

14 Creating DLBE Programs that Center Equity in the Face of School Choice Policies

Katie A. Bernstein, Kathryn I. Henderson,
Sofía Chaparro and Adriana Alvarez

Introduction

In this chapter, we explain how one trend in education – the growth of school choice policies – impacts another – the growth of dual language bilingual education (DLBE) programs. We show how the intersection of these movements has created pressures and tensions for DLBE leaders across contexts, as well as consequences for which students DLBE programs serve and why. These pressures, tensions and consequences can in turn make equity for linguistically and racially minoritized families an increasingly elusive goal. Yet, as we highlight in this chapter, strong educational leaders with *ideological clarity*, or ‘a framework of thought that serves as an anchor and beacon that announces or denounces teaching for equity and social justice’ (Alfaro, 2019: 195), can navigate constraints and create programs and policies that serve marginalized students and communities.

School Choice and Competition

All 50 US states now offer some form of school choice (National School Choice Week, n.d.). *School choice* refers to parents having the right to select the school that they enroll their children in, from neighborhood public schools, to other public schools in or out of their school district, to magnet schools, charter schools, private schools or home-schooling (Berends, 2015). In most states, per-pupil state funding follows the student to their chosen program. Schools thus depend on student enrollment for funding and, increasingly, many school leaders feel they must compete for students in order to survive. Advocates of school choice policies view this competition as a way to force schools to improve, innovate and become more efficient (Ball, 2017). They argue that competition

gives students a level playing field: when schools are products in an education market, parents can shop for the best programs for their child (Angus, 2015).

This philosophy – that society and people’s lives are best organized through marketplace logic and competition – has been called *neoliberalism* (Harvey, 2005). Neoliberal logic also holds that individuals should work to make themselves competitive as well: for things like school admissions, scholarships and jobs. One way that individuals can increase their competitiveness is through language proficiency. Through a neoliberal lens, bilingualism is therefore increasingly seen as a valued skill, an individual resume builder and an economic asset in a globalizing workforce. Many school districts have taken note of this trend and have begun to use language programs as marketing tools to attract families to their districts, including by adopting and implementing DLBE programs.

Dual Language Bilingual Education

DLBE programs offer exciting possibilities for learning. They provide instruction in two languages – often English and Spanish – with the goals of bilingualism, biliteracy and biculturalism for all students (Baker & Wright, 2017). In contrast to programs that aim to transition emergent bilingual students¹ to English-only instruction as quickly as possible, DLBE takes an additive orientation toward bilingualism, supporting strong development in both languages (Baker & Wright, 2017). DLBE programs can also foster linguistic and cultural pride for emergent bilingual students, and contribute to their long-term academic achievement (Collier & Thomas, 2017).

Yet, as bilingualism is increasingly seen as a neutral, economic commodity through the lens of neoliberalism described above, DLBE has become desirable to a wide range of families, not just those who have a cultural or familial connection to the languages of the program (e.g. Spanish, Mandarin, Arabic). This desirability has meant a shift in who enrolls in DLBE programs. For example, Spanish–English programs attract not just Latinx, Spanish-speaking families, but an increasing number of White, English-speaking families (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Chaparro, 2020; Dorner, 2011; Flores & García, 2017). Scholars have called these trends, ‘the gentrification of DLBE’ (Valdez *et al.*, 2016).

In addition to changing who enrolls in DLBE, the neoliberal framing of bilingual education as a resource that benefits all and is available to all has contributed to divorcing bilingualism from community struggles for racial equality (Flores, 2017) and to shifting the purpose of bilingual education from teaching bilingual children to simply teaching children two languages (Flores & García, 2017). We have called these shifts *ideological gentrification*: when DLBE schools move away from providing socially transformative, culturally affirming education to a focus on providing a profitable tool for students’ resumes (Bernstein *et al.*, 2021).

At its best, DLBE can serve linguistically marginalized students and bridge cultural divides (García-Mateus, 2020; Heiman & Yanes, 2018). Yet, when it is not implemented thoughtfully and carefully, DLBE can disproportionately serve and represent the interests of White English speakers, and it can reproduce social and linguistic disparities (Cervantes-Soon *et al.*, 2017; Valdés, 1997).

We have found in our work that school choice can amplify these effects. Because school choice forces school leaders to equate enrollment with funding and survival, schools are often happy to take all the families they can get (Bernstein *et al.*, 2021). And higher-income, English-speaking families can often have an outsized voice in shaping the direction of programs (Joffe-Walt, 2020).

To better understand how DLBE leaders experience and respond to school choice, we interviewed 21 school and district leaders in three different state contexts – Arizona, California and Texas. Based on these interviews, we identified four interrelated school choice pressures felt by DLBE leaders (for more detail on this larger study, see Bernstein *et al.*, 2021). Below, we summarize these pressures. Then, we share two case studies of leaders who navigated these pressures with a social justice orientation, thereby combating the ideological gentrification of DLBE.

School Choice Pressures

The following table summarizes the four school choice pressures impacting DLBE programs that we identified. In the left-hand column, we describe the pressure in our words. In the right-hand column, we illustrate that pressure through the words of one of our participating leaders.

Pressures on Leaders	Perspectives and Reactions
School Choice Pressure 1: Education is a competitive enterprise	
When funding is attached to enrollment, competing for students becomes necessary for survival. Education leaders saw certain schools taking students away from others by ‘skimming’ and ‘filtering’, or recruiting/ selecting high-achieving students and weeding out others (Howe <i>et al.</i> , 2001). Leaders worried that this was heightening racial and socioeconomic disparities between schools/districts.	School Leader J: ‘We’re in competition with each other. We really are. Because the more kids we pull in, it looks better for our schools. We get more money; we can offer more. [...] As one of my former superintendents said, “Oh yeah, we’ll send the pirate ships out”. Absolutely. Absolutely. If I can send pirate ships out and start picking from other schools, heck yeah, let me do it, because then I can build better programs’.
School Choice Pressure 2: Marketing is part of the job (and DLBE is a brand)	
Education leaders felt the need to play the marketing game, using DLBE to attract students and thinking of DLBE as part of their ‘brand’.	School Leader P: ‘Charter schools have figured it out and have capitalized on marketing firms. We just need to understand that that’s the new norm. Like it or leave it, love it or hate it, we’ve got to do something. And so to me that looks like, “How do we identify ourselves as a brand?” And I know that sounds horrible to think like that. It <i>shouldn’t</i> be, but that’s the new paradigm in which we live’.

Pressures on Leaders	Perspectives and Reactions
School Choice Pressure 3: Keep ‘customers’ happy (even at the cost of a broader mission)	
Administrators felt pressure from their districts to keep ‘customers’ (i.e. families) happy so that they wouldn’t leave once they were at the school. This sometimes meant downplaying a social justice mission and instead focusing on individual skills gained.	School Leader M: ‘With our superintendent, it seems like her goal is more like, “Let’s focus on what the customer wants”. That’s not what I’m used to. Mine was like, “Okay, where can [dual] language have more of a social impact?”’
School Choice Pressure 4: Every school for itself (don’t collaborate with the competition)	
DLBE leaders from different districts and schools perceived each other as competitors, which resulted in a lack of collaboration and isolation. Some administrators noted how this division weakened their collective voice.	School Leader J: ‘We ARE in competition a bit with each other. Back in the day, when [Arizona’s restrictive, English-only] law started to come out and really changed bilingual education completely in the state, I think as a community, a bilingual dual language community, we did not come together to really go and take it seriously’.

Together, these pressures point to how school choice and bilingual education intersect: in a competitive education marketplace created by school choice, language can serve an attractive ‘added value’ for parent-consumers, especially those from White professional families. DLBE schools can use this added-value logic to market their programs to those consumers, and may even use this logic to drive programmatic decisions (Heiman & Murakami, 2019; Jabbar, 2015). In these ways, DLBE programs can undergo concurrent demographic and ideological gentrification: simultaneous shifts in who and what DLBE is for.

**Pushing Back Against Ideological Gentrification
in DLBE: Two Cases of Leading for Equity**

What can educational leaders do in the face of school choice pressures? The following two case studies of exemplary DLBE leaders illustrate possible approaches, highlighting specific actions that each leader took to resist these pressures.

While the four pressures identified above are very much intertwined, Case 1 focuses on a district-level response to the pressure of competition (Pressure 1) and the pressure to market schools in order to keep enrollment (Pressure 2). Specifically, this case shares how a district leader, Dr Olivia Hernández,² responded to the loss of students in her district to charter schools and the connected systemic financial pressure.

Case 2 illustrates a school-level response to the four school choice pressures on schools, that of competition (Pressure 1), marketing (Pressure 2), the need to keep ‘customers’ happy (Pressure 3) and the isolation created from competition (Pressure 4). This case shows how a DLBE principal, Moyra Contreras, responded to an influx of White (and some Asian) professional families to her Spanish-English DLBE school, bringing the potential for both demographic and ideological gentrification.

Case 1: Centering bilingual and emergent bilingual students, Dr Olivia Hernández, Texas

Dr Olivia Hernández was an assistant superintendent for a large school district in Texas, with over 40 years of experience as an educator and 10 years as a district leader. Her pathway to becoming a social justice advocate in bilingual education started in childhood. Born in Monterrey, Mexico, but raised in Chicago, her bilingual education came from her father:

My father was my bilingual teacher at home... He taught us how to work our math problems the way you do it in Mexico. We were all having to read in Spanish to him at the kitchen table. We all had to learn our Spanish music, too—Mexican music—and he always made sure that we knew that we were Mexican—what our heritage was and where we came from.

In contrast, her formal schooling in the United States was all-English, ‘sink or swim’. When Dr Hernández returned to Mexico at 12 years of age, her education radically shifted. She went from feeling like ‘Maybe I don’t belong here. I’m different, right?’ to ‘not only a sense of belonging, but also pride’. This sense of pride in her culture and her bilingualism are what led her into teaching and bilingual education.

Over her career, as she rose up the ranks in education administration – from teacher to principal to bilingual director for two different districts to assistant superintendent – pressures from school choice, specifically Pressure 1 (Education is a competitive enterprise), increasingly impacted her job and decision-making. When she began her role as bilingual director in her district, bilingual students and families were leaving the district to go to charter schools. The district had lost 2000 bilingual students in three years and was under severe financial pressure. There were bilingual classrooms with fewer than 10 students, which the district could not afford. Dr Hernández felt Pressure 2 (Marketing) to engage in marketing and advertising efforts to bring families *back* to her district from charter schools.

Dr Hernández, aware that no solution is perfect, approached the decision-making process by centering bilingual and emergent bilingual students and their families. She advocated for DLBE as a solution to increase enrollment in the face of school choice pressure *and* to support bilingual students: ‘Deep down, I knew I was benefitting from being bilingual. I knew [finding ways to save our bilingual programs] was the right thing to do’. Dr Hernández developed a DLBE redesign committee to work collaboratively across stakeholders (parents, teachers, administrators and community members) (Hernández & Henderson, 2023), and she recruited schools on a volunteer basis to be the first to implement DLBE.

To address bilingual programs not serving enough students, Dr Hernández supported the district in implementing DLBE district-wide (over 50 schools previously implemented transitional bilingual education) and expanded their bilingual cluster schools (called ‘hubs’) including the creation of three schoolwide or ‘wall-to-wall’ open enrollment DLBE schools. While Dr Hernández knew that clustering programs would result in some campuses losing their bilingual program and being redesignated as an English as a second language (ESL) campus, she believed it to be the best option for emergent bilinguals, as the hubs would eliminate one negative consequence of under-enrolled bilingual programs: mixed classrooms that combined general education students and emergent bilingual students (not intentionally like DLBE), with teachers expected to teach two separate curricula simultaneously. More emergent bilinguals would also now be served in wall-to-wall DLBE schools.

Throughout the redesign, Dr Hernández listened to the community. She organized ‘pláticas’ (roughly, ‘chats/talks’) with families to discuss goals and wishes for students (Hernández & Henderson, 2023). She also worked to mitigate the negative consequences as much as possible:

We looked at the number of kids in every school. We looked at how many bilingual teachers there were in every classroom. We looked at how the school was doing... Were we going to rock the boat too much there? And then we also looked at geographically families having to move too much. Was it going to be close by?

As the redesignation process unfolded, many parents were happy to join whole-school bilingual communities that shared their dreams and vision for their children. And at schools that did not share visions of bilingualism – for example, at one school where teachers and administrators initially redesignated the program as ESL – the parent community mobilized to fight for DLBE. As Dr Hernández described: ‘There was a full house of people wanting bilingual [education]... It’s the community. They want it. They’re going to keep it. That’s fine, but we’re going to do it right’. The campus was redesignated again from ‘ESL’ to ‘DLBE’ and the bilingual office began to work with the teachers and community for the necessary training to become a DLBE school.

Dr Hernández emphasized that the commitment to DLBE has to be above and beyond pressures from school choice, finances or accountability. As she said, you must learn ‘to just let go and do what’s right for kids’. And doing what is right meant centering the needs of minoritized children:

The challenge is always the hegemonic forces, that people, departments, and even people with very good intentions and even great supporters—they’re not always thinking about bilingual or English

learners. Our systems are not created to be always thinking about the minority children. I'm always that thorn that's in the meeting saying, 'What about our English learners? Did you think of how they're going to fit into this?'. That's the *lucha diaria* (daily fight), and I don't think it's ever going to end.

Breaking Down Case 1: Dr Hernández Navigating School Competition	
Which pressures connected to school choice did this leader face?	Pressure 1 (Education is a Competitive Enterprise) Pressure 2 (Marketing)
What did school choice pressure look like in this context?	School choice pressures manifested as • Losing students to charters in and outside the district. • Funding following students, leading to district financial distress. • Bilingual programs as a strand within a school/severely under-enrolled. • Needing to market to recruit students back to the district.
What would it have looked like to just go along with the status quo and give in to pressures?	In the face of these pressures, Dr Hernández could have • Closed the under-enrolled bilingual programs without alternative options. • Not made an effort to listen to teachers and families. • Ignored schools' efforts to maintain bilingual programs. • Prioritized finances. • Opened DLBE without consideration for <i>who</i> enrolls. • Focused recruitment on English speakers.
What was this educator's vision for DLBE? How did that vision help this leader resist DLBE gentrification (either in demographics or in ideas)?	But she • Drew on her own childhood experiences to ground her social justice advocacy in bilingual education, prioritizing cultural pride and a sense of belonging. • Prioritized serving bilingual and emergent bilingual students for DLBE. • Committed to prioritizing the social justice tenets of DLBE over finances, marketing, etc. • Viewed DLBE as a way to resist hegemonic systems, views and practices that were not created for emergent bilingual students. • Viewed decision-making in DLBE planning as a community endeavor that involved multiple stakeholders.
So, what did this leader do instead? What specific actions did this educator take in response to the pressures of school choice?	So, instead, she • Supported the implementation of district-wide DLBE to replace transitional bilingual education. • Created a dual language redesign committee and involved parents, educators, administrators and community members in decision-making. • Supported the expansion of cluster schools and the creation of 'hubs' to provide schoolwide DLBE programs to address under-enrollment in strand bilingual programs and prevent 'mixed classrooms'. • Responded to communities when the 'redesignation' process did not fit the community's needs/wants and made changes accordingly, including maintaining bilingual programs and supporting the transition to DLBE. • Focused marketing and recruitment on bilingual and emergent bilingual students.

Case 2: Ideological clarity and a strong vision. Principal Moyra Contreras, California

Moyra Contreras was principal of a prekindergarten-Grade 8 DLBE school in Oakland, California. Growing up, her family spoke Spanish,

but they lived in a mostly White, English-speaking area, and she was tossed into English-only schooling. ‘It was a traumatic experience’, she recalled. ‘I had to really give up my language and my culture and just my identity to get through school.’ She moved to Oakland in the 1980s because of the political work happening in the Latinx community there, and she came to see DLBE as an important kind of political engagement. As a DLBE teacher and then principal, Principal Contreras wanted something different for her young Latinx students than what she had experienced as a child.

Principal Contreras’s school, Melrose Leadership Academy (MLA), was located in a neighborhood that was once predominantly African American, but that had become mostly Latinx. Principal Contreras recognized how history shaped relationships in her school and saw building bridges as part of her mission. She said:

African American families saw Latino families moving into their neighborhoods and then impacting their schools. And nobody was talking about it. There was no political work around, like ‘we should be allies’. So, there was a lot of bad blood. *That’s* the work that I’ve been really focused on [at my DLBE school]: How do we understand each other? How do we understand that we’re fighting for the same crumbs and we shouldn’t be fighting at all?

After MLA opened, the neighborhood kept changing. At the time of our interview, more White families were moving in and housing prices were skyrocketing. With school choice and the increasing popularity of DLBE, the school was also changing. Principal Contreras said, ‘This has become a very popular school. We have principals’ kids, teachers’ kids, a superintendent’s kids... a lot of district staff bring their kids here’. Principal Contreras said that in 2015, she gave one tour of her school to a group of prospective parents. In 2019 (the year we met), she gave 10 tours.

Yet, Principal Contreras’s vision for her school had not changed. While she, of course, wanted students to learn Spanish and English, she also wanted her DLBE school to reflect the population of Oakland, to build bridges between students and families and to drive social change:

I want [students] to be completely bilingual and biliterate. I want them to understand their responsibility to their community and I want them to have practice in advocacy... Everybody has something to contribute and so, you think about what you can contribute, not just to this group of kids, but this city and this country and the world. Because we’ve been separated so long, and we have to see each other as family. And if we can live like family – have these disagreements, but really understand deeply who we are – then we can be better advocates for each other. It’ll be harder to divide us.

Principal Contreras recognized that to accomplish these goals, she would need not only to combat separation within her school, but also to work to combat segregation between schools, thereby countering three school choice trends: (1) elite parents choosing her increasingly popular school; (2) African American families seeing DLBE as not for them and choosing other schools; and (3) Spanish monolingual families worrying that DLBE would keep their children from learning English and choosing other schools.

First, Principal Contreras recognized that she needed to get information out about the school (i.e. market) in different ways. She saw that only affluent families were using the internet to get school information and that only affluent families were seeking school tours. So, she urged the district to instead do outreach in communities, visiting preschools serving all Spanish-speaking families or African American families to speak specifically about how DLBE can benefit *them*. Principal Contreras also created multiple versions of brochures. For example, the first brochures mirrored language use in the school: everything in Spanish, followed by translation in English. But Principal Contreras had experienced Black families handing the brochure right back to her, saying ‘That’s not for me. I can’t even READ that’. So, she created a second version, in English-only, with more African American students on it. Keeping her larger, social goals in mind helped Principal Contreras recognize that it was okay to temporarily diverge from the school’s language policy (everything in Spanish then English) to be responsive to parents and, eventually, to meet the larger goals of the school.

A second way that Principal Contreras worked toward her program’s aims was by being direct about those aims with more affluent families and White families. Principal Contreras told us that, on tours:

The first thing I say is, ‘If you’re coming here so your kid can acquire Spanish, then you’re probably in the wrong place. If you come here because you want to create a community that cares about social justice and that everyone acquires two languages so that they have a broader sphere of influence and their voice can reach more places and take responsibility for their understanding of how they impact the world, then that’s what we are. Language is not the end all. And that’s not our goal’.

Principal Contreras asked all parents, students and teachers at MLA to sign three agreements when they joined the school: ‘1) We teach and learn. 2) We are responsible for ourselves and our community. 3) We are kind and create safe spaces’. For students, these three agreements played out through things like restorative justice approaches to discipline. For parents, they manifested in things like parent training in how to support transgender students and the creation of a parents’ deportation legal defense fund.

Finally, a third way that Principal Contreras worked toward her programs aims and countered school choice pressures was by making sure that the curriculum reflected her mission of building bridges and of representing Oakland. She told us:

We try our best to represent all cultures of the kids that are with us in the content. So, even though the language of instruction is Spanish, that doesn't mean that we're just highlighting Latino culture. Like we were talking about the Black Panther Party and their Ten-Point Program in the middle school, in Spanish.

Having a clear vision for the program – beyond language goals – and sharing that vision with parents/families, students, teachers, the district and even after-school staff was critical to helping MLA grow toward its goals and not simply in the direction of gentrification.

Breaking Down Case 2: Principal Moyra Contreras, Having a Clear Vision	
Which pressures connected to school choice did this leader face?	Pressure 1 (Competition) Pressure 2 (Marketing) Pressure 3 (Keep 'customers' happy) Pressure 4 (Every school for itself)
What did school choice and gentrification pressure look like in this context?	In this context: • School choice in the district <i>combined with</i> • Neighborhood demographic shift and gentrification (African American → Latinx → White) <i>combined with</i> • The growing view of DLBE as a resume builder <i>combined with</i> • Newcomer families being guided into one-way bilingual schools or seeing DLBE as not for them <i>and</i> • Black families seeing DLBE as not for them <i>which resulted in</i> • The school becoming popular with White, English-speaking, more elite families <i>and</i> • Losing Spanish-speaking Latinx families and Black families from the neighborhood and school
What would it have looked like to just go along with the status quo and give in to pressures?	In the face of these pressures, Principal Contreras could have • Prioritized numbers and finances: • Just been glad to have lots of students (and their funding). • Not worried about who was enrolling (White families). • Not worried about who was leaving (Black and Latinx families). • Geared tours and marketing to new families. • Let new parents guide the vision (i.e. DLBE is just to learn Spanish). • Not worried about how things were going for other schools.
What was this educator's vision for DLBE? How did that vision help this leader resist DLBE gentrification (either in demographics or in ideas)?	But she believed that • DLBE is for societal transformation and bridge-building. • The school should reflect the population of Oakland. • Her school needed to combat separation within and segregation between schools.

Breaking Down Case 2: Principal Moyra Contreras, Having a Clear Vision	
What did this leader do instead? What specific actions did this educator take in response to the pressures of school choice?	So, instead she • Took history into account: saw enrollment as a result of specific economic circumstances (that shaped who lived where) and policies (that shaped who went to school where). • Had a clear vision for her program. • Turned marketing on its head by not just recruiting for numbers, but also recruiting for equity (targeting Black and Latinx families). • Didn't see parents as 'customers' to keep happy (e.g. upfront, straight talk with White families about goals beyond language). • Made curricular decisions that reflected her vision: helped bridge students and connect them to history and place.

Conclusion

We recognize that school choice and its accompanying pressures are a reality for educators. In this chapter, we aimed to highlight the agency of school leaders as policymakers, even in the face of policy constraints. We hope that in naming these pressures and illustrating concrete responses to them, we empower our readers – from pre-service teachers to long-time district leaders – to see *themselves* as being able to name and respond to the pressures they feel in their contexts.

It is also possible that readers might critique some of the educator responses in this chapter. In the Texas context, some community bilingual programs *were* shut down. In the Oakland context, student demographics *did* shift. Responding to systemic neoliberal pressures while keeping a social justice orientation is messy work, and no response will ever be perfect. Yet, both of the leaders in this chapter had ideological clarity (Alfaro, 2019) about their vision for DLBE. When they needed to make decisions about how to respond to each school choice pressure, they were able to use that vision to guide them. Based on this work and from learning from these and other exemplary leaders, our advice to DLBE leaders is

- (1) Identify your vision, your beacon, your ‘north star’: why do you believe in DLBE and what do you see it doing for your students and community?
- (2) Use your vision to teach and lead for justice and social transformation in DLBE, even in the face of policy pressures.
- (3) Recognize that you’re never going to please everyone. Part of having ideological clarity is being clear about who you need to prioritize and who you are willing to upset in the process.

Reflection and action

To help you begin, we next provide some suggestions for DLBE educators with varying degrees of experience to consider when creating, promoting and serving in programs that serve the ends of social justice.

- Start by analyzing your *own* case like we did with the two cases above:
 - What school choice pressures does *your* context face? (Is it similar or different to the two cases we wrote about?)
 - What would it look like for your school/district to just give into these pressures?
 - What is *your* vision for DLBE?
 - How might the cases of these two leaders help you expand or shift your vision toward one that centers bilingual, emergent bilingual and/or Latinx, Black and students of color?
- After reflecting on the pressures that you face in your context, select a few that you would like to prioritize to take action on, understanding that these changes do not happen overnight and that they require small steps in the right direction. Think about the intentional actions you can take for each one, considering the challenges you might face and the outcomes you'd like to see. What resources or supports would you need to be able to do this?
- Now that you are aware of school choice pressures, begin to use a different discourse. Rather than uncritically adopting the language of 'customers' and 'marketing', use language that aligns with *your* DLBE vision (e.g. customers → community). One idea is to examine the language you, your school and your district use in varying situations, such as the school's entrance, newsletters, website, family orientation and recruitment materials. What kind of language is used? What are some shifts in language you can make to match your vision and ideologies?
- Find other role models – in person, in your extended network or in books. Who is succeeding in creating programs that aim beyond language acquisition to social transformation? What can you learn from them?

Notes

- (1) We use the term 'emergent bilingual students' to refer to students who are learning English in school, in order to positively highlight students' trajectory toward multilingualism.
- (2) Both of the leaders in this chapter are proud of their work and publicly stand by their actions and therefore wanted their real names to be used. In using their names, we are following in the tradition of other researchers who publicly recognize the work of exemplary leaders (e.g. Izquierdo *et al.*, 2019).

References

- Alfaro, C. (2019) Preparing critically conscious dual-language teachers: Recognizing and interrupting dominant ideologies. *Theory into Practice* 58 (2), 194–203.
- Angus, L. (2015) School choice: Neoliberal education policy and imagined futures. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 36 (3), 395–413.

- Baker, C. and Wright, W.E. (2017) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (6th edn). Multilingual Matters.
- Ball, S.J. (2017) *The Education Debate* (3rd edn). Policy Press.
- Berends, M. (2015) Sociology and school choice: What we know after two decades of charter schools. *Annual Review of Sociology* 41 (1), 159–180.
- Bernstein, K.A., Alvarez, A., Chaparro, S. and Henderson, K.I. (2021) ‘We live in the age of choice’: School administrators, school choice policies, and the shaping of dual language bilingual education. *Language Policy* 20, 383–412.
- Cervantes-Soon, C.G. (2014) A critical look at dual language immersion in the New Latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal* 37 (1), 64–82.
- Cervantes-Soon, C.G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R. and Choi, J. (2017) Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs. *Review of Research in Education* 41 (1), 403–427.
- Chaparro, S. (2020) School, parents, and communities: Leading parallel lives in a two-way immersion program. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 14 (1), 41–57.
- Collier, V.P. and Thomas, W.P. (2017) Validating the power of bilingual schooling: Thirty-two years of large-scale, longitudinal research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 37, 203–217.
- Dorner, L.M. (2011) Contested communities in a debate over dual language education: The import of ‘public’ values on public policies. *Educational Policy* 25, 577–613.
- Flores, N. (2017) From language-as-resource to language-as-struggle: Resisting the coke-ification of bilingual education. In M.C. Flubacher and A. Del Percio (eds) *Language, Education and Neoliberalism: Critical Studies in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 62–81). Multilingual Matters.
- Flores, N. and García, O. (2017) A critical review of bilingual education in the United States: From basements and pride to boutiques and profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 37, 14–29.
- García-Mateus, S. (2020) ‘Yeah, things are rough in Mexico. Remember we talked about hard times?’ Process drama and a teachers role in critically engaging students to dialogue about social inequities in a dual language classroom. *The Urban Review*, 1–20.
- Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Heiman, D. and Yanes, M. (2018) Centering the fourth pillar in times of TWBE gentrification: ‘Spanish, love, content’, not in that order. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 12 (3), 173–187.
- Heiman, D. and Murakami, E. (2019) ‘It was like a magnet to bring people in!’: School administrators responses to the gentrification of a two-way bilingual education (TWBE) program in central Texas. *Journal of School Leadership* 29 (6), 454–472.
- Hernández, O. and Henderson, K. (2023) The power of plática: Expanding dual language bilingual education at the district level with a bilingual redesign committee. In L. Dorner, D.K. Palmer, D. Heiman, C. Cervantes-Soon and E. Crawford-Rossi (eds) *Critical Consciousness in Dual Language Bilingual Education* (pp. 85–94). Routledge.
- Howe, K., Eisenhart, M. and Betebenner, D. (2001) School choice crucible: A case study of Boulder Valley. *Phi Delta Kappan* 83 (2), 137–146.
- Izquierdo, E., DeMatthews, D.E., Balderas, E. and Gregory, B. (2019) Leading dual language: Twenty years of innovation in a borderland elementary school. In D.E. DeMatthews and E. Izquierdo (eds) *Dual Language Education: Teaching and Leading in Two Languages* (pp. 163–180). Springer.
- Jabbar, H. (2015) ‘Every kid is money’: Market-like competition and school leader strategies in New Orleans. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 37 (4), 638–659.
- Joffe-Walt, C. (2020) Nice White Parents (No. 1). *New York Times* podcast. See <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/23/podcasts/nice-white-parents-serial.html> (accessed 21 July 2021).

National School Choice Week (n.d.) <https://schoolchoiceweek.com> (accessed 23 July 2021).

Valdés, G. (1997) Dual language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review* 67 (3), 391–429.

Valdez, V.E., Delavan, G. and Freire, J.A. (2016) The marketing of dual language education policy in Utah print media. *Educational Policy* 30 (6), 849–883.