tuition assistance needs of the Latino population. DiPerna (2012) notes in *Latino Perspectives on K-12 Education and School Choice* that the Latino population prefers private schools (46%).
Additional Sources of Support

Creativity in identifying additional sources of funding is necessary especially if those identified previously are not available. Ospino and Weitzel-O’Neill (2016) note several examples such as non-profits, private foundations, funds and endowments. Minimally, 11 (arch)dioceses and one national and one regional foundation reported as providing need-based or merit-based scholarships directly to the families or grants to the schools, with most providing financial support to academically challenging and/or low-income students of all backgrounds.

Just as there are foundations and funds that support the education of students with disabilities in Catholic schools, Ospino and Weitzel-O’Neill (2016) report there are also three designed specifically for Latino students: the Segura Institute in the Diocese of Richmond, the Latino Scholarship in the Archdiocese of Omaha, and the Hispanic Recruitment Initiative in the Archdiocese of Boston. Also notable were several multi-congregational and arch/diocesan based initiatives the researchers highlighted which support Latino families in educational and social needs. They include AIM, Action in Montgomery, in Montgomery County, MD as well as Catholic Partnership Schools in the Diocese of Camden.

In sum, the financial obstacles experienced by our families on one side and our school budgets on the other are real. We are hopeful that through further development of federal programs, tuition assistance, school choice and funds, and additional funding sources, culturally and linguistically diverse students may encounter Catholic schools that are accessible, affordable, and affirming of their gifts.

English Learner Programming Options

Just as there are a variety of terms to describe linguistically diverse students, there are also a variety of English learner program models that can be adopted to serve this population. Instructional programs for English learners generally fall under two main categories: bilingual education and English as a second or new language.

Understanding the language goals of each program, the timeframe of each, the role of integration between EL instruction and general education, necessary educator qualifications and skill sets, available resources, state policies, student language profiles and students’ educational histories are essential considerations as (arch)diocesan and school leaders determine the programming options that best meet the needs of the local community (Sugarman, 2018).

Bilingual Education

There are several types of bilingual programs, and generally the field is seeing an increase in the number of bilingual programs being offered. It is to be noted that bilingual education is a broad term that requires precise clarification when being utilized in a school setting, specifically when designing program offerings. Two of the most widely implemented bilingual programs, transitional bilingual and dual language educational programs are discussed below.

• **Transitional Bilingual Educational Program** – In this type of instructional model, students are English learners and the language goals include a focus on English proficiency and literacy, as well as initially support for the partner language. Rennie (1993) noted that in this model, instruction is primarily in English, with the native language skills developed to assist transition to English. Rennie (1993) continued in stating that the selection of this model may either reflect the preference of the community or parent(s) or may be the only bilingual option due to limited access to bilingual teachers. Transitional bilingual programs typically fall under three categories: early exit, late exit, and newcomer (Sugarman, 2018), and the programs differ “primarily in the amount and duration that English is used for instructions as well as
the length of time students are to participate in each program” (Ramirez, Yuen, & Ramey, 1991). Overall, transitional bilingual education is marked by the following characteristics: an English focus with some support for the partner language, varying program starting and ending points depending on student needs, and an overall decrease in the utilization of the partner language over time (Sugarman, 2018).

- **Dual Language Educational Program** – The language goals for this instructional model entail bilingualism and biliteracy in a partner language and English (Sugarman, 2018). Among other descriptors, Sugarman (2018) outlined three key characteristics of this instructional approach: oral and written grade-level proficiency in both English and the partner language, student early entrance into the program (Pre-K, K, 1st) and a targeted exit of at least five years, and significant role of the partner language in both 90-10 models and 50-50 models. Dual language program models include developmental bilingual offerings and two-way immersion programs.

- **Developmental Bilingual Models** - Developmental bilingual models might also be referred to as maintenance or one-way immersion models. In these programs, instruction is provided in both English and the partner language simultaneously (New York Department of Education, 2019). In this model, students are English learners with a shared partner language (Sugarman, 2018).

- **Two-Way Dual Immersion Model** – The goals of bilingual education include bilingualism and biliteracy, grade-level academic achievement and cross-cultural competence for all students (New York Department of Education, 2019). Bilingual education is sometimes regarded to be an additive language model in which students are gaining proficiency in a new language in addition to their home language (Sugarman, 2018). The two-way dual immersion model includes the integration of English learners and non-English learners (Sugarman, 2018). Classrooms reflect an estimated balance of native English speakers and students will primarily speak the partner language (Sugarman, 2018). An estimated number of native and non-native language English speakers and students will learn in and through two languages through predetermined amounts of time depending on the model adopted.

**English as a Second or New Language**

In this type of instructional model, students are English learners and the language goals include a focus on English proficiency and literacy, as well as initial support for the partner language. This model can be considered as subtractive, as it only uses the primary language of the students as a cushion until they transition to English classes. ENL models can be referenced as English only models in that home languages are often used informally, but not in a developed, systematic, or growth-minded fashion; in turn, English development is the primary goal. With this being said, given the realities in schools around time, resources, faculty, etc., ENL programs are often the most realistic and feasible supports. It is to be noted that these models are research-based and can play a vital role in the educational life of English learners.

English focused program models can overlap and can be described relative to the role of specialist and relative to the role of general education (Sugarman, 2018). It is to be noted that various iterations of these programs can exist and thrive in schools. What follows is a chart identifying program models and a brief description of each (Sugarman, 2018, Genesee, 1999).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Program or Service</th>
<th>Description of Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pull out</td>
<td>In this model, ELs are pulled out of their general classroom for specialized ENL instruction. This model is common in elementary settings and can involve one-on-one support or support in a group setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Push in</td>
<td>In a push in model, a specialist visits and pushes into the general education classroom and assists one or a small group of ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching</td>
<td>In this collaborative model, an ENL specialist and a general education teacher plan and work together to instruct lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENL class period or classroom ENL</td>
<td>An ENL class period is a setting in which ELs participate in a specific class period designated for direct instruction of English. This model is common in middle and high schools, and often students are grouped according to language proficiency levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered instruction or content-based ENL</td>
<td>In this model, ENL content classes are provided and instruction focuses on developing English skills through content areas. Classes are designed to allow grade-level content to be accessible to ELs through content and language integration. Specific models in the field include Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) and Specifically Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer instruction</td>
<td>Newcomer programs can also fall under bilingual programs in some instances. In this model, newly arrived students, typically identified as first year students, participate in full-day ENL instruction, often focusing on basic English development. In this program which is often established in secondary schools, newcomers are mainstreamed for electives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, the following considerations should be examined when determining the best program option: language goals of each program, the timeframe of each, the role of integration between EL instruction and general education, necessary educator qualifications and skill sets, available resources, state policies and student language profiles and educational history.

**Family Engagement**

“**Partnership between a Catholic school and the families of the students must continue and be strengthened: not simply to be able to deal with academic problems that may arise, but rather so that the educational goals can be achieved.”**

—Congregation for Catholic Education’

The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School (1988), n. 42

Pope Francis proclaimed in his letter on the Pastoral Care of Families, *Amoris Laetitia* (2015), “families are not a problem; they are first and foremost an opportunity” (n. 7). Educational research clearly points to a strong connection between parental involvement and student achievement (Best & Dunlap, 2012). Family involvement and engagement are used interchangeably to describe the interactive relationship between the child’s family, parents, grandparents or guardians, and the school. Parental engagement positively affects
learner outcomes as illustrated in numerous studies (Harvard Research Project, 2010; Desforges & Abouchaar, 2003; Henderson & Mapp, 2002). The study conducted by the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) demonstrated parent involvement impacts student achievement regardless of culture, language or background, country or socioeconomic status (Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, 2012). For both educators and students to fully reap the benefits of family engagement, it should be ongoing, mutual, built on trust and respect, and focused on student learning and achievement. Meaningful two-way communication based between the home and school should span the child’s educational journey so the child will be equipped for future challenges.

The loss of familial heritage, culture and language is a central concern for parents of English learners as their children become assimilated in American culture and proficient in English (Dormer, 2016). Even though research clearly illustrates English learners will excel at a greater rate if their first language is maintained and developed (Cummins, 2000), well-intentioned or uninformed educators often encourage parents to use English at home with their children (Dormer, 2016). Emphasis on English at home may limit parent-child communication and may incite harm to the relationship the parents have with the school. Parents who do not have sufficient proficiency in English to assist their student with homework may feel powerless to assert their role as first educators of their children. It is important the school assist the parents in maintaining this authority by promoting the use of their native language in the home and by carefully considering the implications of using children translators. While this is sometimes the only available option, having children translate adult topics (medical care, finances, immigration, legal concerns, etc.) is not the preferred method due to the nature and content and the advanced and nuanced vocabulary involved. A study conducted by Vera, Heineke, Carr, Camacho, & Israel (2017) on parental involvement of Latino children in Catholic schools revealed parents felt welcome in the school and satisfied with the home and school relationship, but identified the need for teachers to be able to communicate their level of investment in the child. This correlates to Santiago and Arvelo Alicea’s (2015) premise that teachers cannot remain in isolation, but must complement their educational understanding with the understanding of the family to approach holistic literacy and cultural formation of the student.

Inclusive efforts by school leadership and the teacher promote family and parental engagement (Chavez-Reyes, 2010). The term inclusive is used to represent all rather than the interests of one ethnic, majority or minority group (Chavez-Reyes, 2010; Scanlan, 2009). Research has indicated inclusive efforts to draw from the funds of knowledge of families, especially with how they parent their children, assisted in strengthening the students’ educational achievement (Chavez-Reyes, 2010) and promoted higher degrees of metacognitive awareness for students (Johnson & Johnson, 2016). When a teacher or school took the initiative to get to know the families of the students, the teacher and members in the school community were able to broaden their perspective of the level of engagement a family had with the school (Johnson & Johnson, 2016). Johnson and Johnson (2016) proclaimed the integration of the student’s familial and cultural background and experiences into the experiences of the classroom was a powerful means for supporting the student and their families. When used in the classroom, the English language learner became empowered and the effects of sociocultural bias or marginalization due to linguistic diversity were minimalized (Johnson & Johnson, 2016). Inclusive behaviors and educational practices offered the best opportunity for all stakeholders to play a positive role in the futures of students and their families.

While considerable scholarship has noted the positive correlation between parental engagement and Catholic schools (Killeen, 2017), there has not been sufficient study in the expanded social services role the Catholic school can play in serving ELs and their families. However, it is recognized that the Catholic school, as a ministerial agent of the Church and through its relationship with the family, has a unique opportunity to provide support and facilitation to access needed social services such as healthcare and welfare needs, particularly relevant for parents with limited English proficiency.
This section began by asking how might we best educate culturally and linguistically diverse students in our Catholic schools, and five key factors were identified: teacher efficacy, leadership, fiscal resources, programming options, and family engagement. In moving forward, the adoption of the Framework for Serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students as outlined in this section, or a similar framework, will prove to be a linchpin in your overall success. The authors encourage you to take a deep dive into ENL professional development for your teachers, adoption of the three-strand approach for serving ELs, establishment of root beliefs by school leadership, an examination of fiscal resources, a review of service options and creation of a thoughtful plan for family engagement.

**Conclusion**

As the number of culturally and linguistically diverse children continues to increase in our Catholic schools, we encourage you to encounter the historical call to serve this population, embrace the changing demographics and challenges (and graces) personally and make significant strides in educating your English learners well. We conclude this paper where we began, with three essential questions.

- What is the mission of the Church and Catholic schools in service to culturally and linguistically diverse students? What does it look like to fully encounter this mission in our schools?

- To fully embrace this mission, what is known about this student population and what graces and challenges might be experienced?

- With our end goal of forming the whole child, how might we best educate culturally and linguistically diverse students in our Catholic schools?

Overall, Catholic schools provide high-quality educational opportunities and much-needed faith formation to millions, instilling in children strong morals, and a commitment to the common good. We hope that by engaging with this publication, you have gained a strong resolve to make these opportunities available, affordable, and accessible to culturally and linguistically diverse students and families. We also hope that you have garnered an understanding of who these students are, how to best serve them and how our response to serve is deeply rooted in Catholic school tradition. Blessings and prayers to you and the students that you serve as you learn more about the process of language acquisition, research-based instructional strategies and culturally sustaining pedagogy (Dees, Lichon, & Roach, 2017). May your important work mirror the beautiful legacy of our Catholic schools and may your work serve as a beacon of home for the future of our English learners.
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