

**Investigating Language Policies in IB World Schools:
Final Report**

Submitted to: International Baccalaureate Organization

Submitted by: Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL)

Molly Fee, Na Liu, Joanna Duggan, Beatriz Arias, & Terrence Wiley

August 15, 2014

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Literature Review	6
Research Methodology	19
Case Studies	25
IES Mar Blau	26
École du Centre Ville	47
Mexico Colegio Armadillo	56
Evergreen High School	77
Happy Achievement International School	86
Circle International School	95
Excellence Academy of India	104
Leadership School of Japan	114
Conclusion	123
Recommendations	129
References	132
Appendices	135
A: Case Study Matrix	136
B: Interview Consent Form	143
C: Observation Consent Form	145
D: Interview Protocol: For Senior leadership member and IB coordinator	147
E: Interview Protocol: Teacher	150
F: Observation Protocol	152

Introduction

School language policies are more than just a written document. They are a reflection of particular national, regional, and local contexts as well as the individuals involved in their developing and implementing (Hult & King, 2011; Moore, 2014; Borman, Wiley, Garcia, & Danzig, 2014). It is in this sense that school language policies must be studied alongside policy in practice at the school and classroom level (Menken & García, 2010). Since there is no predicting exactly how a written language policy will be translated into classroom practice, both need to be contextually understood as two sides of the same coin (Johnson & Freeman, 2010), since a school language policy gains real world meaning through its implementation. From this point of departure, this project sets out to investigate language policy development and implementation in eight International Baccalaureate schools in order to better understand “the centrality of language in the learning-teaching relationship” (May, 1997, p. 229).

Language is omnipresent in the IB educational philosophy; “the role of language is valued as central to developing critical thinking, which is essential for the cultivation of intercultural awareness, international-mindedness and global citizenship” (IBO, 2011, p. 3). Similar to Menken & García’s (2010) objective to “bridge the gap between research and practice by exploring the negotiation of language education policies in school around the world and to provide educators with deeper understandings of this process to guide their implementation of language policies in school and classrooms,” (pp. 1-2), this project hopes to shed light on the exemplar practices, common struggles, and contextual factors that play a role in language policy development and implementation in the IB classroom. The following research questions guided the project’s overall approach:

1. What are the key activities involved in the course of LP development and implementation?

- a. What elements are involved for promotion and maintenance of the language policy over time?
 - b. What challenges are faced by schools, administrators, and teachers that impact implementation of IB language policies?
 - c. What are the supports that positively impact schools, administrators, teachers, and families in their implementation of IB language policies?
2. How does the development and implementation of a language policy differ in various settings?
- a. In publicly funded versus privately funded schools?
 - b. In continuum versus non-continuum schools?
 - c. In different regions of the world?
3. How are *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012) used by schools and programs in their development and implementation of LPs?
- a. To what extent is the guidance helpful to the development and implementation of the LPs in IB programs?
 - b. Are there elements that could be developed further and improved?

With more than forty years of experience, the International Baccalaureate (IB) has built a network of over 3,000 schools serving nearly 150 countries and is exceptional and laudable in its mission “to develop inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect” (IBO, 2011). IB schools take a multilingual approach to language use and language learning as a means providing their students with a rich foundation from which to grow academically. A key component of supporting this approach to education is a dynamic school language policy that best reflects a particular school’s students, families, and community. While, in general, most elementary and secondary schools tend to have an assessment policy, admissions policy, and disciplinary policy, a written school language policy is much more infrequent and seldom discussed as an imperative element of a school’s educational philosophy.

The Center for Applied Linguistics designed and conducted a study to investigate language policy development and implementation in IB Schools. Through document

analysis, interviews with key stakeholders, site visits, and classroom observations, this project examined the multiple facets of “daily policymaking” (Tollefson, 2013, p. 306) that take place in IB schools in order to “capture the confluence of histories, attitudes, and ideologies that engender a language policy but, alone, cannot account for how the creation is interpreted and implemented in the various contextual layers through which a language policy must pass” (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, p. 511). By bringing school language policy into focus, this project hopes to serve as a means of supporting schools as they navigate language policy development and implementation as well as highlight its omnipresence in learning environments.

This project is neither an evaluation of the International Baccalaureate Organization nor the eight schools used as case study sites. Rather the objectives of this project were to better understand exemplar practices in language policy development and implementation, the influence of factors such as national or local context, and common challenges faced by administrators, teachers, and students. This report serves as a means for conveying our findings by presenting eight examples of what a language policy might look like in a school setting. Furthermore, in accordance with our Institutional Review Board requirements, this research must maintain the anonymity of our case study sites and those teachers and administrators who agreed to participate in interviews and classroom observations. Pseudonyms have been used in place of actual school names and locations have been concealed to prevent identification. Lastly, the information in each case study report is presented as it was reported through interviews. Therefore, claims such as those regarding linguistic abilities and definitions of terms reflect interviewee responses and not the researchers’ assessment of the situation.

Literature Review

Defining Language Policy

Language policies can be instituted at multiple levels, by governments, districts, and schools, and therefore at times they may be overlapping, complementary, or even conflicting. As a result, individuals are not just navigating within a language policy, but also among various interacting policies. Regardless of how static a written language policy might be, language policy in practice is “a far more dynamic, interactive, and real-life process” (Menken & García, 2010, p. 4). Similarly, according to Corson (1999), “[i]t is a dynamic action statement that changes along with the dynamic context of a school” (p. 1). In its broadest sense, a language policy includes the “language practices, beliefs and management of a community” (Spolsky, 2004, p. 9) and encompasses “language-related beliefs, or ideologies; language practices, or what people actually do with language; and language management, the conscious and explicit efforts to control the language choices and uses” (McGroarty, 2013, p. 36). Annamalai (2013) defines language policy as a collection of values based on an ideology that influence and direct behavior to achieve an objective. According to Shohamy (2006) language “mechanisms” are what make up “real” language policy. In understanding how these mechanisms, both overt and covert practices that employ language as a tool, control the ways in which language is used, one sees the influence and effects of a language policy.

Not all language policies are as easily identified as such. Shohamy (2010) points to the distinction between “overt” and “covert or hidden” language policies. While in some instances language policies make explicit statements about language use in various situations, other policies more implicitly use language as a tool to achieve a particular outcome (Menken & García, 2010). Even when there is not a clear overt language policy

in place, schools will nevertheless have “tacit practices of its teachers and administrators” that very clearly represent their stance on language (Corson, 1999, p. 3). Moreover, a language policy relies on its implementer, particularly in schools, as each teacher becomes responsible for bringing the policy to life under his or her own terms (Menken & García, 2010).

Just as language policies reflect their implementers, language policies are also highly reflective of the contexts in which they are situated. In this sense, language policies exist within the “public sphere” and permeate through public life (Tollefson, 2013). Shohamy (2010) considers these acts of “linguaging” to go far beyond the typical scope of language to include “clothing, music, food practices, and architecture” to name a few, which all necessitate varying degrees of communication, and therefore engagement with language policy. Pennycook (2002, p.94) has also argued for a broader resonation of language policy within culture, describing language policies as “cultural policies, addressing questions of language within a far broader cultural field.”

While Spolsky (2004) considers language policy to encompass language practices, language beliefs, and language planning and management, Menken and García (2010) make a point to distinguish between language policy and language planning. According to their definition, language policy consists of “the ideas, laws, relations, rules and practices” whereas language planning implies “an activity to promote systematic linguistic change in a community of speakers” (p. 249). While the two are inherently linked, each has its respective role. Similarly, Corson (1999) makes a distinction between the research orientation of language policy and the action orientation of language planning, which includes mapping out ways of achieving “future social and linguistic goals” (p. 11). Corson (1999) also further differentiates the role of a language philosophy,

which sets the foundation upon which a policy is developed, and from that language philosophy, the language policy is able to outline “*how we will do what we hope to do*” (p. 61). In the simplest of terms, a language policy should “identify the language problems that the school has, and then... find and agree on solutions to those language problems” (Corson, 1999, p. 3).

All of the above components of dynamic, contextual, and interpreted language policies must be taken into account in order to study language policy in schools. As Tollefson (2013) notes, “critical linguists and language policy specialists must aggressively analyze policies, identify and characterize the underlying ideologies, and provide critical analysis of the effects of those policies on communities” (p. 30). The research conducted for this project has kept in mind the wide net that language policy casts, particularly in school settings in order to further tease out how these eight IB schools have come to construct their language policies and the factors that shape their implementation.

Historical Framing of Language Policy

Characterized by its emphasis on the role of national governments in determining the language policy agenda, the study of language policy in the 1960s and 1970s focused on policy decisions as they were applied broadly at the level of the nation-state. In this sense, policy making was restricted to the domain of those who possessed the appropriate qualifications in order to address “language problems” at the local or community level (Tollefson, 2013, p. 26). As a result, little consideration was afforded to the various sociohistorical and sociopolitical contexts of communities (Tsui & Tollefson, 2004). This myopic view of prescriptive policy development was at the expense of accommodating the dynamism of policy implementation as it happens at the local level (Tollefson, 2013).

In the 1990s, the perspective on language policy began to shift towards a historical-structural approach, which grew concerned with the “power, inequality, and the impact of coercive policies on language learning and language behavior” (Tollefson, 2013, p. 26). While still very much focused on the role of national governments as the main actors in policy making, the historical-structural approach focused upon the coercive powers of language policy decisions regarding language use, including issues such as language loss (Tollefson, 2013). Since policy makers were for the most part representative of the dominant sectors of society, their policies preserved power dynamics despite veils of equality (Tollefson & Tsui, 2004). It became clear that top-down language policy cannot be assumed to be “a neutral, often beneficial, problem-solving activity” just as it cannot be assumed that policy in practice will necessarily look like the policies that have been prescribed (Ricento, 2000, p. 20). Currently, research on language policy has moved away from examining governments as the sole agent in policy making and instead has prioritized the individual’s role in mediating language policy (Tollefson, 2013).

This new strand of language policy research gives agency to those who were previously assumed to merely fit into the top-down structure imposed upon them. Other disciplines such as anthropology and cultural and global studies have influenced this new approach to language policy research, which recognizes the power that individuals have to mediate, adjust, and influence language policy to fit within their local contexts and communities (Tollefson, 2013). Furthermore, as opposed to assuming that languages have a particular ascribed and inherent status, this sociolinguistic approach grew more concerned with the connections between the social and economic status of speech communities as more relevant than simply the languages that they used (Ricento, 2000).

Within this school of thought, the “ecology-of-language paradigm” grants space for linguistic diversity, multilingualism, and global identities (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996, p. 429). Current approaches to language policy research are more representative of a much earlier UNESCO resolution regarding the importance of students maintaining a positive identity towards the languages used in their home and community (Wiley, 2008). The objectives of this research project fit within this new strand of language policy, acknowledging where human rights fit in to both the role of top-down language policy development as well as bottom-up implementation, which is dynamic, responsive, and context specific.

Language in Differing National Contexts

Due to the power of local circumstance and context, it is difficult to predict how developed language policies will look when implemented. Various political dynamics, global influences, and social realities mediate and shape written policies when they are put into practice (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). Additionally, external factors such as global migration, urbanization, and economic incentives are constantly confronting and reshaping the ways in which language policies are understood and implemented throughout the world (Tollefson, 2013). Therefore the role of a language policy finds itself at the intersection of multiple power dynamics, which exist on a global, regional, national, and local scale (Tollefson, 2013).

Language policies are not created and implemented within a vacuum. They often stand as a reflection of other political and social factors at play, particularly in situations of restriction and repression (Leibowitz, 1974). As social or economic issues arise, language policies often become an implicit and reactionary tool. Particularly when immigration is concerned, language restriction and choice becomes a symbol of more

deep seeded fears of “foreignness” (Tollefson, 2013). Similarly, as economic circumstances worsen and unemployment grows, political responses may manifest themselves through restrictive policies that target minority groups as convenient scapegoats while simultaneously preserving privileges for those in power. Past examples of this politically charged and reactionary language policy implementation have taken place in countries such as Rwanda, France, Turkey, and the United States (Tollefson, 2013).

These social and political power dynamics filter into school settings through school language policies, which further substantiate and entrench restrictions. Restrictive language policies in schools are “almost always coupled with...discriminatory legislation and practices in other fields against the minorities who [speak] the language, including private indignities...which [make] it clear that the issue [is] a broader one” (Leibowitz, 1974, p. 6). Decisions regarding school language policies are therefore often symptomatic of trends in “power (re)distribution and social (re)construction” (Tsui & Tollefson, 2004, p. 2). Nevertheless, language policies and the politics behind them are not always clear-cut. Language policies and the circumstances under which they are developed and implemented are greatly nuanced, and therefore might not always map neatly on to a particular ideology (Ricento, 2000).

As a result of increased global migration, the expansion of technology, and the ease of modern communication, globalization and multilingualism have grown in relevance and prevalence in the field of language policy research. With multilingualism regarded as desirable and advantageous for economic and academic success, many countries are struggling to move from a monolingual to a multilingual paradigm. Language planning

becomes delicate in instances where no one language is considered neutral, as has been the case in India and Pakistan (Ricento, 2000), and there are few models of successful multilingual planning on a national scale. In situations such as India, a former colonial language often becomes the “neutral” language in post-colonial nation building, yet while “[t]he adoption of a colonial language as the lingua franca may be seen as an ethnically neutral move, but it is by no means a politically neutral move” (Tsui & Tollefson, 2004, p. 5). Such decisions only further substantiate and institutionalize inequalities and former colonial power dynamics (Tsui & Tollefson, 2004).

Language Policies and Schools

Due to the omnipresence of language in learning environments, school language policies are an imperative component of any educational institution (Menken & García, 2010). Verbal, aural, and written interactions make up the core of a child’s learning experience (Tollefson & Tsui, 2004). As more children have access to formal education and attend schools, schools have become the main site of much of their language learning, as well as the social implications of their language use (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1997). School language policies are one such “mechanism” of broader language policies and implementing large-scale language planning goals (Shohamy, 2006). At the school level, language policies must take into account regional and national policies at one end of the spectrum as well as classroom and playground practices at the other end, as they apply to both teachers and students (Tollefson & Tsui, 2004).

In an ideal situation, a school language policy would be:

a policy document aimed at addressing the particular language needs of a school. It is cross-curricular in its concerns, breaking down traditional subject boundaries, and should normally involve not only staff, but if possible the whole school community, in its development and implementation. The policy, once compiled, identifies areas within school organisation, curriculum, pedagogy and assessment where specific language needs exist. Having identified

salient language issues, the policy sets out what the school intends to do about these areas of concern. It should provide staff with direction within a discretionary and flexible framework, and provide a statement of action that includes provision for follow up, monitoring and revision in the light of changing circumstances. (May, 1997, p. 229)

The key components of this definition point to the cross-curricular, collaborative, flexible, and dynamic nature of a school language policy. Inherent in this definition is the fact that a language policy must be developed by the stakeholders of a school in order to fully represent the school. In developing a school language policy, attention must be paid to which ideological frameworks are given priority over others, and therefore “whose standards based on notions of cultural, class, or national norms for behavior should prevail?” (Wiley, 2008, p. 236). The challenges that both students and teachers alike will face need to be considered and explored in the development of a school language policy, including those challenges that extend beyond the classroom (Tollefson & Tsui, 2004).

There is a lot at stake in developing a school language policy. According to Hornberger (2010), “[i]t is their language policies, after all, that have the power to affirm or undermine the language and intellectual resources learners bring to the classroom, and thereby to empower or contain them as future citizens of our globally and gloriously multilingual world” (p. xiii). Just as some language policies can promote inclusion, allowing students to thrive, others can perpetrate inequalities and stifle creativity and achievement (Tollefson, 2013).

Whether de facto or highly prescribed, many school language philosophies gravitate towards a monolingual paradigm, which typically favors and implicitly rewards speakers of the dominant language. This approach carries undercurrents of hierarchies among languages. As noted by Wiley (2000):

A central tenet of the monolingual ideology is that languages are in competition. It presupposes a contest between languages in which only one language can prosper, and it assumes that to do so it must conquer all others lest it be conquered. This false dichotomy is

merely an artifact of the ideology of monolingualism itself, which suppresses the more typical and accommodating tendency toward bilingualism/multilingualism... There has never been a struggle between languages, but only among their speakers. (pp. 67-68)

While monolingualism does not necessarily imply racism, many racist and discriminatory agendas will employ strict monolingual policies to further bolster existing power dynamics (Wiley, 2000). However, the IB language philosophy not only acknowledges multilingualism but asserts “multilingualism as a fact, a right and a resource” (IBO, 2011) among students and within learning environments. As IB has exemplified, school language policy development must be taken seriously; language policy decisions have consequences beyond classroom interaction and extend to “social, political, and economic participation, social equality, and human rights” (Tsui & Tollefson, 2004, p. 17).

Developing a School Language Policy

There are three major stages to language policy development: problem identification, fact gathering, and decision making (Corson, 1999). Not only does a language policy determine which languages are officially used by governments and taught by teachers, they also contribute to the ideologies that become associated with different languages (Menken & García, 2010). While language policies typically take the form of a written document, they need not be treated as static and final. Language policies are flexible and adaptable and come alive through classroom practice (Menken & García, 2010). Therefore, as a language policy is conceptualized and developed, schools must expect and allow for the degree of interpretation that is befitting of a working document. Similarly, in addition to keeping an eye toward the dynamism of a school’s policy, policy makers should acknowledge the many stakeholders who will either affect or be affected by its implementation, including administrators, teacher, students, and families from a bottom-up perspective (Tollefson, 2013). Therefore, in order to develop a school

language policy that is reflective of all parties involved, it is imperative to identify key community stakeholders and convene a language policy steering committee. By including “the so-called bottom of the educational policy structure” (Menken & García, 2010, p. 3) in the policy development process, the voices of staff, parents, and students will come through in the policy. Furthermore, as Wiley noted, “No matter how much the language curriculum is overtly planned by teachers, curriculum designers, and textbook writers, it is still experienced differently by the learners” (Wiley, 2008, p. 237).

A school language policy is more than just determining the conventions around the language of instruction; it also incorporates the physical environment of the school and classroom. The linguistic landscape of a school “functions not only as an informational indicator, but also as a symbolic marker communicating the relative power and status of linguistic communities in a given territory” (Shohamy, Ben-Rafael, & Barni, 2010, p. xi). Since the linguistic landscape is constructed and controlled by the school’s most powerful stakeholders, these official and unofficial signs serve as a physical representation of the linguistic and societal reality (Shohamy, Ben-Rafael, & Barni, 2010). According to Corson (1999), additional factors that permeate the language environment of schools include the moving, watching, representing, and viewing of actors in that particular setting.

Implementing a School Language Policy

Development is only one half of the language policy equation. Inevitably “language policy is a process that beings with a potentially heterogeneous text that is interpreted and appropriated in unpredictable ways by agents who appropriate, resist, and/or change dominant and alternative policy discourses” (Johnson & Freeman, 2010). As different individuals implement the same language policy on a regular basis, it will constantly be negotiated and mediated (Menken & García, 2010), as well as modified or even

challenged (Wiley, in press). Teachers play a pivotal role in school-based language policy (Lo Bianco, 2010), and therefore become policy makers as “the final arbiters of language policy implementation” (Menken & García, 2010). Nevertheless, the process that policy goes through in implementation should not be viewed as negative nor should it be avoided (Menken & García, 2010). Rather it is important that policy makers as well as researchers recognize the ways that language policy implementation works in tandem with policy development.

As noted by IB, “There can be unnecessary misunderstandings of the role of language in learning unless its range, depth and complexity are recognized. Very often, complex situations are addressed and decisions are made on the basis of teachers’ experience and intuition” (IBO, 2011). Since teachers are a central point from which policy is turned into practice, it is vital that teachers not only feel empowered to actively take on this responsibility but also feel equipped with the proper training (Baker 2001; Corson, 1999; Wright, 2010). Without opportunities for professional development, “teachers [get] caught in the gulf between policy and practice, between what is prescribed by others and what is required for the children” (Menken & García, 2010, p. 258). According to May (1997), “Without staff development, a school language policy is doomed to fail. Teachers have to have a sufficient basis in theory to understand the educational intentions involved in school language policy development if they are to be able to implement them effectively” (p. 235). On a daily basis teachers will be negotiating language policy in the classroom, so schools should prioritize teacher learning and in-service training on how to navigate language policy implementation.

A constant process of evaluating and maintaining a relevant school language policy follows policy implementation. As students change, teachers turnover, economies fluctuate, and local educational policies and standards shift, the school will need to

maintain a constant awareness so that the language policy does not become obsolete.

Necessary modifications will follow seamlessly when the doors to the language policy are always left open and the policy is flexible enough to respond to its ever-changing context (Corson, 1999).

Language Policy in IB Schools

IB's approach to language policy prioritizes multilingualism with openness to diverse linguistic, cultural, and national backgrounds, where languages are "much more dynamic interrelated complex practices best represented in a multilingual profile" (IBO, 2011, p. 7). As a multitiered system, the IB Organization has developed a language policy outlining which languages are officially used, the process by which languages are added or their status is changed, and the requirements for offering the IB curriculum in different languages. This IB language policy serves as a starting point from which individual schools' language policies stem. By creating this foundation, schools are able to build their own language policies that fit within their own school contexts and national or regional policy restrictions.

Language and learning in IB programmes (IBO, 2011) provides a theoretical framework to guide schools in constructing their individual language policies. This document is strong in its theory and research, which provides schools not only with a contextual understanding on the positionality of language policy in schools, but also conveys where IB stands philosophically with regards to best practices in language policy. Furthermore, as the schools develop or revisit their language policy, *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012) provides a starting point for stakeholders to think more critically about how various elements of their policy functions within the school.

Research Methodology

To investigate the development and implementation of language policies (LPs) in IB Schools, research activities involved establishing a better descriptive understanding of key characteristics of LPs in IB programs, including their development and implementation; elements supporting or hindering LP development and implementation; and their variance across settings and contexts. The proposed study addresses the following questions:

1. What are the key activities involved in the course of LP development and implementation?
 - a. What elements are involved for promotion and maintenance of the language policy over time?
 - b. What challenges are faced by schools, administrators, and teachers that impact implementation of IB language policies?
 - c. What are the supports that positively impact schools, administrators, teachers, and families in their implementation of IB language policies?
2. How does the development and implementation of a language policy differ in various settings?
 - a. In publicly funded versus privately funded schools?
 - b. In continuum versus non-continuum schools?
 - c. In different regions of the world?
3. How are *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012) used by schools and programs in their development and implementation of LPs?
 - a. To what extent is the guidance helpful to the development and implementation of the LPs in IB programs?
 - b. Are there elements that could be developed further and improved?

Addressing these questions reveals trends, themes, and incongruences among the research sites with regard to their development and implementation of respective LPs. These questions serve as a point of departure for engaging methods that allow for a more in-depth understanding of the processes through which LPs are developed and implemented by stakeholders at selected IB Schools.

The research questions above address three key components of an IB World School's LP: (1) the extent to which the contextual factors of a particular school might influence the development and implementation of its LP, (2) the process by which a school develops and implements its LP; and, (3) the extent to which schools use, and align with, IB's published documents outlining school LP development and implementation.

Our research questions guided each stage in the methodological approach in this project, including the initial literature review, interviews, observations, collection and analysis of relevant IB documents, document analysis in relation to each school's LP, and presentation of findings.

Research Methodology: Multi-site Case Studies

To examine the research questions listed above, this study employed in-depth multiple-site case studies utilizing a combination of document analysis, interviews, and observations of eight IB Schools. When selecting the schools, several factors were taken into consideration. Firstly, the eight schools represented all three IB regions: Africa/Europe/Middle East, Asia-Pacific, and Americas in order to have as diverse as sample as possible. Secondly, we included both continuum and non-continuum schools, since policies might be developed and implemented differently. Thirdly, both public and private schools were included because of variations of the external influences on making school policies. The initial list of schools was approved by the IBO; though a few schools were later changed due to their inability to participate in the study or a lack of responsiveness. The final eight cases included in this study did successfully represent the three IB regions, both continuum and non-continuum schools, and both public and private

schools. Of the eight case studies, four were conducted on-site at the schools, while the other four were conducted off-site. The four on-site cases included interviews, classroom observations, and document collection. The four off-site cases included interviews and document collection. Interviews were conducted in each of the eight cases with three school-based stakeholders: one senior leadership member/IB coordinator and two teachers.

Observations were conducted in two classrooms for the four on-site cases. Each school was asked to choose two teachers to participate in the study. In some cases, such as the school in Spain, the school wanted three teachers to participate, instead of two, which therefore led to a small deviation in the research design. Documents associated with each program's LP were collected and analyzed for all eight cases. Instead of transcribing each interview in full, the project staff took thorough notes during the interviews in addition to having a full recording of the interview as back up for further consultation.

The research design is summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Research Design

Type of Case Study	Number of schools/programs	Methods
On-Site Case Studies	4	Interviews, Classroom Observations, & Document Analysis
Off-Site Case Studies	4	Interviews & Document Analysis

The project staff first developed interview and observation protocols and submitted an IRB (Institutional Review Board) application. Once the IRB application was approved, the project staff identified the research sites. In conjunction with points of contact at each IB Regional Office, sites were identified

based on criteria for diversity of region, IB program, and public or private funding.

The eight sites are listed below in Table 2.

Table 2. IB School Locations

Country/ Region	School	IB Region	Public/ Private	Continuum/ Non-continuum	On-Site/Off- Site
Spain	IES Mar Blau	Africa, Europe, Middle East	Public	DP	On-Site
Canada	École du Centre Ville	Americas	Public	PYP & MYP	On-Site
Mexico	Mexico Colegio Armadillo	Americas	Private	Continuum	On-Site
United States of America	Evergreen High School	Americas	Public	MYP & DP	On-Site
China	Happy Achievement International School	Asia Pacific	Private	Continuum	Off-Site
West Africa	Circle International School	Africa, Europe, Middle East	Private	Continuum	Off-Site
India	Excellence Academy of India	Asia Pacific	Private	PYP & DP	Off-Site
Japan	Leadership School of Japan	Asia Pacific	Private	MYP & DP	Off-Site

Once the sites and points of contact were identified, the project staff contacted the sites to introduce the project’s objectives and invite the school to participate voluntarily in the project. Each site’s main point of contact helped identify one senior leadership member or IB coordinator and two teachers for the project staff to interview using the same interview protocol. For the four on-site cases, the project staff observed the classrooms of the two teachers they interviewed and completed observation protocols for each class. IB documents on LPs and the individual schools’ LPs for all eight schools were collected before interviews and observations.

To summarize, eight school LPs were collected and analyzed, 25 semi-structured interviews (15 hours total) and 13 classroom observations (11 hours total) were conducted by three researchers for this project.

Development of Interview and Observation Protocols

An interview protocol (see Appendix D & E) was developed primarily based on the research questions. The list of questions in the protocol serves as a starting point to guide the interaction between the interviewers and interviewees. The interviews addressed specific information regarding interviewees' teaching backgrounds, the schools' contexts, and the development and implementation of their school's LP. Additionally, the interviews allowed project staff to respond to situations at hand and to new ideas as they emerged.

An observation protocol (see Appendix F) was developed to guide the project staff's non-intrusive observation of classrooms. The protocol includes components of observation, including the topics of the classes, the classroom settings, the student population, the languages used for instruction and communication, and how the teachers implemented the language policy in the classrooms. The project staff noted any concerns or surprises regarding the language policy implementation and languages used in the classroom as well.

Research Methodology: Data Analysis

IB documents on LP and each school's LP were thoroughly reviewed and analyzed so as to provide background information on the foundation and key characteristics of language policies in the eight IB schools.

The interview and observation data were thoroughly reviewed and analyzed. These data were examined using content analysis, which allows the researcher to "systematically and objectively identify the special messages" (Berg, 2001, p. 240) recorded on the written text. Since data collection and analysis is inescapably a selective

process (Miles & Huberman, 1994), the data were theme-categorized primarily based on the research questions. A structure of assertions was made and cases to demonstrate the assertion were provided in the report. The emergent themes were also analyzed and discussed in the findings section. Project staff that conducted the site visits or telephone interviews independently coded their interview and observation data if applicable, and drafted their case study reports. The first case study report was drafted and reviewed by the IBO staff. The remaining case study reports followed the format of the first case study report and were reviewed by additional project staff. The final report was compiled by the project manager and reviewed by the full research team.

Case Studies:

1. IES Mar Blau
2. École du Centre Ville
3. Mexico Colegio Armadillo
4. Evergreen High School
5. Happy Achievement International School
6. Circle International School
7. Excellence Academy of India
8. Leadership School of Japan

IB Case Study 1: IES Mar Blau

Instituto de Educación Secundaria [Secondary School] (IES) Mar Blau is a public school located in a Catalan-speaking region in Spain, bordering the Mediterranean Sea. In the 2013-14 school year, IES Mar Blau had 771 students divided between *Educación Secundaria Obligatoria* (ESO) [Obligatory Secondary Education]¹, *Bachillerato* [Baccalaureate education]², and *Formación Profesional* [Professional Training Programs]³. The school is in its second year of the IB Diploma Program (DP), which coincides with Baccalaureate education, so students who study in the IB program are concurrently studying the DP and the curriculum of Baccalaureate education and will take the IB exams in addition to the national Baccalaureate exams. There are currently 21 students in year one of the DP and 18 students in year two. The students graduating in the spring of 2014 will be the first class of IB DP graduates from Mar Blau.

A site visit was conducted in order to study the development and implementation of the language policy at IES Mar Blau. During the site visit, five interviews were conducted: with an English teacher, a physics teacher, a Catalan teacher, the IB coordinator, and the school principal. Additionally, one class period was observed for each of the content teachers.

¹ ESO comprises four years of compulsory education (1st ESO - 4th ESO) for students in Spain between the ages of 12 and 16 (roughly). These grades equate to 7th -10th grades in the U.S. educational system.

² Baccalaureate education is two years of non-compulsory education that follow completion of ESO. It is aimed at students who plan to go on to university studies or certain Professional Training Programs.

³ Professional Training Programs are vocational training and can be in any number of subjects. For example, schools have programs for students who want to be auto mechanics, physical education teachers, or aviation mechanics. Professional Training Programs are typically completed after successful completion of ESO, except for some Professional Training Programs that require successful completion of Baccalaureate education in order to enroll.

Table 3. Interviews at IES Mar Blau

Interviewee	Date	Length	Type of Interview	Language of Interview	L1 of Interviewee	Other Ls of Interviewee*
Principal	April 3, 2014	12 minutes**	On-site, Mar Blau	Spanish	Catalan, Spanish	English
IB Coordinator	April 3, 2014	34 minutes	On-site, Mar Blau	Spanish	Spanish	Catalan, Latin, Greek (classical)
English Teacher	April 2, 2014	37 minutes	On-site, Mar Blau	English	English, French	Catalan (C2), Spanish (C2)
Physics Teacher	April 2, 2014	38 minutes	On-site, Mar Blau	English	Catalan	Spanish, English (C2), French, Italian
Catalan Teacher	April 3, 2014	32 minutes	On-site, Mar Blau	Spanish	Catalan, Spanish	French

* Other languages listed were given in response to the question “what is your personal language background?” If a level is not indicated, the interviewee did not offer their level for that particular language.

**The principal did not answer the full series of questions, only addressed a few questions that the IB Coordinator thought he could provide further input for.

Table 4. Observations at IES Mar Blau

Class Subject	Grade Level	IB Program
English	Bach 1/DP Year 1	DP
Physics	Bach 2/DP Year 2	DP
Catalan	Bach 2/DP Year 2	DP

The School Context and Language Profile

The region of Spain where the school is located has two co-official languages, Spanish and Catalan, as granted by the Spanish Constitution of 1978. Established after the end of the rule of Francisco Franco, the Spanish Constitution of 1978 names Castilian Spanish as the official language of Spain, but grants “the ‘other Spanish languages’ official status in their respective autonomous communities” (Plann, 2009, p. 369). This includes Catalan in Catalonia, Valencia, and the Balearic Islands; Basque in the Basque

Country; and Galician in Galicia (Plann, 2009). During the Franco era (1939-1975), Catalan, along with the other minority languages in Spain, was suppressed by the regime. Its use was prohibited in broadcast media, publications, and shop signs (Strubell, 2011). Catalan was also outlawed in education, where teachers were threatened with expulsion if they were caught speaking it, even in the recreational areas of schools (Strubell, 2011). There were some periods of relaxation under the regime during which books and materials were published in Catalan, but it was not until 1978, after Franco's death, that Catalan regained official status and began to assert its standing in language policies and planning in the Catalan-speaking regions (Strubell, 2011).

According to the principal, as part of the ongoing process of recuperation of the Catalan language from the repression under Franco, Mar Blau adopted a language policy in the early 1990s that was designed to protect and promote Catalan. The staff at Mar Blau that were interviewed for the study noted that the school is unique in the region because they have prioritized using Catalan as the language of instruction, which is not something that all public schools in the region have done. The school considers itself even more unique now because it is an IB school, and while there are other IB schools in the region, Mar Blau is the only one that uses Catalan as the main language of instruction.

While the staff at Mar Blau is able to make some language policy decisions to distinguish themselves from other public schools, it is also evident that the local language policies of the regional government affect the languages of instruction at Mar Blau. One teacher at Mar Blau explained that the school's language policy has always been closely linked to the government's educational policies. Until very recently, public schools in the region were operating under a language policy known as the *Decreto de Mínimos* [Decree

of Minimums], which dictated that a minimum of 50% of classes were given in Catalan. In 2013, the ruling political party introduced a new law, which obliges schools to teach in three languages, Spanish, Catalan, and a foreign language, preferably English. According to the staff interviewed for the study, the introduction of this policy is a political move on the part of the party that introduced it; they want to demonstrate that they are committed to improving the foreign language proficiency of students, especially proficiency in English. The staff also described how the government has not made attempts to work with school administrators or teachers in the process of developing and implementing the policy. To that end, the local university hosted a conference to dialogue about the development of a trilingual model of education for the region, but according to the staff at Mar Blau, no government officials participated.

In the new proposed policy the breakdown of time of instruction in Spanish, Catalan, and English is to be an equitable 33%, 33%, and 33%. This new language policy was to be introduced at the start of the 2013-14 school year, but due to widespread concern of teachers, administrators, and the broader school community, to the point of strikes and demonstrations, the implementation of the new law was postponed. As of the beginning of April 2014, the staff at Mar Blau said there was still no decision on what would happen for the 2014-15 school year.

One concern regarding the new law voiced by the teachers and administrators at Mar Blau was that they do not have enough staff with a high enough level of English and with training and experience in teaching in English to be able to effectively carry out this law. Another concern expressed by the English teacher is that the new law would ask a

B2 level⁴ of English to be able to teach a class in English. In the opinion of this teacher, a B2 level is not sufficient and would contradict the school's philosophy on teaching classes in English, which is to do so only when the teacher is fully equipped to teach in English effectively. Similarly, there is also a concern that not all students have a high enough level of English to take on more classes where English would be the language of instruction.

A larger, broader concern shared by some that were interviewed for this study is that the government's new plan to promote a trilingual model of Spanish, Catalan, and English puts too much emphasis on English and reduces the importance of Catalan, as well as Spanish. One teacher framed the new plan as trying to promote trilingualism in English, Spanish, and Catalan as if the three were equally integrated in society, which is not the case. In her opinion, this representation in the curriculum is not a reflection of the social reality, where, at least in the cities in this region, the majority language is Spanish.

As the new government language policy has not yet been implemented, Mar Blau has been operating under its school language policy, which still reflects the previous Decree of Minimums law. The Catalan teacher believed that it has always been possible for the school to meet this requirement because the teachers have made an effort to teach in Catalan, even those who have had to learn it have made an effort to do so, and their efforts have been supported by professional development in the school. This was the case for some teachers who do not have Catalan as a mother tongue because they are from an area where the language is not used. The language policy states that since 2002 it has been required that all teachers who are given a position at the school have the capability to teach in Catalan.

⁴ B2 is the upper intermediate level on the Common European Framework of Reference scale.

Beyond historical, cultural, and political issues, the linguistic profile of the local community has played an important role in defining the school's specific context. All of the teachers and administrators interviewed for this study reported that the local community of the school is bilingual in the two co-official languages, Catalan and Spanish. The principal described the linguistic context in the area by commenting that "Here everyone is bilingual. It makes everything easier." (Principal of IES Mar Blau, personal communication, April 3, 2014. Author's translation.) The IB coordinator also pointed out the bilingual nature of the community, at least in oral expression. She said it is very common to have a conversation in which one person is speaking Spanish and the other is speaking Catalan without any problems in communication. She said this is very natural to them; to have two languages and use them interchangeably is natural.

The students who attend Mar Blau live either in small towns outside of the city closest to Mar Blau or in the city itself. It was noted that in the small towns it is more typical that Catalan will be the main language used in the community, while in the city, Spanish tends to dominate as the main language in the community. There are currently few newly arrived immigrant students enrolled in the school. For example, according to the language policy, in 2010 only 3.8% of the students in 2nd ESO were of immigrant origin. The staff remarked that ten years ago there were more immigrant students who came from countries in Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America. This meant that some of the students were not proficient in Catalan or Spanish, but other students, like those from South America, were proficient in Spanish, but not Catalan. According to one teacher immigration has subsided in recent years due to the economic crisis in Spain and those immigrant students that are enrolled at the school have been there for a number of

years and are fully integrated, meaning that they can use the languages proficiently as required of them in the classroom, from this teacher's perspective.

Since this region is a destination for many tourists, foreign languages are also present in the local community. There are also large ex-patriot communities of foreign nationals who live in the region year-round, or at least during several months of the year. The most prominent foreign language present is English, spoken by many tourists as well as people working in the restaurant and hotel industries. The other common foreign languages in the local community are German, French, and, increasingly, Russian. Therefore it is not only the two co-official languages that define the linguistic profile of the community, but it is a broader multilingual profile.

Language Policy

The language policy of Mar Blau takes into account the school's unique context and addresses the local government policies, the community's language profile, the students' language profiles, and the role of Catalan as a minority language in the region. The current language policy that was adopted for inclusion in the IB program echoes the protection and promotion of Catalan of the previous language policy document written in the early 1990s. The document lays out the language philosophies of the school; the language profile of the school; the organization of the teaching of languages, including language objectives, the teaching of the mother tongue, the teaching of the mother tongue to newly-arrived students, the teaching of additional languages, the teaching of Latin, and the teaching of language in all of the subject areas; admission into the IB program; areas of opportunity; the committee; and references.

The language philosophies on which the document is based call for a culture of dialogue to contribute to a more peaceful world and a commitment to the culture and languages of the region as well as a commitment to the integration of the newly arrived. The principal objective of the language policy is that all students will be competent in both official languages of the region, Catalan and Spanish. A secondary objective is that the school will aim to produce students who are competently trilingual (in oral as well as written language) in Catalan, Spanish and either English or French, because language is fundamental in the preservation of cultural identity and the understanding between different nations and cultures.

In terms of the organization of languages, the language policy dictates that Catalan is the language of instruction in the school and that English and French are the foreign languages of the school that will be used to communicate with the rest of Europe and the world. According to the principal, the decision to keep Catalan as the main language of schooling in the IB language policy was a part of continuing the recuperation process of Catalan and to give Catalan prestige on an international scale. As per the language policy, all formal documents of the school are written in Catalan, with the exception being documents that are presented to bodies outside of the bilingual region, which are to be written in Catalan and Spanish or in English or French. The school website is written entirely in Catalan, as is the menu in the school cafeteria. The language policy is posted on the school's website in Catalan, and a version in Spanish also exists.⁵ All of the signs in the hallways of Mar Blau indicating directions, offices, and rules are also in Catalan.

⁵ The version made available to the public on the website is in Catalan. However, when a version in Spanish was requested, the school was able to provide one.

The language policy states that for the entire secondary school the subject of Catalan will always be taught in Catalan, and, similarly, the subject of Spanish will always be taught in Spanish. Foreign languages are ideally to be taught in the foreign language, but when that is not possible, the language of instruction of the school is to be used. The rest of the subjects are to be given in either Catalan or Spanish, depending in part on the requirements of the *Consejería de Educación* [Department of Education] for secondary education. The exception is the subject of technology, which is to be taught in English, in a content and language integrated learning (CLIL) model in the 2nd and 3rd ESO years. Within the IB DP specifically, Catalan is designated as Language A and English is designated as Language B. Spanish is not mentioned in the language policy as being a second Language A, it is only noted that students enrolled in IB will study Spanish in a Baccalaureate Spanish class and that students will take the IB exams in Spanish. Latin is also an optional course for IB students.

The language policy presents many ways in which the document connects to other school-based initiatives regarding languages. For example, since 2003 Mar Blau has been teaching the CLIL course in technology with English as the language of instruction. Similarly, the school is a Trinity Center⁶ where students and teachers can prepare for Trinity exams and can get an accredited diploma. They also have a program with the local *Escuela Oficial de Idiomas* (EOI) [Official Language School], which affords students an opportunity to earn a diploma reflecting their foreign language competency from the EOI before they go to university. All of these resources are offered for free to all students to prepare them for university or for jobs. There are also options for all staff at

⁶ Trinity College London offers a certificate of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) for non-native speakers of English. A school (public or private) can become a Trinity Center, meaning that they conduct the exams on site and offer exam preparation.

the school to study and prepare for Trinity exams. The English teacher expressed that from her point of view the CLIL course and other opportunities for learning English have always been done with the goal of helping students to use English in real-life situations but not at the exclusion of Catalan or Spanish. “It is not English taking over a school,” she insisted (English teacher of IES Mar Blau, personal communication, April 2, 2014.).

Beyond the initiatives mentioned by the staff interviewed, the language policy also describes other connections that exist between the document and school initiatives. For example, the school participates in exchange programs with other countries where the students have an opportunity to practice their foreign languages in an authentic setting, usually in French- or English-speaking countries. Additionally, the students in 4th ESO participate in a Comenius project with students from other countries. The Comenius program is a European Union educational project to promote the range of European cultures, languages, and values. In some of the Professional Training Programs, students participate in programs like the Leonardo da Vinci program or the Erasmus program, which also offer students experiences abroad in other European countries. In partnership with the local university, the students at Mar Blau participate in a debate in English hosted by the university. In the debate, the students must represent a form of energy and argue for the merits of the industry that they represent, using the English knowledge and competence they have built up over two years studying in a CLIL technology class delivered in English. Finally, every year students from the school also participate in speaking and writing contests in English hosted by Cambridge and International House.

The language policy is not only connected to the numerous school-based initiatives, but also to the frameworks and approaches of the IB program. The document references not only the *Language and Learning in IB programmes* but also the

Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy. There is also discussion of the learning about and through language, and respect for language and culture. Two of the language objectives in particular highlight the idea of respecting languages. The first is to learn and respect language, traditions, celebrations, and historic figures from their own culture as well as from foreign cultures, especially those whose languages they study. The second language objective is to be respectful towards any language, without devaluing the language or switching out of using a language when you lack a word or the ability to communicate orally in that language. One teacher commented that making sure that all languages are respected is one of the keystones of Mar Blau. The English teacher felt that the school's policy in terms of English is to make students use language effectively, make students respect language, and to make students love language, which was easy to relate to the IB's philosophy. The Catalan teacher explained that one of the aspects that characterizes IB at Mar Blau is that they have been a school that has been distinguished from the rest of the schools in the region for the use of a minority language as the language of instruction. And when they thought about applying to the IB, they did it precisely because they knew there was a large respect for minority languages, at least in Europe if not in the rest of the world.

Language Policy Development

In order to develop the language policy for IB, a committee was formed with representatives from almost all subjects at the Baccalaureate level (the grades that coincide with the IB DP). The current members of the language policy committee include the IB coordinator who also teaches classical languages, the principal who also teaches

history, the head of Baccalaureate studies who also teaches French, a Catalan teacher, an English teacher, and a Biology teacher. The members of the committee will rotate in order to incorporate new perspectives each year. As mentioned above, the school had an existing language policy so the committee was tasked with reconciling the IB documents (*Language and Learning in IB programmes* and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy*) with the local government policy and the existing school policy. The IB coordinator was responsible for seeking out documents and examples from the IBO and bringing them to the committee. The committee looked at and discussed those documents and the school's existing language policy to form an idea for the language policy for IB. After they had a framework for the language policy, the IB coordinator met only with the Catalan teacher and the English teacher to further solidify the issues related to their language areas because those the teaching of those two languages is what is most emphasized in the document. From there, the language policy was introduced to the rest of the IB teachers for input, but they did not have any issues to discuss or changes to suggest. After that it went to the school-wide staff and then to the local school council. And finally, the language policy was posted on the school's website for parents and students to see. It was also put on the school's intranet and on Moodle for students to access.

As described above, parents and students were not involved in the process of the development of a language policy. Since Mar Blau had been using Catalan as the primary language of instruction for some three decades and had been teaching a CLIL course in English for 10 years, from the staff's point of view it was already known to parents and students that Catalan is a priority and that English is the principal foreign language taught

at the school. Because this was already established and is known to parents and students when they come to the school, the IB coordinator remarked that there was no controversy in reaching an agreement between all the interested parties on the language policy for IB. The language policy was nothing new; the only new thing was that although the students would still be taking classes that are given primarily in Catalan, they would have to take the IB exams in Spanish. This attitude was also voiced by another teacher who explained that parents and students were not involved in these decisions because the school's preferences regarding language were already known. In fact, this teacher believed that since language is an issue there, they tend not to ask parents what languages they think should be used because it could possibly stir up controversy. For example, the decision to offer the CLIL technology course in English was not proposed to the parents, it was decided by the staff, and they have received no complaints—parents gave their “silent consent”.

When asked what factors were taken into account in the development of the language policy, a common theme from many of the parties was that while the local governing policies have always been taken into consideration, so has the desire to promote Catalan as a minority language. One teacher stated that “all factors” were taken into account when they were developing the language policy for IB, and the fact that the school has a history of promoting languages was emphasized in the document (English teacher of IES Mar Blau, personal communication, April 2, 2014.) Another teacher felt that the key factor that was considered was the bilingual background of the school community and the fact that historically they have been a school that teaches primarily in Catalan, which is not very common in the region.

The main challenge that was mentioned by all of the Mar Blau staff interviewed was the fact that the exams for IB have to be taken in Spanish. So although the main language of instruction in the school is Catalan, to some extent teaching, materials, and practice exams have to be in Spanish. Most of the teachers noted that the majority of this burden lies on the students to do the extra work of translating the knowledge from Catalan to Spanish, and that they are all capable of doing so because they are proficient bilinguals. Despite giving some materials and practice exams to students in Spanish, they discovered in the first year's practice IB exams that the students had trouble understanding some words in the questions and had trouble finding the word they wanted to use in Spanish even though they knew it in Catalan. This issue has been resolved to some degree because soon after the practice exams they found out that the IB allows students to use a translation dictionary during exams, so this has helped address some of the concerns with taking the exam in Spanish.

Classroom Implementation

The implementation of the language policy at Mar Blau depends heavily on the subject matter that is being taught. For example the English teacher described her implementation of the language policy by saying that she uses English 100% inside and outside of the classroom for interacting with students. Observation of her class supported this assertion, as the teacher never used Catalan or Spanish in the classroom. There was an additional language that was present during one lesson, but it was French. The teacher was giving the history of the etymology of some English words and wrote their French roots on the board to accompany the story she was telling of how the words came to be adopted into English. The teacher gave explanations of definitions of words in English,

used gestures and drawings on the board to reinforce meaning, gave examples that were relevant to the students to illustrate the meaning of phrases and idioms, and did not provide translations in Catalan or Spanish. Students often spoke to one another in side conversations in Catalan or Spanish to confirm their comprehension.

The physics teacher described her implementation of the policy as being “intuitive.” The language policy was clear to her that she would be teaching in Catalan, the exams would be in Spanish and she could do whatever she wanted in English. She decided that the class textbook would be in English. She feels that although the main language of instruction is still Catalan, having additional materials and the textbook in English has improved the students’ English and their ability to switch between languages. Her use of three languages in the classroom is consistent with the language policy, which states that it is possible that students in the IB program will receive class or materials in any of the three languages of Catalan, Spanish, or English.

The observation of her classroom supported her description of a trilingual environment. The teacher mainly, but not exclusively delivered the class in Catalan. She used some materials from a website in English about monochromatic waves, electrons, and lasers. The website was projected on the board so the vocabulary was visually present to students in English. The teacher was talking about the website mostly in Catalan and was translating most of it from English to Catalan, but occasionally she would read the word aloud in English as it was written on the website before translating it into Catalan. Students also had some worksheets on their desks that were written in Spanish, though Spanish was rarely spoken during the lesson.

One challenge of implementing the language policy that was mentioned by the physics teacher is finding materials for IB physics in Spanish, including on the internet. Although this is a challenge, she also noted that there is a benefit to learning to follow a text in English because it helps prepare the students to learn physics anywhere in the world, and it helps their mental agility. Along the same lines, in order to prepare the students with real practice for the exams, she gives them practice exams in Spanish but the question bank for past IB exams is only available in English so it requires more time to translate everything.

When asked for sources of positive support in implementing the language policy, one factor that was mentioned by multiple parties in the interviews was having the support of the school and the principal. The teachers were willing to be a part of the IB program and work with the language policy because they knew that the school's philosophy and framework would promote the language policy and whatever might be necessary to successfully implement it in the classrooms. There was also mention of IB training courses. Although they are a rare opportunity, the teachers felt that they are very useful to be able to hear other teachers' experiences. One teacher also mentioned the IB forum as a "fantastic" source of support, not just for implementing language policy but for issues related to the IB program (Physics teacher of IES Mar Blau, personal communication, April 2 2014.).

The IB coordinator noted several strategies that are in place for maintaining the language policy document over time. A primary instance is the recognition that the language policy is not a closed document and that it will be revised every year. For example, the allowance of dictionaries during the exams was added into the language

policy after the first year, and they anticipate making more changes in the future years. The IB coordinator also plans to rotate the teachers who are on the language policy committee. As part of overall evaluation, the school carries out surveys with the students about different issues, and sometimes the issue of the language policy or the languages that are used in the classroom is part of the surveys. Another strategy that they have in place is to deal with students who need reinforcement in any subject area in order to enroll in the DP. In those cases, the school already knows the situation before the student enters IB so they recommend that they take classes over the summer to support their development in the subject, whether it is Catalan, Spanish, English or non-language subject. The language policy also mentions areas for improvement, such as increasing the level of English proficiency among staff, coordinating more efficiently between the language departments, and increasing the overall foreign language competency of students in both English and French.

The Use of Language and Learning in IB programmes (IBO, 2011) and Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy (IBO, 2012) in Language Policy Development and Implementation

Of the teachers and administrators who were interviewed for the study, all were familiar with *Language and Learning in IB programmes*, but not *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy*, depending on their role in the development of the language policy for IB. The IB coordinator commented that the *Language and Learning* document was interesting because it included more points of view about multilingualism and that without it she would not have known where to begin. The Catalan teacher felt that this document was good to put each school into a context. She felt it helped to illustrate the fact that just like there is not one country that is identical to another, there is

also not one school that is identical to another—each school depends on the context where it is. The English teacher believes this document is important enough to be shared with students; she includes excerpts of *Language and Learning* in the materials that she gives to her students at the beginning of the year. Beyond the *Language and Learning* document, the IB coordinator felt what was also really helpful was contact with other coordinators. It was helpful to be able to compare language policies from other schools. They studied a lot of policies from other schools to see what made sense for their particular context.

In terms of improving the documents, the staff interviewed for this study expressed that it would be helpful to have more examples, maybe something separate or a page on the website with links to schools' language policies so schools could see examples. Regarding the *Guidelines* document, it was noted that perhaps more space for writing their ideas and filling out the chart would be useful. The documents have not been used in PD sessions with teachers at Mar Blau.

Findings and Discussion

The interviews and observations at Mar Blau indicate that the school has identified key activities to develop and implement the language policy and maintain it over time. It also emerged that while the school has a certain degree of autonomy over their language policy, the local context of the school has historically exerted much influence over the language policy of the school and will likely continue to do so in the future.

The first research question sought to answer how *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy*

(IBO, 2012) are used by schools and programs in their development and implementation of language policies. The staff at Mar Blau indicated differing levels of familiarity with these two documents, depending on their role in the language policy development process. Overall, they felt that it would be helpful to have more examples of language policies from other schools because that was something that helped them in developing their policy, although they had to tailor it to their specific context.

Regarding the second research question (What are the key activities involved in the course of LP development and implementation?), Mar Blau has closely followed the steps recommended to schools in the *Language and Learning* document. The school convened a language policy committee of teachers and administrators to guide the development of the document, however there are no librarians, parents, students, or other members of the community involved. They also followed the second step of writing a school language philosophy, except in their case it was modified from the existing language philosophy that was already in place. The school also reviewed the current language situations and practices to compile a school language profile. While most of the topics that are suggested by the IB document for this third step are covered in Mar Blau's policy, it is not entirely clear in the document what were the data gathering exercises used to inform the language profile and who was involved in those exercises. Most notably, there is again an absence of involvement from the members of the broader school community like parents and students. Mar Blau's language policy does address further considerations, though this is an area that could probably be expanded as the current areas listed are not greatly elaborated on, only mentioned in one sentence each.

The school has established a review process, consistent with the first step of making the language policy a working document. They have also linked it to other documents, though they could include more information about language assessments and the system used for reporting and feedback on language development, as suggested by the IB document for step two. Finally, the school has communicated the policy by posting it on their website and the school's Moodle platform, though they have not taken into consideration how to keep the whole school community informed of the policy process and how they might make contributions, as is recommended in *Language and Learning*.

A number of key activities are in place to provide students opportunities to develop competency in both Catalan and Spanish, the two official languages of the region, and opportunities to study and use the English that they are studying in order to communicate orally, as well as in writing, in this foreign language. Although French is also named in the language policy as a possible foreign language in the students' trilingual profile, there were not many initiatives observed or described by staff that exist to support the policy in the school. The CLIL course offered at the school is also given in English, there is no CLIL course offered in French. The language policy does mention exchange programs with a school in France; however, this was not mentioned in interviews with teachers or administrators, nearly all of the opportunities for developing foreign language competency mentioned were connected to English. This bias may be due in part to the fact that no French teachers were interviewed for the study, nor were any French classes observed. The school was asked to select which teachers would participate in the study, so the researchers had no control over who would participate. Additionally, in Mar Blau's language policy more attention is given to the language

objectives and policies for Catalan and English as languages of instruction, so it is not so surprising that a representative from French, which is clearly labeled as the second foreign language in the document, was not selected to participate.

The third research question asked how the development and implementation of a language policy differs in various settings. Although Mar Blau is a public school, they appear to have a certain degree of autonomy, at least in the decision making regarding the language of instruction in classrooms. The fact that the staff is able to develop a language policy internally before sharing with any external school council or the school community indicates that they have a certain level of control and are confident that their decisions in this arena will be accepted by the school council and the broader school community. The staff also expressed the uniqueness of the school, in terms of the priority that is given to Catalan, which also indicates that they have the ability to make promoting a minority language a priority. While they are able to make some language policy decisions to distinguish themselves from other public schools, it is also evident that the local language policies of the region affect the language of instruction at Mar Blau. The previous Decree of Minimums law and the impending new law about teaching 33% in three languages were mentioned by all of the staff members interviewed for this study as factors that influence the language policy of the school. And though the school has been committed to Catalan as a language of instruction for a number of years, it was clear that moving forward their policy would somewhat be affected by the new law, if it is to be implemented. It seems that as long as the school language policy is in alignment with the local language policy (which it was under the Decree of Minimums), they have the freedom to implement it. It remains to be seen what will happen to the school policy if

the new law obliges fewer hours of Catalan instruction in the school and an equitable split between Spanish, Catalan, and English.

References

Catalan teacher of IES Mar Blau. Personal communication, April 3, 2014.

English teacher of IES Mar Blau. Personal communication, April 2, 2014.

IB Coordinator of IES Mar Blau. Personal communication, April 3 2014.

Physics teacher of IES Mar Blau. Personal communication, April 2, 2014.

Plann, S. (2009). Arabic: Another “other Spanish language”? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6(4), 369-385.

Principal of IES Mar Blau. Personal communication, April 3, 2014.

Strubell, M. (2011). The Catalan Language. In Dominic Keown (Ed.) *A companion to Catalan Culture*. (pp.117-142). Woodbridge, Great Britain: Tamesis.

IB Case Study 2: École du Centre Ville

École du Centre Ville (ÉCV) is a public elementary and middle school located in an urban setting in the Canadian province of Québec. The school currently has a total of approximately 600 students divided among the elementary and middle school, which are housed in separated neighboring buildings. As an IB school for over two decades offering the PYP and MYP, ÉCV embraces the international nature of its curriculum and student population, which complements the mission of an IB curriculum.

The school's language policy is framed by the philosophy that language is a window into other cultures and fosters a respect for other cultures. As a public school, they must balance national educational requirements, regional requirements, and IB program requirements. First and foremost, the school adheres to the province's educational standards, which are to promote French in the classroom, particularly with immigrant students to ensure that they can participate successfully in French-speaking society and also to protect the status of French among future generations. As a public school located in the province of Québec, the language of instruction and all school communication is French, though the school happens to be situated in a predominantly Anglophone neighborhood. While the official language of the province and the city is French, the city has a French/English bilingual identity, though the language of work, school, and general communication airs towards French. Nevertheless, French has a long history as a minority language both in Canada and North America, so the school is aware of the role they must play in protecting the status of the French language. The school engages with its urban setting through field trips and relationships with community services and makes use of its location in a highly diverse and multilingual city to further

enrich students’ learning experience. This public school is open to all residents within the city.

One of the teachers interviewed spoke at length about the aggressive policy for linguistic assimilation in the city, which has a growing immigrant population. In an effort to protect the status of French, laws were put into place a few decades ago that only allow immigrant students to enroll in public schools that are French-medium. Since the option of English-medium public schools is only afforded to children whose parents are Canadian citizens and were educated in English, all other students, including all immigrant students, must attend school in French. The teachers interviewed for this project were very supportive and proud of these efforts to maintain and support the French language and also for the benefits that their students will gain from acquiring French as a second or third language. In their local context, the political and social implications of language choice are very palpable as they are an extension of one’s identity.

A site visit was conducted over the course of two days. Interviews were carried out with an IB coordinator, an MYP French teacher, and an MYP Spanish teacher. One classroom period was observed for both content teachers interviewed.

Table 5. Interviews at École du Centre Ville

Interviewee	Date	Length	Type of Interview	Language of Interview	L1 of Interviewee	Other Ls of Interviewee
IB Coordinator	April 15, 2014	34 minutes	On-site, ÉCV	French	French	Arabic, English
French Teacher	April 15, 2014	37 minutes	On-site, ÉCV	French	French	English
Spanish Teacher	April 16, 2014	21 minutes	On-site, ÉCV	French	French	Spanish, English

Table 6. Observations at École du Centre Ville

Class Subject	Grade Level	IB Program
French	7	MYP
Spanish	7	MYP

The School Context and Language Profile

Among the 600 students enrolled at the school, only 23% are from French-speaking families. Though some of these students come from homes where English is the primary language, the student population represents 28 different languages. The most represented countries and regions of origin include China, Russia, North Africa, and Eastern Europe. The school staff reported that they only seem to experience minor difficulties at the beginning with those students who come from non-French-speaking homes and finds that their French proficiency improves quickly. The students who generally face the greatest challenge are those coming from non-Latinate language backgrounds. Particularly in instances where parents are unable to assist their children with French, the teachers are always available to put in extra time in order to ensure that students stay up to speed. While French is required in almost all school settings, there is also a school culture of respect among teachers and students for different cultures and backgrounds. Many of these students are using up to four languages on a daily basis: French as the primary language of instruction, English and Spanish as additional languages in school, and a fourth language at home.

Though ÉCV is publicly funded, they are able to provide a more specialized and rigorous curriculum than many other public schools. As a result, among other public schools in the city, one teacher noted that this school has a reputation of being elitist, since they are a public school yet have more selective admissions process due to high demand and a limited number of spaces. Consequently, they feel a bit alienated from the

rest of the public school system. They reported feeling a bit torn between the desire to maintain a specialized curriculum and also maintain the budget of a public school. Due to their reputation, they feel that they are not in a position to request additional funding from the government, and therefore sometimes need to bill parents for some of the enrichment activities that they organize.

Language Policy

As a French-medium school, more than one third of the school's written language policy asserts the role of the French language within the school and within Canada. The language policy has to simultaneously ensure that French remains the sole language of the school, aside from additional language courses, and accommodate those students who are entering the school with lower levels of French proficiency, many of whom are first or second generation immigrants. Much emphasis is placed on cultivating French literacy among students and developing strong oral skills. English and Spanish are the schools' additional languages, which are limited to language classrooms, and the number of hours spent learning these languages corresponds to the Ministry of Education's requirements. The school cites budgetary restrictions as the reason why they are not able to offer more language courses that better reflect the diversity of the school's population. The extent to which the language policy addresses the development of mother tongue is in acknowledging that many students attend weekend language programs run by the community and that they try to incorporate students' home languages and cultures in a special annual cultural week. In addition to a week dedicated to other cultures, the school also holds a French week where teachers organize activities around French language and Québécois culture.

All students learn English and Spanish as additional languages. Spanish was added to the school in recent years at the request of parents. There was enough demand for it that the school rearranged its schedule to accommodate the new Spanish courses. Due to the multitude of home languages among students, the school would not have the means to provide courses in all home languages, however students are encouraged to share their cultural backgrounds in the school setting.

While the school's language policy document has not necessary been widely distributed among teachers, there is an implicit language policy that is widely internalized among teachers and staff. Though one teacher interviewed had not seen the written language policy until the day before her interview, she nonetheless embodied the school's philosophy of their responsibility to promote French language, literature, and Québécois culture throughout the school, while also acknowledging and asserting respect for students' mother tongue and cultural backgrounds. Additionally, ÉCV's school language policy aligns with the regional language policy as well as other school-based policies, such as their integrity policy, their special education policy, and evaluation policy.

Language Policy Development

The school language policy is revised every five years to coincide with the IB school evaluation and is currently going through the final stages of their most recent language policy review process. Revisions are conducted by an IB committee that reviews all of the school policies. Language policy development is limited to a select committee within the school of administrators, coordinators, and a few teachers and is not a school-wide effort. The language policy was presented more widely at one point to solicit feedback, from which it was revised. However, teachers are invited to approach the

school's leadership to express concerns and be heard. For example, the French teachers wanted to establish regular theatre trips for students, and now the school has set up a program with regular local excursions. The school's professional development activities are not mandatory for teachers, and while there are not opportunities specifically related to the language policy, they are able to seek out professional development through organizations outside of the school. Otherwise, new teachers are expected to gain professional development and guidance from more senior teachers along the way. When new teachers are brought in, they undergo more formal training that aligns with the IB philosophy and guidelines.

Classroom Implementation

Throughout the school, French oral and written skills are cultivated and emphasized in all content areas. The school has encouraged strong oral skills by entering several students in regional and national public speaking and poetry recitation competitions where they have performed quite well in both French and English. These competitions allow students to demonstrate both their French and English abilities, which validates students' bilingualism. The school has established a relationship with the local public library, which holds three events per year for students to further explore literature and writing.

Regarding mother tongue, an IB coordinator noted that one difficulty the school has with the implementation of their language policy is preventing teachers from assuming that language policy is synonymous with French. Given their geographical and political setting, French clearly occupies a dominant space within the school, however there is still room for and support for the development of other languages. Moving forward, some

members of the school hope to stress the point that expanding the role of mother tongue in the school is not mutually exclusive with promoting French. Mother tongue is brought into the learning environment at the discretion of the teacher. One teacher interviewed spoke about how she makes a concerted effort to acknowledge students' mother tongue in the classroom. In this teacher's classroom, she wove in opportunities throughout her class which encouraged students to share their mother tongue in writing and speaking. This class had approximately 14 nationalities among the 23 students, including Chinese, Bengali, Russian, Vietnamese, Korean, Romanian, German, and Filipino. There was written work on display in the classroom, and since students were encouraged to incorporate their home languages into their projects, the linguistic landscape is reflective of the student's multilingual identities.

In another class, students were working on a writing project where they write their personal and their family's life histories, including stories of migration. Considering the diversity within the school, this project lends itself naturally to the school's dual goals of building high levels of French proficiency while also showing respect for students' heritage. While all writing was conducted in French, they were encouraged to bring in additional languages to supplement their work.

Those stakeholders interviewed expressed concerns regarding the omnipresence of English, which poses a challenge for the teachers in promoting French as the language of instruction. Due to the frequency of exposure to English in their social lives and through pop culture, they noted a certain pull that students feel toward English. To some extent the predominance of English through culture and in their national context makes teachers even more resolute to cultivate a francophone environment within the walls of the school.

The Use of Language and Learning in IB programmes (IBO, 2011) and Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy (IBO, 2012) in Language Policy Development and Implementation

These IB documents were used to construct the language policy. There was little familiarity with the documents among teachers and were instead utilized by administrators and IB coordinators in the language policy development process. According to the IB coordinator, these documents have proven to be helpful and very detailed. Additional elements that would have assisted them in their language policy development process include what should be in a school language policy, the general length of a language policy, and more examples of other schools' language policies. In developing their own language policy, it has been helpful for them to review any other schools' language policies available in order to gain some of these answers. Beyond these two documents, the IB coordinator regularly refers to other IB documents available online for guidance.

Findings and Discussion

Regardless of the students' countries of origin, there was a sentiment among interviewees that the students needed to learn French in order to be able to learn their Québécois culture. Therefore, while there may be a strong push for linguistic assimilation, it functions as the one hurdle necessary to jump before becoming part of French Canadian culture. One teacher expressed the concern that even children in French Canadian families do not necessarily identify with their cultural background, and therefore the school needs to take on the responsibility of teaching this culture before it is lost. It is clear that the teachers and staff are very proud of their school's diversity, the success of their students, and their dedication to the French language. Even though all

teachers might not be familiar with the school's actual language policy document, there is an inherent preoccupation with language policy, language minority status, and language maintenance in the region and among teachers and staff that is reflective of the written language policy. The school follows some of the suggestions as laid out by the IB in the *Language and Learning* document and has reported using the IB documents to frame their language policy development and implementation. The school could be more closely aligned with the IB approach to language policy by engaging more teachers, students, and members of the school community in the process of evaluating and revising the language policy. Additionally, there is room for improvement in conducting professional development with staff around the language policy. Since the local context of Québécois culture heavily influences the school's implicit language policy of promoting French in the classroom, it may not seem like an immediate priority at ÉCV to conduct professional development around the language policy or engage a wider group of people in the development of the document.

References

École du Centre Ville Language Policy, April, 2014.

French Teacher of École du Centre Ville. Personal communication, April 15 2014.

IB Coordinator of École du Centre Ville. Personal communication, April 15 2014.

Spanish Teacher of École du Centre Ville. Personal communication, April 16 2014.

IB Case Study 3: Colegio Armadillo, Mexico

Colegio Armadillo is a private school in a city in Mexico, serving students from preschool through 12th grade. As an IB World School, Colegio Armadillo has an IB Primary Years Program (PYP), an IB Middle Years Program (MYP), and an IB Diploma Program (DP). The school became an IB school in 2007 with the implementation of the PYP, followed by the addition of the DP in 2008, and the MYP in 2012.

Colegio Armadillo was founded in 1993 by a group of parents from the Jewish Maguen David Community in Mexico who wanted their children to study in a school that taught in Spanish and English and that also had Hebrew and Jewish religion and tradition as a part of the curriculum. At the time of its founding, Colegio Armadillo was the only school in the city to offer this trilingual curriculum; there were other secular schools with a similar bilingual Spanish/English curriculum or other Jewish schools that did not have such an emphasis on English. The emphasis on English as the preferred second language (L2) in the curriculum was a basic tenet of the school at its founding, according the English Principal of Colegio Armadillo. Although the school is private and designed its own model of trilingual education, it also complies with the requirements of the *Secretaría de Educación Pública (SEP)* [Secretary of Public Education], the federal department of education in Mexico.

The Maguen David Community has been in Mexico for some 75 years and descends from Jewish ancestors in Aleppo, Syria (¿Quiénes Somos? [Who Are We?], n.d.). The school's mission is "to provide the Jewish-Mexican community with a personalized, trilingual international education of excellence, enhanced by technology, in accordance with Jewish identity and values in partnership with parents" (Colegio Armadillo Language Policy, 2013). Along similar lines of achieving excellence and

Jewish tradition, the school’s vision is “to be the Jewish institution at the forefront of national and international education, achieving the highest standards of academic excellence, forming ethical leaders capable of responding to the challenges of an ever-changing world” (Colegio Armadillo Language Policy, 2013).

A site visit was conducted at Colegio Armadillo over two days during which three staff members were interviewed and a total of four classes were observed.

Table 7. Interviews at Colegio Armadillo

Interviewee	Date	Length	Type of Interview	Language of Interview	L1 of Interviewee	Other Ls of Interviewee
English principal	May 30, 2014	67 minutes	On-site, Colegio Armadillo	English	English	Spanish, Hebrew
English teacher	May 30, 2014	28 minutes	On-site, Colegio Armadillo	English	English, Spanish	Portuguese, Danish, French
Hebrew Teacher	May 30, 2014	26 minutes	On-site, Colegio Armadillo	Spanish	Spanish	Hebrew, Yiddish, English

Table 8. Observations at Colegio Armadillo

Class Subject	Grade Level	IB Program
English	9	MYP
English	9	MYP
Hebrew	4	PYP
Hebrew	3	PYP

The School Context and the Language Profile

According to the school’s language policy document and the staff of Colegio Armadillo who were interviewed for this study, 99% of the student population of the school speaks Spanish as a first language. In terms of the IB curriculum, Spanish is Language A of the school. English and Hebrew are present as what the school terms

“additive languages,” not intended to take away from the mother tongue, according to the school’s language policy document. The school does not conceive English or Hebrew as totally “foreign” languages to their students because of familiarity with these languages. English is familiar to the students through their proximity to the United States and their exposure to American culture through movies and television. It was also noted that many students often have opportunities to travel to the United States. One teacher reported that there were even a few students who were born in the United States or lived there for their first few years. English is Language B for the purposes of IB curriculum.

The students’ relationship with Hebrew was described by the staff as well as the language policy document as being about culture and identity. Students are often familiar with Hebrew through the celebration of Jewish holidays and tradition and through prayer. One teacher explained that there are also a few parents who are immigrants to Mexico, and they speak Hebrew as a first language, and these families also usually have grandparents that speak Hebrew. Additionally, the same teacher noted, many of the students have Israeli grandparents.

According to the English principal of the school, parents who send their children to Colegio Armadillo may not consider Hebrew a priority, but they understand if they put their children into this particular Jewish private school that Hebrew is part of the curriculum. The English principal also reported that 20 years after its founding, Colegio Armadillo still continues to have the most emphasis on English of all private Jewish schools in the area, so the parents who are most interested in English send their children there.

The school feels that the national policies of the SEP in terms of language teaching lay down only basic requirements so the school is able to implement an enriched curriculum for the teaching and learning of English and Hebrew. There are only limitations from the government on certain subjects that must be taught in Spanish, like Mexican history. The English principal also reported that the school meets the language requirements of the IBO, which requires that they teach at least two languages.

Language Policy

Colegio Armadillo's language policy document provides language objectives and framing for how the three languages will function in the school based on the founding goals of the school of creating a trilingual Spanish/English/Hebrew learning environment. Central to this document are the facts that Spanish is the dominant language for students at Colegio Armadillo, Hebrew is an important cultural language, and English acquisition will serve the students' future needs, as many of them go into careers of business and communications that require some knowledge of English.

Students can be enrolled at Colegio Armadillo at the age of one year and eight months, at which they would enter nursery classes that have a half an hour of English every day. At three years old in pre-kinder the students enter a total early English immersion program, which continues for three years through kinder II. In those three years the medium of instruction is English, with the exception of the introduction of some Hebrew through the teaching of words and phrases related to Jewish holidays and traditions. The school has an "extra" year in the preschool—"prefirst"—which is intended to provide students with additional time to reaffirm their early literacy and reading/writing skills, which in preschool are developed in English.

After the prefirst year begins the elementary program, which is delivered in equal parts of English and Spanish, with some Hebrew. In the first grade, students continue to develop their English skills and begin to read and write in Spanish as well. In the middle and high school programs, the language policy document notes that English continues to be of importance, though the number of subjects taught in English each year depends on the availability of English-speaking staff.

Meanwhile, more Jewish themes are introduced in the first grade in order to support the development of vocabulary in Hebrew. In second grade students also begin to read and write in Hebrew. The Hebrew teacher explained that the reading and writing of the Hebrew language is an important part of the culture and religion, especially since the Torah is written in Hebrew. The focus for Hebrew throughout the entire school curriculum is on acquiring the language for communicative purposes of culture and identity, as opposed to being acquired for academic purposes. The Hebrew teacher described the material that they use for teaching as a spiral, each time adding more words and more developed language. According to the same teacher, the vocabulary is mainly of everyday things: birthdays, holidays, the house, and restaurants, until 6th grade when students work with more grammar. As students progress through middle school and into high school they continue with some basic conversational Hebrew because at 15 years old they take a trip to Israel. The Hebrew teacher commented that while the students prepare for the trip with simple conversational Hebrew, much of the preparation takes place in Spanish as student and teachers discuss more complex topics of the culture of Israel is and what it means to them and the community. The same can be said for religious studies at the middle and high school levels—the medium of instruction is

Spanish. In the past the school tried to carry out some religion classes in Hebrew, but found that the proficiency level of the students was too varied to ensure that they would all have access to the content.

Beyond providing a guide for the use of the three languages throughout the curriculum, the language policy of Colegio Armadillo also includes the guiding language philosophies that the school recognizes as essential. These include recognizing that language, cognition, and learning are intimately related; that language is a basic element in human relationships; that language learning and development are an essential part of the school's educational program; that students will learn about and through the languages; that language needs to be taught in a variety of ways; that language reflects cultural beliefs and practices and creates identity; that language is a connecting link that foments across curriculum, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary learning; that all teachers are language teachers; and that language can be considered a living entity. (Colegio Armadillo Language Policy, 2013). It is noted throughout this section that many of these principles are aligned with the IB framework and are reflected in IB documents like the new MYP Programme Model (2014).

A thoughtful discussion of the varying definitions of bilingualism and multilingualism is also included in the language policy. While it does not promote one definition over another, it does define how the acquiring, learning, and teaching of Spanish, English, and Hebrew should be understood in their specific context. Of particular note is the fact that in the specific context of the school the English program is considered to be somewhere between English as a Second Language and English as a Foreign Language. And while English is acquired for communicative purposes through

the use of materials designed for native English speakers, balanced bilingualism between Spanish and English is rarely achieved by the students at Colegio Armadillo because Spanish continues to be the dominant language in the students' lives. Hebrew is considered as an additional language, and in its essence is a language of identity for the school community.

The language policy also includes sections discussing admissions (how the languages of newly arrived students are assessed and supported), professional development (the recent reorganization of PD in the school, the introduction of a new course on teaching English in early immersion for the preschool teachers, the use of peer coaching in elementary), and assessment (what types of assessments are carried out at which grade levels).

Finally, an “areas of opportunity” concludes the language policy. The topics identified as areas of opportunity are 1) language focus: a deeper understanding in the school community of connections between language study, approaches to learning and theory of knowledge; 2) communication: the lack of a clear and defined policy for when/where to use English, Spanish, and Hebrew; 3) staff: the difficulty of finding qualified English and Hebrew teachers, the necessity for the staff to receive “bilingual (English/Spanish/Hebrew)” preparation, the need for the promotion of English among the administrative staff by conducting meetings in English, the need for teachers of English to always stay in English; 4) curriculum: insisting on a richer, more correct mastery of Spanish, motivate parents to achieve a greater appreciation for Hebrew so that the Hebrew department can successfully reach its goal of a basic communicative level of Hebrew; introducing the new 2014 MYP; and finding a balance between

concepts/content and form/language. The English principal elaborated a little bit on the second area of opportunity (communication). She discussed how the language environment in school requires more attention and that trying to balance what is communicated in what languages (the signs and bulletin boards in the hallways, the communication with parents, etc.) is a political issue. She characterized the school as “schizophrenic” with relation to languages—she felt that there is no clear delineation about what to do in which languages, partially because in the past there was the fear that parents and grandparents would not understand if they did too much in English (English Principal of Colegio Armadillo, personal communication, May 30, 2014). Though she noted that they are starting to move toward more English for communication with parents as English becomes more popular with adults.

An appendix to the language policy is a section called the “Armadillo English Policy.” It outlines more specifically how English teachers are to implement the language policy in the school. It states that English teachers and teachers of other subjects “MUST use English in classrooms at all times and require that all students participate in class activities, be they oral or written in natural, in English” (Colegio Armadillo Language Policy, 2013). It also lays out strategies that teachers of other subjects in English should take into account regarding vocabulary, continuous assessment, and the challenge of academic language in the L2. The appendix also calls for any texts published by students in English to be carefully edited by students with the support of teachers and using methods such as peer correction and digital spell check.

Language Policy Development

According to the English principal, when she came into her current role in 2009-10, the school had no language policy. Based on the knowledge that the IB required its schools to have a language policy, she started out by writing her own document. After the initial writing, she attended an IB course for language policy writing in Mexico and then re-wrote the policy with the help of the other principals of the school and language coordinators and language teachers from the different sections of the school. A formal committee was not established, instead the English principal worked with the staff either one-on-one or in groups to brainstorm and elicit input. The school board, parents, and students were not involved in the initial creation process, though it was noted that because of its history, the desires of the parents have always been central to language teaching at Colegio Armadillo.

All three staff members interviewed for the study commented that the language policy is always being updated and changed. The English teacher and Hebrew teacher both described being asked by the English principal for their thoughts on language in the school and what is working well and what are areas for improvement, as well as what can be done to change the things that are not working well. The Hebrew teacher mentioned that they anticipate changes to be made to the Hebrew curriculum and, as a result, to the language policy because a new Hebrew principal has recently been hired. The English teacher also noted that when making updates they work with the parents and the parent-teacher association to know what the parents want to get out of the situation, “which is very important because they created the school” (English teacher of Colegio Armadillo, personal communication, May 30, 2014).

When asked what elements and factors were taken into consideration in the development of the language policy, the English teacher responded that the English principal considered what the teachers as well as the parents thought, and also what she [the English principal] saw in class in terms of language use. The Hebrew teacher mentioned that IB documents and research are taken into account when the English principal writes it. The English principal discussed the school's mission, vision, philosophy, and educational model as important factors.

The things that were noted as challenges to the development of the policy include the English principal finding the time to do it, among her other responsibilities. The English principal herself commented on this challenge. She described the need for it to be a living document and the difficulty in keeping it up-to-date because that requires her to revise it and go to the different principals, coordinators, and teachers to see what might be changed. She also noted that until she took the IB course for language policy development, she was not sure what the expectations were from the IB for what the document should encompass.

The staff sees the language policy as well connected to other initiatives in the school and to the frameworks of the IB programs. The English teacher believes that "everything" they do is all connected together (English teacher of Colegio Armadillo, personal communication, May 30, 2014). This includes the curriculum, the language policy, time in the classroom with students, and extracurricular events for students to display their language skills. The English principal discussed the connection the language policy has with IB principles, for example the close relationship between language and Theory of Knowledge (TOK) in the DP. She has tried to address the fact that the English

DP curriculum needs to integrate TOK and that English teachers in the DP have to be aware of the relationship between content and academic language development. This is indeed addressed in the language policy, in the discussion of language focus as an area of opportunity for the school to improve.

Colegio Armadillo has tried various strategies to promote the language policy and maintain it over time. One recent strategy is hiring foreign teachers so that the school has more capacity to teach content subjects in English. The English principal noted that this has expanded the classes that are taught in English, as well as delivered some unanticipated consequences. One of the unexpected results of the foreign hires policy has been that the school realized that most of its documents for staff were written in Spanish so everything had to be translated into English. A second interesting consequence was that the non-English-speaking staff started learning more English by it being more present in the school environment. In conjunction with the increased presence of English in the school, the English principal has also offered free English classes to anyone on the staff for the past four years. Additionally, as the staff is mixed between Jewish and non-Jewish, classes for Hebrew and Judaic history and tradition for staff members have also been offered for free.

In terms of evaluating the language policy, the two teachers interviewed commented that they can always give input to the English principal if they feel that something in the language policy should be modified. The English principal elaborated beyond this one internal source of evaluation to discuss external evaluations that carry a lot of weight in evaluating the success of the language policy. Mostly, these assessments are the measures of how students perform on the IB Language B exam (English exam).

There are also various types of assessments of English proficiency throughout the grades, and Colegio Armadillo has experimented with many different types of language assessments to try to find ones that most appropriately fit their context.

Changes in broader school policies have also prompted re-evaluation of the language policy. For example, a few years ago the school worked with a university as an external evaluator to help them redefine the school's mission and vision. According to one of the teachers, the previous mission of the school was basically "bring us your kids and we'll do everything," but that has been adapted to be more in touch with where the school is today and what they really want, which has implications for the language policy because language plays an important part in the school's objectives (English teacher of Colegio Armadillo, personal communication, May 30, 2014).

Language Policy Implementation

At the beginning of the school year, the English principal presents the language policy to the teachers of the different sections. This is done every year, regardless of whether the teachers are new or returning, because there have often been modifications to the document. According to the English principal, the parents are explicitly told at the beginning of the year that there is a language policy and that the staff considers language very important. The involvement of the school's board in implementing the language policy is dependent on who is part of the board in any given year. The English principal explained that when there are very involved members, she will meet with them and discuss English and the language policy with them and what to do to resolve some of the language issues at the school. She said that most of the students are unaware that there is

a written policy, but that they are subconsciously familiar with it because they live it and it frames what they do.

When asked for what challenges the school, administrators, or teachers face in implementing the policy, all three of the staff members interviewed for the study responded that making people more aware of the policy and having everyone in the school putting it into practice is a major challenge for them. The English teacher elaborated that the teachers who teach only in Spanish do not feel the need to do anything related to the language policy or worry about it at all. It was recognized that a starting point for this issue is the fact that the language policy is written in English. Although the English principal translates the document for staff meetings so that it is accessible to all, one teacher felt that it still was not an important or successful document to non-English speaking staff. From her point of view, the language policy implementation entails that they all recognize that their students' L1 and dominant language is Spanish, and that they involve the mother tongue as well as English and Hebrew, but she did not think that this is understood by many staff who are not English or Hebrew teachers.

The English and Hebrew teachers both discussed the role of the parents in the implementation of the language policy. From the point of view of the English teacher, the parents' support and desire for their children to learn English makes it easier to implement the language policy in regards to English. Though she struggles with the students' resistance to using English in the classroom and what she perceives as their failure to understand the importance of English for their lives, she knows that the parents regard it as important and it was one of the reasons why the school was created. On the contrary, the Hebrew teacher expressed the fact that many parents are not especially

concerned with their children learning Hebrew beyond the purposes of prayer and temple. From her perspective, although the incorporation of Hebrew was one of the founding tenets of the school, she feels that for the parents Hebrew is in “third place” out of the three languages used in the school (Hebrew teacher of Colegio Armadillo, personal communication, May 30, 2014). At some point she feels that this creates a barrier for what they can really achieve in the teaching of Hebrew because the parents’ lack of support for the language is transmitted to students. She noted that one way the school is addressing this is to see how they can better adapt the Hebrew curriculum into the IB program. They are trying to see how Hebrew and IB can be more related, because she initially felt after taking her IB course that she really enjoyed the topics and discussions but was not sure how it could be applied to her subject area.

Some elements that were described as supports for the implementation of the language policy included having the support of principals and administration, having teachers with a high level of the target language, professional development for teachers and staff, and early intervention for academic support for students. The English principal explained that they have psycho-pedagogical and psycho-educational departments that work together with teachers to evaluate and suggest strategies for students with language development needs. In the past the school had an academic support program in place, but this is now replaced by differentiated classes to help students with different levels of development both in language and cognitive skills.

Classroom Implementation

Since Colegio Armadillo’s language policy is closely linked to IB frameworks and principles, at the beginning of the year, the English teacher shares her MYP guides

with her students to discuss their language phases and expectations for the year. The English teacher described her implementation of the language policy as using English as the medium of instruction in her classroom and trying to get the students to speak in English as well. The classroom observations supported this implementation as the teacher's medium of instruction for both class periods was entirely English. For her the biggest challenge in implementing the language policy is keeping the students in English. She feels like she encounters a resistance in the students' desire to use English, not a lack of ability: "At the end of the day, I know that my kids can speak it, I know my kids can elaborate their ideas in it, they just don't want to" (English teacher of Colegio Armadillo, personal communication, May 30, 2014). She believes that their resistance is due to a failure to grasp why it is important for them to do so. Indeed, during one of the classroom observations one of the students asked, in Spanish, "why does it matter if we speak Spanish?" One approach she uses to try to increase the use of English in the classroom is to have one discussion class each week in which the students must participate in English in order to get a grade.

A second approach to try to get the students to use English in the classroom was noticed during the classroom observations. When the students address or answer the English teacher in Spanish, she replies with "what?" often repeating it more than once until the students switches from speaking in Spanish to speaking in English. This strategy was deployed multiple times during both class periods that were observed.

The Hebrew teacher felt that the Hebrew department is currently implementing the language policy as written. According to her, the teachers of the department are teaching Hebrew vocabulary, reading, and writing and dealing a lot with the language

that has to do with identity. In terms of managing the two languages in the primary classroom, the Hebrew teacher explained that she uses Hebrew for what she knows the students already have previous knowledge of and for vocabulary she would like for the students to be learning. She uses Spanish for what she thinks the students will not understand. The goal in the end, according to her, is to be able to give everything in Hebrew, so she works towards a gradual implementation of that objective.

The classroom observations support the presence of both Hebrew and Spanish in the Hebrew classes. Both classes that were observed began with greetings in Hebrew. In the 2nd grade classroom Spanish was used to support the instructions for students to pick up materials for their activity, while in the 3rd grade classroom Spanish was not used in this same specific context (both classes were structured similarly, with small groups of students working together on various Hebrew activities). The students in both classes interacted with each other in Spanish and almost always addressed the teacher in Spanish as well. The teacher's responses to students varied between Spanish and Hebrew;; sometimes she responded entirely in Hebrew, other times she introduced some Spanish into her response, or switched from Hebrew to Spanish while she was interacting with the students. The teacher sometimes also asked students questions in Spanish, and then guided the students' answers by providing some of the Hebrew, or a model of the pronunciation, for example.

Similarly to what the English teacher reported, the Hebrew teacher said she often deals with a lack of motivation or resistance to doing activities in Hebrew in the classroom. She said that students sometimes question why it is necessary to do something in Hebrew when everyone in Israel would understand them in English. For this reason

she sees part of her role as a Hebrew teacher as providing them with a foundation of the importance of Hebrew for them in their cultural context.

The Use of *Language and Learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012) in Language Policy Development and Implementation

While all the three staff interviewed described familiarity with various IB documents, the *Language and Learning in IB programmes* and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* specifically were not two of the documents that they knew or had used in the creation or implementation of the language policy. The language policy cites 11 different IB documents in its references section, and one of them is the *Guidelines for Developing a School Language Policy* (IBO online publication), so perhaps some version of the *Guidelines* document was consulted even if it was not immediately recognized in the interviews. *Language and Learning in IB programmes* is not one of the documents cited in the list of 11. The English principal noted that she is more familiar with the *From principles into practice* guides and that they have used those guides for each section; these guides are indeed cited in the references section of the language policy.

The teachers noted that it is helpful that everyone at the school has access to the IB documents, so they can always refer back to any IB document they need. The English principal felt that the guides are helpful in that they give you orientation to the importance of learning language; they emphasize the basic idea that you learn about, in, and through language; and they make one more aware of how language is involved in thinking in all subjects. The idea that all teachers are teachers of language has formed the basic tenet of their approach to the way they look at language. She also felt that the

guides are helpful for understanding the phases of language development and conveying the idea that language acquisition is related to a process and not to a grade or age.

In terms of elements in the IB documents, that the Colegio Armadillo staff was familiar with, that could be further developed, the English teacher and English principal both noted that sometimes IB documents can be too general, making them hard to interpret for their specific context. The English teacher elaborated that sometimes it seems like the IB documents are more geared towards international school situations, but they are more of a bilingual school because they do not have international students who come in and out year after year.

Findings and Discussion

The interviews and observations at Colegio Armadillo indicate that the school has thoughtfully discussed and planned a language policy to suit the needs of their specific linguistic context. They continue to evaluate the success of their language policy and seek strategies to improve the teaching and learning of languages in their school.

Regarding the first research question (How are *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012) used in the development and implementation of the language policy?) the staff at Colegio Armadillo offered little familiarity with these two particular documents, but noted that there are other IB documents with which they are more familiar and that have been helpful in the development of the language policy and framing how language is taught and learned in the school.

The second research question sought to answer what the key activities are in the course of LP development and implementation. The language policy of Colegio

Armadillo is informed by the research and principles of the IB program. Studies, scholars, and IB documents are referenced throughout the language policy; however, it is also evident that the school has not exactly followed the suggestions for developing a school language policy as laid out in the *Language and Learning* document. This is not surprising given the fact that in the interview, the English principal discussed which documents she is familiar with and uses, and admitted that she should be more familiar with *Language and Learning*. Instead of developing a steering committee, the English principal of Colegio Armadillo has taken the lead in developing and revising the language policy and has sought input from administrators and language teachers and used the founding language principles of the school as a guide. Other people that could be involved in this process, based on the recommendations of IB, are librarians, parents, students, or other members of the community. Colegio Armadillo did follow the suggested second step to write a school language philosophy. The third step in *Language and Learning* includes reviewing the current language situations and practices and compiling a school language profile. Colegio Armadillo's language policy includes a comprehensive language profile of the school community and includes many of the points suggested by the IB. The only piece that could be enhanced in this step is documenting what the data gathering exercises were in the creating the language profile. The fourth step of addressing further concerns is adequately covered in Colegio Armadillo's language policy because there is an extensive section on areas of opportunity in which the issues that need further attention are discussed in great detail.

As suggested in the first step of making the language policy a working document, Colegio Armadillo has established a review process that is primarily driven by one person so it may not be as consistent a process as if it were the responsibility of a broader

committee. The language policy is linked to other school documents for policies, which is the second recommended step in this part of the process. Finally, for the third step of the process, the school has taken deliberate steps to communicate the language policy to staff and parents, but even so they noted that awareness of the language policy across the school is still a challenge for them. The English principal presents the language policy to both staff and parents at the beginning of the school year to make sure that the school community is aware of the school's approaches to its three languages. The language policy is used in professional development with staff, and opportunities are provided to staff to study both English and Judaic religion and traditions for free. In order to address the challenge of increased awareness in the language policy, Colegio Armadillo could investigate other avenues of distribution and consider how they might better inform the school community of the policy process and how the community might be more involved.

The final research question asked how the development and implementation of a language policy differs in various settings. Colegio Armadillo is a private school and was founded for express linguistic and cultural purposes. It was designed to meet the needs of a specific community in Mexico, and this fact is represented in the language policy, as well as in the development and implementation of the document in the school. The school's teaching of languages complies with the national SEP requirements, and because of the minimal nature of those policies, Colegio Armadillo feels free to go further in the teaching of their additional languages and offer a tailored trilingual curriculum to the school community.

References

Colegio Armadillo Language Policy, November 2013.

English teacher of Colegio Armadillo. Personal communication, May 30, 2014.

Hebrew teacher of Colegio Armadillo. Personal communication, May 30, 2014.

English Principal of Colegio Armadillo. Personal communication, May 30, 2014.

¿Quiénes Somos? [Who Are We?] Retrieved from
<http://www.maguendavid.com/index.php>

IB Case Study 4: Evergreen High School

Evergreen High School is a secondary public school located in the United States of America. It serves a diverse population of approximately 2,200 students in grades 9 through 12. Evergreen High School has been recognized for academic excellence and was awarded the Blue Ribbon in Education Award by the United States Department of Education. The mission of Evergreen is to prepare students to live in and contribute to a changing world and engage in active, life-long learning by providing a balanced, varied school curriculum designed to meet the academic, cultural and social needs of individuals from the diverse backgrounds of their community. Evergreen High School envisions itself to be a world-class model of a professional learning community committed to high expectations and high achievement for all students through effective, respectful collaboration with all stakeholders.

Evergreen is home to the IB Magnet program, which was established in 1987. Evergreen High School houses the MYP program with a partner middle school and DP program. Evergreen's IB program quotes and embraces the mission of the International Baccalaureate, which aims to develop inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect.

A site visit was conducted at Evergreen high School over two days during which four staff members were interviewed and a total of four classes were observed. The interviews were conducted with one DP IB coordinator, one MYP IB coordinator, and two teachers, one English teacher and one chemistry teacher. Two classes of each teacher were observed on different dates. Detailed information about the interviews and observations is illustrated in Table 9 and 10.

Table 9. Interviews at Evergreen High School

Interviewee	Date	Length	Type of Interview	Language of Interview	L1 of Interviewee	Other Ls of Interviewee
IB coordinator	May 12, 2014	46 minutes	On-site, Evergreen High School	English	English	Unknown
MYP coordinator	May 15, 2014	54 minutes	On-site, Evergreen High School	English	English	Unknown
English Teacher	May 15, 2014	17 minutes	On-site, Evergreen High School	English	English	Russian
Chemistry Teacher	May 12, 2014	14 minutes	On-site, Evergreen High School	English	English	N/A

Table 10. Observations at Evergreen High School

Class Subject	Grade Level	IB Program
English	10	MYP
English	10	MYP
Chemistry	10	MYP
Chemistry	10	MYP

The School Context and Language Profile

Evergreen High School is located in a densely populated city area, where the population is diverse and international. The MYP coordinator mentioned that there was a big cohort of IMF (International Monetary Fund) families who live locally. Students at Evergreen represent over 60 countries and speak 44 different languages. In the 2013-2014 school year, 6.3% students were enrolled as English Learners (ELs) and had anywhere from one to three classes a day of EL support. Languages spoken by students at home include Spanish, Thai, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Swahili. All interviewees reported that students at Evergreen primarily speak English, or Spanish. English is the primary language used for instruction and informational

documents. In addition, Spanish translation is added on informational documents, including flyers and announcements.

Out of a total of 2,200 students, about 500 students are attending the IB magnet program, with a high percentage of Asian Americans. In the classes observed, the project staff did witness a high percentage of Asian Americans, about 30% in the Chemistry class and over 25% in the English class. 90% of students in Grades 9 and 10 and 100% of DP students are taking world language classes, which are Spanish, French, and Chinese.

Language policy

Evergreen's language policy provides the school language philosophy, school language profile, and language practices. The version provided to the project staff was revised in December 2011 and it will be reviewed and revised in 2015. The language philosophy stated in the language policy includes: all teachers are language teachers; language is a primary means of learning and communicating; language acquisition is to be promoted as a partnership between all members of our community, including parents, students, teachers and staff; mother tongue languages help form cultural and personal identity and should be respected; learning world languages is an integral part of becoming a global citizen.

To support development of additional languages, students have the option of enrolling in IB language B classes: Chinese, French, Spanish, and Spanish for Spanish Speakers. English learners are supported in their mainstream classes through collaboration with EL teachers, peer support, and differentiated instruction. At Evergreen, a variety of extra-curricular activities are offered to provide students the opportunity to develop sensitivity to their own and other cultural and linguistic heritages, including the French, Spanish, and Chinese Honor Societies and clubs for Chinese, Asian American, Francophone culture and Latin Dance.

The MYP and DP programs have their own language policies; however, the project staff were only able to obtain a full copy of the language policy from the MYP and an unfinished

rough draft from the DP. The major components in the two language policies are similar to each other; however, according to the MYP coordinator, the two policies will have different sections due to the different student needs in each program and different program reaccreditation requirements. The MYP coordinator commented that their current language policy barely meets the minimum expectations of IB.

Language Policy Development

None of the interviewees was involved in the development of the current version of the language policy back in 2011. The IB coordinator recalled that the previous coordinator brought together some teachers and discussed the issues related to languages, including what support the school needs to provide for ELs to facilitate their learning in classrooms and how to maintain students in world language classes. The ESOL teachers and world language department were included in the development process. However, this development process certainly did not elicit broader stakeholder input, nor was it widely published and promoted according to the MYP coordinator. As a result, the science teacher interviewed did not know that there was a language policy at Evergreen, nor did he know what a language policy was, despite teaching at Evergreen for 5 years.

Since Evergreen has over 25 years' history as a IB program, the primary question for all of their policies, including the language policy, is whether they are still appropriate with the changing demographics of students, and changing requirements from IB and the county where the school is located. As indicated in the interviews, two primary factors were taken into account when the language policy was revised. The first factor was to increase the number of students taking language classes. One challenge at Evergreen is that students tend to drop out of world language classes after the first year or two. Since it is not a required course by the county, the IB

program cannot require that students take them. However, it is a requirement for IB students if they want to obtain their IB diplomas, in which case they need to attend world language classes for 4 years. Bilingual diplomas are offered to students if they study a world language for 7 years and pass an assessment. The second factor is to promote accessibility to students to attend the DP program, especially for ELs. Since English is the language of instruction at Evergreen, providing support to facilitate ELs' learning in classes is an important issue to consider.

The language policy aligns with several initiatives at Evergreen. For instance, the school wants the students to continue to study world languages regardless of whether they are in the IB program.

Classroom Implementation

The interviews revealed that the language policy was never formally introduced to the school community at Evergreen, though informal means were adopted to introduce the language policy. For instance, the school administrators and staff did mention and refer to the language policy when they talked to parents, students, and teachers, and used the language most accessible to them.

The Chemistry teacher was not aware of the existence of such a language policy, which confirms the statement by the IB coordinator that when she thinks about language policy, she only thinks about language teachers rather than subject teachers. The Chemistry teacher did mention that he uses scaffolding strategies to make sure students understand the concepts and content in his class. For instance, he explains some vocabulary or jargons in the field of Chemistry or Physics, such as percentage error and percentage uncertainty. He always asks students to do a dry run with chemical experiments to make sure they know the steps.

When the English teacher started to work at Evergreen the previous year, the language policy was sent to him by email from the IB coordinator along with other IB policies. He admitted that the language policy is not a working document he refers to on daily basis. But he is aware of the existence of this document, which promotes the diversity of languages present in the student population, and presents some recommendations on how to give students opportunities to interact with content in their native languages. The MYP coordinator states that though the language policy was not formally introduced to the school community, the staff and teachers might know more about it than what they admitted they know. The efforts were not coordinated, but in practices, teachers understand that the school promotes world language learning and values the diversity of languages.

The interviewees discussed a few challenges Evergreen faces when it comes to the language policy implementation. As introduced above, Evergreen is a public school, which needs to adhere to county policies and regulations. With the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) initiative, an assessment called PARCC (Partnership for Assessment for College and Careers) will be implemented in 2015. With this assessment, it is unknown that how the students will be impacted and whether it supports the language development of students. Curriculum changes due to the CCSS will have a huge impact on who will be responsible for teaching languages.

Another challenge is that American schools, especially large public schools like Evergreen, are not used to asking teachers to develop policies. Teachers normally were told what the policy is and they have no power to change it. Therefore, it is a shift in thinking for Evergreen to involve the whole school community in the development and implementation of their language policy. The MYP coordinator stated that there would be huge benefits if the whole community could commit to it.

Classroom observations confirm that English is the language of instruction and

communication among teachers and students. No other languages were used during all of the four class periods. No encouragement to use other languages was observed either. All visual materials in the classrooms were in English as well. Both the science teacher and English teacher focused on content during their class period rather than promoting language development.

During the interview, the two teachers did mention some strategies they used to help scaffold the content and concepts, including explanations, dry runs, and realia to showcase the steps of an experiment. The English teacher sometimes chose literature from other languages and cultures and used bilingual texts to provide students who are proficient in that language with opportunities to develop their additional languages. During the interviews, both coordinators mentioned the importance of teaching students the command terms in English, which were included in the IB curriculum documents. These terms need to be emphasized in classes by both language and subject teachers in order for students to pass IB exams.

The Use of Language and learning in IB programmes (IBO, 2011) and Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy (IBO, 2012) in Language Policy Development and Implementation.

All of the four interviewees knew the two IB documents; however, their familiarity with them varies. The coordinators reviewed the documents and refer to them when they need to revise their language policy. They commented that the *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) document is helpful from pedagogical and philosophical standpoints. The *Guidelines for school self-reflection* document is more exhaustive, practical, and straightforward. They are certain that they will refer to these documents in 2015 when they need to revise the language policy. IB created the two documents after Evergreen first started its IB program and already had a language policy. Thus, it is recommended that these documents be included in the coordinator trainings so that they can discuss and reflect on them for policy revisions.

The IB documents have not been used in any professional development workshops at Evergreen. The Chemistry teacher commented that the documents look familiar from the IB website; however, he has not read them because the documents are about language and language learning. The Chemistry teacher focuses more on his subject and content area rather than on languages. He also mentioned that English is used primarily for assessment, so he does not need to worry about the use of other languages most of the time. On one occasion, one of his students was assessed in Spanish. The assessment is also available in French. The English teacher has seen the two documents, but did admit that he did not use them often.

Findings and Discussion

Evergreen has over 25 years of experience with IB programs, and it was clear that the old policy documents were being revisited and revised to meet the new IB accreditation requirements. Four policies need to be revised: the special education needs policy, the academic honesty policy, the assessment policy, and the language policy. The language policy is the last to be revised, and the justification is that since language policy impacts all of the students, it takes more time to revise.

When the MYP language policy was revised in 2011, the previous IB coordinator worked with some language teachers to develop it, though did not introduce it to the whole school community upon completion. Therefore, the chemistry teacher was not aware of it. The English teacher only knew about it because the IB coordinator believes that the language policy is more closely related to language teachers than content area teachers. This practice is in conflict with the statement in the language policy that all teachers should be language teachers. Evergreen is a public secondary school in a large public school district in the United States. While the coordinators try to comply with all of the requirements of IB policies, they also need to adhere to the country requirements, such as following the CCSS. Therefore, it does take extra efforts to balance the curriculum and meet multiple external requirements.

The two IBO documents were helpful to the coordinators in the sense that they providing pedagogical and philosophical frameworks, though the teachers do not see them as working documents to refer to on daily basis. The Chemistry teacher especially does not refer to the documents, as he believes that they are not related to his content area. In summary, Evergreen High School has a substantial history as an IB program. While it aims to promote the diversity of languages and value language development among students, it does face challenges as a public school. For instance, as a public school, Evergreen is required to adhere to all of the regulations the county imposes, including the recent implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). With this new set of standards, it is unknown how students' academic achievement and language development will be impacted.

References

Evergreen High School Language Policy, December 2011.

Chemistry Teacher of Evergreen High School. Personal communication, May 12, 2014.

English Teacher of Evergreen High School. Personal communication, May 15, 2014.

IB Coordinator of Evergreen High School. Personal communication, May 12, 2014.

MYP Coordinator of Evergreen High School. Personal communication, May 15, 2014.

IB Case Study 5: Happy Achievement International School

Happy Achievement International School (HAIS) was founded in 2005 and is a not-for-profit, independent, co-educational day school offering an international curriculum from Pre-K through Grade 12. As an IB World School, HAIS is authorized to teach all three IB programs (PYP, MYP, and DP) and is accredited by the Council of International Schools (CIS) and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

The mission of HAIS is “to educate and empower students to be compassionate and inspired people, who act for the good of all and for the sustainable development of the world.” This has given rise to the school motto: “Empowering and inspiring through challenge and compassion.” Happy Achievement focuses on students’ academic excellence and confidence building, while nurturing in the students a strong sense of social and environmental responsibility. HAIS celebrates the fact that each student is different, as a person and as a learner, and it aims to offer a personalized education specifically designed to stimulate the intellectual curiosity of each child.

HAIS is one of the four off-site case studies. Three telephone/Skype interviews were conducted in order to study the development and implementation of the language policy at HAIS: One with the Head of Chinese, secondary school; one with the literacy coordinator; and a third with the Deputy Head of School/Elementary Principal/IB coordinator as shown in Table X.

Table 11. Interviews at Happy Achievement International School

Interviewee	Date	Length	Type of Interview	Language of Interview	L1 of Interviewee	Other Ls of Interviewee
Chinese Teacher/Head of Chinese	April 23, 2014	65 minutes	Telephone	English	Chinese	English
Literacy Coordinator	April 30, 2014	30 minutes	Skype	English	English	Not known

Deputy Head of School/Elementary Principal	April 22, 2014	27 minutes	Skype	English	English	Not known
--	----------------	------------	-------	---------	---------	-----------

The School Context and Language Profile

HAIS was located in a large metropolitan city in China, where Mandarin Chinese is an official language and is widely spoken by the public, together with a number of Chinese dialects. Two interviewers responded that since HAIS is an independent school, it does not need to adhere to any curriculum requirements or local policies in China.

Since its establishment in 2005, HAIS has grown rapidly from a small elementary school to a comprehensive international school. During the 2013-2014 school year, the approximately 790 students are from about 40 different nationalities. About 50-60 students speak Mandarin Chinese at home and the rest of the student population speaks various languages, including English, German, Italian, and Portuguese. The Chinese teacher used a different categorization strategy to describe the student population at HAIS: 25% of the students are Chinese passport holders and 75% are foreign passport holders, which includes families of Chinese heritage. The largely expatriate faculty is mainly from the United States of America, Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom as well as from a number of other countries in Europe and Asia.

Language Policy

HAIS's language policy is a 3-page document, dated April 2013. The language policy states that English is the medium of instruction and the primary language of communication in HAIS. In the elementary school (Pre-K-Grade 5) English is taught in all curriculum areas in mixed-proficiency classes as part of the PYP. In the Secondary School (Grades 6-12) English is taught in Language A and Language B classes through the MYP and DP programs. In order to facilitate clarity of communication and support all members of the HAIS community in receiving

important information, HAIS seeks to establish resources to translate information sent home in the host country language, Mandarin Chinese, whenever possible. Outside the classroom, students will speak the common language in group social situations. All students from Pre-K-Grade 12 have opportunities to learn Mandarin Chinese at a variety of proficiency levels.

In accordance with their language philosophy, HAIS acknowledges the importance of maintaining and developing language and literacy skills in the mother tongue. Therefore, the school educates parents in ways to maintain their children's mother tongue and facilitate a mother tongue language program to be taught by external providers outside the school day. Two foreign languages are offered to MYP and DP students: Spanish B is offered to students in grade 8 and above for non-native speakers, and Korean is offered to students in grade 9 and above. Korean is only offered as Korean A for native speakers. Four 50-minute lessons per lessons per week are offered.

In addition to the general language policy document, HAIS started to develop a language movement policy document starting in September, 2013. This document is still under revision, and the purpose of this document is to provide detailed guidelines and procedures on how to place students in different language classes (English, Chinese, Spanish, and Korean), and address other related language issues.

Language Policy Development

The current language policy was revised in 2010 and in 2013, respectively. No interviewee was involved in the original development of the language policy, so no information was obtained regarding that process. To revise the language policy, the head of school chaired a committee, which was composed of 15 to 16 representatives from different groups, including teachers, students, parents, board members, administrators, the Head of English, and the Head of

Chinese. The committee discussed important factors and elements to be taken into consideration in the language policy. The first draft of this language policy was sent to the entire school community by the Head of School through email requesting feedback. The school community is composed of teachers, students, and a parent-teacher association. Then the committee discussed and addressed the comments and feedback. Once the language policy was finalized, it was shared with the whole school community through email, posted to the school's website, and included in the teacher and parent handbooks. According to the elementary principal, the language policy originally included a lot of details, however, most details were removed since the committee believe that language policy should focus more on language philosophy and guidelines rather than detailed procedures.

When asked what factors were taken into account in developing the language policy, the interviewees mentioned several. First is the students' best learning interest. As teachers, they want students to progress well. Therefore, students are encouraged to grasp English while maintaining and developing their mother tongues as English is the language of instruction for all subjects at HAIS. On the other hand, though the school wants students to learn English and become proficient in English for academic achievement, they urge and hope that their students can maintain and develop their mother tongues. This is especially important to those whose home language is neither English nor Chinese. The second factor is that the language policy needs to align with the school's vision and mission. The mission of HAIS is to challenge and empower students to be compassionate and inspired people, who act for the good of all and for the sustainable development of the world. Learning additional languages and cultures will help students expand their perspectives and understand other cultures. The third factor is that the language policy needs to reflect current practices in the school and also the practices that the

school hopes to implement. The language policy should not just be guidelines on paper; it should align with what is happening in the classrooms and school community. The fourth factor is language and instruction in the host country. Considering that Mandarin Chinese is the official language in China, classes in Chinese are offered as Language A, Language Ab initio, and Language B.

Some challenges in the process of developing the language policy were mentioned by the interviewees. One challenge the Chinese teacher posed is that during the development process, they should have involved more subject teachers. Most of the teachers involved in the process were language teachers, which lead to another challenge in the implementation process: most subject teachers or non-committee members are not aware of the language policy although they received emails about it. According to the Chinese teacher, about 90% of teachers might not have read the language policy at all and the literacy coordinator also doubts that teachers review the language policy. Another challenge is that with more and more intake of Chinese students, the school has been debating whether they want to continue to run as an English school or as a bilingual school. They struggle with how to balance the program model while also making sure to meet the students' needs. One challenge posed by the elementary principal is that during the development process, the committee received quite a bit of feedback. While it is great to include multiple perspectives, it is also difficult to integrate all of the feedback in the language policy. Another challenge mentioned by the literacy coordinator is the way EL support is offered for PYP and MYP students. In the PYP, students stay in the classrooms and instruction is differentiated based on their English proficiency levels; however, in the MYP, ELs are pulled out of the classes and provided group support according to their English proficiency. He sees this as a challenge because these two methods reflect different language philosophies and does not lead to a smooth transition for ELs moving from the PYP to the MYP.

The interviewees revealed that the language policy at HAIS definitely aligns with the school's initiatives. For instance, HAIS has a mother tongue week, which adheres to the language policy to promote mother tongue development. However, the literacy coordinator pointed out that the language policy does not align very closely with the language curriculum they developed; while developing the language curriculum, the teachers did not once refer to the language policy.

Language Policy Implementation

As described in the above section, once the language policy was finalized, the principal sent the document to the whole school community through email, posted it on the school's website, and included it in the teacher and parent handbooks. In some teacher trainings, the administrators mentioned the language policy, but no special trainings were organized around the language policy. Though it seems that the language policy was widely spread among the school community, the Chinese teacher claims that the school community did not establish a shared understanding of the language policy. The subject teachers especially did not understand the language policy very well, not to mention its implementation. The Chinese teacher estimated that about 90% of the teachers did not read the policy at all.

The interviewees discussed some supports available from the school to help implement the language policy. The Chinese teacher said that their training opportunities are helpful, cultural events to train parents to celebrate multilingualism are often organized, language workshops are offered to parents and students, and extracurricular activities offer free tutoring lessons to parents and foreign teachers to better learn about the host country's language and culture. Another support stated by the elementary principal is that HAIS has a lot of teachers who have strong backgrounds in languages and are very supportive and passionate about

language development. They are great advocates and an asset for implementing the language policy.

One essential challenge in the language policy implementation is how to get their message across to the school community, especially the older teachers and content teachers. The school needs to find an effective way to train the whole school community about where they can access the language policy documents and how they should be used. In most cases, teachers' primary concern is their content area, not policies. The school language development committee spent a lot of time writing the language policy and language movement policy. However, the whole school community might not be fully aware of these efforts. The message was never conveyed clearly and effectively to the school community. In addition, due to regular teacher turnover, it is difficult to make sure that teachers are aware of policies and what is expected of them.

The Use of *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012) in Language Policy Development and Implementation

When asked whether they used or referred to the documents of *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO 2012), the Chinese teacher responded honestly that she used the first document to guide her teaching but used Language A and B guides more frequently in daily teaching. In the orientation usually held the first week of the school year, the first document was mostly used with new teachers to give them the framework of language teaching. In that document, the section on differences between L1 learners and L2 learners is an important concept to share and has helped the Chinese teacher to address some parents' concerns regarding their language choices. The

elementary principal does not know the documents very well but referred to them when developing the school's policies.

Findings and Discussion

To summarize, the data show that HAIS has assembled a committee to develop its language policy, shared the draft with the whole school community, and disseminated it to the community once it was finalized. The language policy was revised regularly to reflect the classroom practices and to address the changing school demographics. When developing the school language policy, the committee took several factors into consideration, including students' English and mother tongue development, classroom practices, and language and instruction in the host country. Some challenges HAIS faces include how to involve more subject teachers in the development process and how to get the message across to the community for better implementation.

HAIS is a continuum school, with the PYP, the MYP, and the DP programs. Therefore, it is a challenge to streamline the policies across the three IB programs. HAIS is located in a metropolitan city in China, where the primary language of communication in the local communities is Chinese. English is the medium of instruction at HAIS. Developing both English and Chinese among students is a focus of the school's language policy while maintaining students' mother tongue when it is not English or Chinese.

Generally speaking, the three interviewees had heard of the two IBO documents. They are more familiar with *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) than *Guidelines*

for school self-reflection on language policy (IBO, 2012). The first document was referred to when the language policy was developed and used in staff professional development workshops.

One suggestion proposed by the interviewees is that the Language A and B guides do not differentiate Chinese, Spanish, and French. Yet there are significant differences between Chinese and Romance languages. It is regulated in the MYP guides that Language B Phase 6 students should be able to move to Language A classes. But for Chinese learners, there are huge gaps between Language B Phase 6 classes and Language A classes. For example, in phase 6, students are required to write about 500 or 600 characters, but in Language A classes, students need to grasp 1,200 characters. They have found that it is almost impossible for Chinese learners to progress from Language B to Language A classes, and therefore is an issue worth investigating further. It needs to be noted that in the IBO MYP guide, it does state that moving from Language B in MYP to Language A in DP is a possible path rather than a guaranteed one.

References

Happy Achievement International School Language Policy, April 2013.

Deputy Head of School/Elementary Principi of Happy Achievement International School. Personal communication, April 22, 2014

Head of Chinese/Chinese Teacher of Happy Achievement International School. Personal communication, April 23, 2014.

Literacy Coordinator of Happy Achievement International School. Personal communication, April 30, 2014.

IB Case Study 6: Circle International School

Circle International School is a private continuum school located in West Africa and is based loosely on the American school model. The school’s mission is to cultivate academic and personal growth among students within their highly diverse and multicultural setting in order for them to succeed both within and beyond the classroom. The school’s vision closely aligns with IB’s mission to foster a learning environment that builds awareness among students as global citizens, while also maintaining a connection to their local environment. The school’s curriculum emphasizes critical and analytical thinking as well as strong literacy skills. As a private school, they do not have to adhere to any national language policies, though the language of instruction in the country happens to be primarily in English.

Table 12. Interviews at Circle International School

Interviewee	Date	Length	Type of Interview	Language of Interview	L1 of Interviewee	Other Ls of Interviewee
IB Coordinator	April 10, 2014	30 minutes	Off site, Skype	English	English	Unknown
PYP Teacher	April 10, 2014	21 minutes	Off site, Skype	English	English	Unknown
DP Teacher	April 23, 2014	34 minutes	Off site, Skype	English	English	Unknown

The School Context and Language Profile

The school’s diverse student body is embraced by an approach to teaching and learning that values different languages and the knowledge that comes with learning new languages. Furthermore, the school is aware that many students will be learning in a language other than their mother tongue, which cannot be ignored in the classroom. In the West African country where the school is located, there are more than 60 local languages that are regionally based and not commonly represented among the student population. According to the interviewees, in the

city where the school is located, English dominates the linguistic landscape and is widely spoken. Furthermore, regardless of students' national backgrounds, many pursue higher education in English at universities in Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The 600 students at Circle International School hold a total of 64 different national passports. Within the PYP, 25% of students are American; British, Israeli, Indian, and Ghanaian students represent 9% each; Lebanese, Canadian, Dutch, Korean, and Nigerian students represent 4% each; and the rest of the PYP student population is from 45 other nationalities. The MYP and DP student population is made up of 22% American students, 10% British students, 9% Ghanaian students, 8% Indian students, 5% Dutch students, with the remaining 46% of students from various national backgrounds. Similarly, English, German, Dutch, Hindi, and French make up the five most commonly used home languages among MYP and DP students.

The school's language profile is updated on a yearly basis from a database of student survey responses. With an up-to-date language profile, the school is able to assess language needs within the school and teachers have the information to be able to address students' needs in the classroom.

Language Policy

Articulated in the school's language policy is the way language is the link that connects students' self-expression, cultural awareness, and respect for diversity. The school's language policy is based upon the understanding that all teachers are language teachers and that language acquisition is the cornerstone of learning. The document is written with teachers as the intended audience. In order for students to succeed in content areas, teachers must constantly incorporate language learning into content area learning. The school's language of instruction is English, with French and Spanish as additional languages. Much of the written language policy is devoted

to the policies surrounding English learner support and developing students' English proficiency, with multiple options that can be tailored to individual students' needs. At the PYP level, while English proficiency is not a requirement for school admission, the school does expect young students to have a foundation in their mother tongue. Throughout all levels, the school does provide both push-in and pull-out support for English learners with their English as an Additional Language (EAL) Program, with support diminishing at grade 10, after which students are expected to have reached a certain level of English proficiency in order to succeed academically. Teachers in grades 3-10 have the support of EAL faculty in their classrooms to assist with English learner students, while students in grades 11 and 12 are monitored on a less consistent basis. Their EAL Program supports students' language development while preparing them to participate in mainstream classes as quickly as possible. Students in the EAL Program are assessed through the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT), classroom work, and ACCESS test along with classroom observation and parent interviews.

With the guidance of an IB consultant, there has been a new school-wide focus on language, which has included an increased emphasis on their additional languages program as well as the EAL Program. Following recommendations from the IB consultant, EAL students in the PYP are now attending French classes along with their peers, rather than assuming that the additional would be confusing to students who are also learning English. The school has been looking at how to better streamline language requirements by using backward planning, beginning with the expectation for students in the DP and then working their way back through the MYP and PYP. For example, since students were lacking certain skills in French reading and writing at the MYP level, they have implemented a new focus on developing French literacy in the PYP to ensure that their students are prepared for the language demands of higher grades.

Owing to the diversity of the Circle International School's teachers and staff, students are exposed to multiple varieties of English. As a convention, U.S. English spelling is used for internal school documents, while British English spelling is used for IB documents. Within the language learning curriculum, French is offered from grades K-12 at multiple levels and Spanish is offered from grades 9-12. For the study of additional languages, students may pursue languages after school or online in certain instances. Due to the large number of Dutch students, there are certain accommodations in place that now allow Dutch students to attend Dutch language classes after school. In the DP, students are also able to pursue self-taught language study if the student already has fluency in that language.

With students coming from many language backgrounds, mother tongue development is an important aspect of the school's language policy. Their language policy states that children have the right to develop their mother tongue based on principles upheld by the United Nations. Students enter the school with a range of language backgrounds and proficiency in English, and their emergent bilingualism is viewed as an asset. The school culture validates students' home language. Both teachers and students are expected to respect other languages, which is imperative if students are to feel comfortable learning in English. Due to the sheer number of home languages represented in the school, much of the responsibility of mother tongue development falls on family engagement, with support from school resources such as library books. Not only is mother tongue development supported, it is also encouraged for students in the EAL Program, since they have seen the cognitive and social benefits that mother tongue development has for their students.

Language Policy Development

The school language policy was developed in small teams of teachers and staff that

represented the scope of the school. The work of these small teams then passed through the educational leadership team, which included the head of the school, two principals, the director of educational programs, and three IB coordinators for further revisions. While there is no formal language policy steering committee, these small teams of teachers who all had a hand in language teaching represented an unofficial committee. Faculty were asked to provide feedback during a few weekly staff development sessions dedicated solely to the school's language policy, which allowed for a lot of give and take in the development process. The issue of greatest concern in developing the school's language policy was addressing the unique needs of the diverse school population, which included conversations regarding varieties of English and conventions of spelling and pronunciation.

Following a recent IB school review, the school conducted an overhaul of their language policy, especially how they can better work with their English learner students throughout the curriculum. Teachers had been struggling with teaching content when their students' English proficiency still needed development. With the help of an IB consultant, the school looked closely at how teachers can develop learning targets and create an environment for discourse that is not limited by vocabulary. Their current language policy has been in place for the past year and a half and there is a concerted effort to make sure that it is consistently revisited and relevant. Since the school population is constantly changing, the language policy will need to be continually updated in order to reflect the needs of their students.

Classroom Implementation

The intersection between the school's admissions policy and language policy is one challenge in implementation. One teacher struggled with finding the balance between the need to assess students' language proficiency for academic success while at the same time not

thematically disqualifying students because they do not meet a predetermined level of English proficiency. It is difficult to say where the line is drawn between giving a student room for growth in the language of instruction and knowing that a student might be at a significant disadvantage. The school's admissions policy allows them to take a chance on some students in the PYP, however, in order to succeed in the DP students' language proficiency needs to have reached a certain bar. Further confounding this dilemma is a lack of consensus among teachers whether the school's screening tests are fully measuring the students' abilities. While the speaking test might be reliable, they do not give as helpful a measure on students' writing or academic reading abilities, which can later become a source of difficulty in the classroom.

The language policy has been introduced throughout the school as an ongoing process and different stakeholder groups have found it helpful in different ways. In the PYP, there has been a recent internalization of the philosophy that all teachers are language teachers. Among MYP and DP teachers, there is a strong focus on what different components of the policy mean to a teacher and in the classroom. For parents, the language policy has not formally been introduced, however it has been conveyed philosophically during parent meetings within the context of what their children are doing in school. As a result of high staff turnover, the language policy is a yearly topic of discussion at the beginning of each school year. While the language policy has always been there, it has not necessarily always been at the forefront. However, in recent years, an emphasis on mother tongue and the role of all teachers as language teachers has increased the positionality of the school's language policy. The school has prioritized discussions around certain words and phrases within the language policy in order to foster a common understanding regarding the policy and the role of language in the school.

One teacher felt that the policy was "generally specific" enough that it accomplished the

goal of a language policy on paper, yet there is still frustration among teachers, particularly in the DP, because sometimes students simply do not have the level of proficiency expected in English. Since many of the courses at this level involve a significant amount of non-fiction reading, students have a difficult time understanding the nuances of technical language and grasping the concepts involved. In implementing the language policy in the DP, teachers have worked on bringing language acquisition strategies seamlessly into the classroom on a daily basis, so that all students are following course content regardless of their English proficiency level. Regarding mother tongue, a PYP teacher has reported to have made an effort to show her students that all languages are equally appreciated and that students can be proud of their home language. She has taken the initiative to incorporate students' mother tongue in small ways like sharing greetings and vocabulary.

The school continues to face challenges with regards to local languages and pressure from parents to more formally include more home languages within the curriculum, which extends beyond their current capacity. Over the years they have struggled with which languages to include as options of study. While the ELA teachers have provided a significant amount of support in the school with regards to English learners, the school is lacking the support they need regarding mother tongue.

The Use of Language and Learning in IB programmes (IBO, 2011) and Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy (IBO, 2012) in Language Policy Development and Implementation

These documents are used as guidelines to ensure that they are following the IB standards and serve the role of providing a theoretical foundation. They have served as a means of support and proved relevant to what they are trying to accomplish in their language policy. With so much energy being placed on the development and implementation of their own school's language

policy, these documents have not been discussed widely with teachers. The school's language policy was mirrored off of these documents, yet they do not provide the practical guidance that the school craves, particularly regarding incorporation of mother tongue. Despite a school-wide effort to better support mother tongue, an IB coordinator made it clear that the school is struggling to figure out how it should incorporate local languages and mother tongue. Due to the overwhelming number of languages present in and around the school, they are in need of more practical information on how to address their circumstances, which they believe are different than most schools. Additionally due to feedback from IB, the school has made efforts to hold mother tongue celebrations and informally bring these home languages into the classroom.

Findings and Discussion

Circle International School has faced challenges ensuring that all teachers view themselves as language teachers and assume the responsibility of students' language development, regardless of their content area. An IB coordinator was confident that once teachers start approaching their classes from this perspective, the rest of the pieces will fall into place. Furthermore, there is not as much clarity among teachers regarding the language policy process, particularly regarding the development and evaluation for those who are not directly involved in the school's process. For those teachers who joined the school after the language policy had already been developed, their understanding of the school's policy development process relied on hearsay. Teachers maintained more of an information understanding regarding the details of the language policy and its development and revision while administrators and IB coordinators seemed to be aware of the formal school process. One way in which Circle International School can be more aligned with the suggestion of the IB for developing a language policy would be to establish a formal language policy committee, and involve more of the school community in the formation of that group.

More recently, the language policy has been a source of tension at the school. They all know that they need to do more and be more consistent with mother tongue and local languages, but they are finding it very difficult. As an IB coordinator noted, the diversity of their student body combined with the diversity of the local languages makes her feel like they are starting out at a disadvantage when it comes to implementing their language policy.

References

Circle International School Language Policy, May 2012.

IB Coordinator of Circle International School. Personal communication, April 10, 2014.

Language & Literature Teacher of Circle International School. Personal communication, April 23, 2014.

PYP Teacher of Circle International School. Personal communication, April 10, 2014.

IB Case Study 7: Excellence Academy of India

Excellence Academy of India's (EAI) mission is built upon the philosophy of cultivating "renaissance individuals" by employing a comprehensive approach to educating students' personal, intellectual, and physical growth. They place a strong value on creativity, and sportsmanship through a big picture worldview of education to produce law-abiding, polished students of integrity. The EAI educational approach mirrors that of IB through their emphasis on fostering global citizenship through inquiry based education that focuses on concepts and not just content.

While the school encompasses all grades, from nursery school through grade twelve, they are certified only to teach the PYP and DP programs. Their middle school program instead adheres to the Indian Certificate of Secondary Education (ICSE) and the International General Certificate of Secondary Education (IGCSE) and is in the process of establishing the MYP. They offer students the option of attending as a day student, as five-day-per-week boarding student, or as a full-time boarding student, depending on families' needs. Throughout the school, there is continuity across the curriculum to build a balanced and holistic educational experience. In an open and respectful learning environment, this school establishes an educational approach with a vision to foster a better world. Language plays a key role in this, since through language learning, students build an aptitude for cultural awareness. The school's objective is to create internationally-minded students and citizens, which also encompasses teachers, since they, too, are learners.

As a private international school, EAI does not face the same language requirements to formally incorporate the regional language into the school. The language of instruction is English, while Hindi and Telugu, the regional language, function as additional languages of

communication.

Table 13. Interviews at Excellence Academy of India

Interviewee	Date	Length	Type of Interview	Language of Interview	L1 of Interviewee	Other Ls of Interviewee
IB Coordinator	May 23, 2014	23 minutes	Off site, Skype	English	Unknown	English, others unknown
DP Language & Literature Teacher	May 18, 2014	23 minutes	Off site, Skype	English	Unknown	English, others unknown
DP World Literature Teacher	May 16, 2014	29 minutes	Off site, Skype	English	Unknown	English, others unknown

The School Context and Language Profile

There is no denying the multilingualism that pervades this school environment. Teachers and students are simultaneously negotiating the national influence of Hindi, the regional influence of Telugu, the influence of numerous mother tongues, all with English as the language of instruction and French and Spanish as additional languages. Language learning encompasses three categories of languages: the language of instruction, world languages, and the mother tongue. Alongside the school's multilingual environment is a culture of respect for language and for the use of different languages. Regarding language learning, the curriculum is designed to equip students with English plus at least two additional languages starting by age seven at the latest. The school's language policy expects for there to be diversity within their school language profile, since there is no guarantee that students' home languages, languages used in the community, and the language of instruction will overlap. Furthermore, the school's teachers and staff represent diverse geographical, and therefore linguistic, backgrounds from around India.

The two most represented groups within the student body are students from Telugu-

speaking homes and American students of Indian origin who have spent time previously living in the United States. Among the 700-800 students at the school, many other home languages are also represented, but on a smaller scale. Due to the range of multilingual student backgrounds, there are opportunities for differentiated learning for those students with lower English proficiency, particularly in the PYP. Approximately 30% of students in the school struggle to some extent with English, mostly in reading and writing. Therefore, the school is well aware of the role it needs to play in supporting and following up with students one-on-one to ensure that they reach the expected level in English language proficiency so that they can keep up with literature requirements. These students tend to be from more rural areas in India and experience more difficulties as they engage with literature-based activities. Their language policy makes note of the various learning paths that students will have and that their role as a school is to support and encourage the learning of all students.

Language Policy

The school seems to understand the central role that a language policy plays in an educational environment and takes their language policy very seriously. As expressed by one of the school's teachers, "whatever we do, we do through language" (World Literature DP Teacher of Excellence Academy of India, personal communication, May 16, 2014). A copy of the school language policy is exhibited in the school's resource library, further highlighting its centrality and the need for a shared school-wide understanding. They see language as very closely connected to culture, and within the school they respect the language and diversity of different cultures. Their polished school language policy begins by setting up a clear, yet concise definition of language policy. Nevertheless, it is understood that the school language policy is a working document.

Their school language philosophy is based around the cornerstone that every teacher is a

language teacher and that language is interwoven throughout the fabric of the school's curriculum and is the point of departure for all learning that goes on within the school. Therefore the burden of implementing the school language policy is distributed among all teachers, and taking on such a responsibility means that the appropriate training must be provided to teachers and staff through ongoing professional development. The school language policy is inevitably connected to the school's admissions and assessment policies. Furthermore, language learning is not simply for the sake of content learning but also for supplemental growth and awareness that comes with language learning. Built into the language policy are certain points of action to ensure that the policy is incorporated within the school and that it maintains relevance over time, since language learning is understood as an ongoing process. English is the school's language of instruction and the primary language of school-wide communication.

The dilemma seen surrounding mother tongue development is that too much of an emphasis on mother tongue in the curriculum ends up pulling attention away from English, which the school regards as a highly important language for India and for teaching and learning at the school. Outside of classroom time, students are free to communicate in whatever language they please. While there is a shared understanding that learning can take place in any language, the school has selected English as the school's language of instruction. The school recognizes that parents may desire to be involved in decisions regarding their child's language learning, and therefore the school language policy asserts that a student's language profile be developed in concert with his or her parents. The school also supports families, as they, too, might need to adjust to the school's language learning environment. By encouraging families to actively engage their children with their mother tongue both at home and in the community, parents are also asked to take on the role of language teacher and cultivate the school's language policy beyond the classroom. In an effort to better know the extent to which mother

tongue is of importance to students' families, the school has administered a survey to learn more about language backgrounds and family involvement in language learning. As a next step, they are involving the local community to provide more robust opportunities for students to engage with their mother tongue and have brought parents in to assist with mother tongue teaching. In an effort to further incorporate mother tongue into the school culture, they conduct special assembly programs, such as Telugu Day and Hindi Day. One issue that has arisen regarding mother tongue is the lack of Telugu in the IB program. Parents in the community have expressed the desire that their children gain Telugu proficiency by the time they graduate, since it is also the local language. The school is encouraged by its conversations with IB to formally incorporate Telugu into the curriculum soon.

Despite not being a continuum school, the school's language policy does not lack any continuity and instead articulates from the PYP through their ICSE/IGCSE middle school program and into the DP. During the PYP, the school's language policy objectives include building an understanding of language learning, a consistency of classroom teaching, and the productive and receptive skills of language proficiency. The role that English plays in the school's curriculum is not explicitly emphasized until it discusses the middle school program, at which point students must demonstrate proficiency in English. Newly admitted students at the grade 6 level must either have English as a first language, score at a certain level on the English Language Proficiency Test (ELPT), or have had at least five years of English-medium instruction; the school asserts the right not to admit students who do not meet the language criteria. The extent of language accommodations provided to students who enter earlier than grade 6 are not afforded to students beginning in middle school or in the DP. Nevertheless, the school is aware that the middle school level in particular will require a period of transition, which may involve a certain degree of individualization depending on each student's language profile and progress. As students advance to the DP, they are encouraged to pursue language

learning, particularly French and Hindi in addition to an option for self-taught learning in the mother tongue.

Language Policy Development

In order to develop both their language philosophy and policy, the school has established a language policy steering committee that is broadly inclusive, including the school's executive director, principal, director of admissions, heads of departments, IB PYP and DP coordinators, language teachers, resource staff, parents, and students who belong to a literary club, for a total of 28 participants. Among their responsibilities for language policy development are both information gathering from the greater community and then acting on behalf of the community they represent. The steering committee is responsible for policy reviews every two years, and all members of the steering committee must be present for these meetings. Following the steering committee's work on language policy development, the working document goes through a survey process with the administration and the resources and library department, after which the policy is further elaborated and strengthened.

Professional development associated with language policy development often takes the form of discussions, deliberations, and debates with the steering committee and among teachers. In these discussions, they examine the scope of teaching and learning within the school, how the process works, and, in turn, how and what they communicate to students. One teacher noted that one of his greatest challenges as an IB teacher stems from the fact that he has never been an IB learner himself, so it takes time to fully understand how IB program implementation affects students' learning. Language teachers participate in outside professional development opportunities and IB workshops. Also, Cambridge workshops related to building English proficiency are available to language teachers who might need more support in this area. Despite the importance placed on language policy, there could be more opportunities for related professional development activities.

The language policy development process begins with crafting the language philosophy as the point of departure. As students enter the school with differing needs, they keep a record in order to later incorporate them into the language policy. The school has established shared Google Docs among the staff so that anyone can participate in amending, updating, and contributing to the school's language policy, which exemplifies the practice of creating a working document and soliciting participating and feedback. Therefore, everyone is able to share their own ideas, which may include book clubs, field trips, theatre excursions, etc. In efforts to improve the policy, the school has attempted to include both parents and the wider community in order to find out what is going wrong and how to remedy these issues. Nevertheless, outreach efforts to families and the community are not always met with as much participation as they would like. More engagement outside of the school would help them develop a stronger language policy. Much of the policy is developed around building students' language profiles, first through English and then through the mother tongue. The language policy is articulated through backward planning, by first looking at what it entails to be successful in the DP and then moving back to ensure that students build up to those skills from the PYP and in the middle school, making sure that language expectations are both vertically and horizontally aligned.

One teacher cited that their greatest challenge was an unrealistic expectation to create the perfect language policy document. In trying to chase an unattainable goal, the school loses sight of their actual practices. Some members of the school grow too fixated on creating a document they believe will be approved in IB authorization and evaluation, and as a result the policy document itself becomes more important than the policy in practice. This teacher reiterated that practice is what will ultimately strengthen the policy, which will continue to grow through implementation.

Classroom Implementation

The school administration's involvement in the language policy extends beyond development, as school resources are devoted to insuring fidelity in implementation among the school's leadership and teachers. The school language policy allows for a certain degree of flexibility for students to explore language learning as they find it most relevant and compelling, engaging with language through numerous content areas.

As new staff enters the school, they are able to access all school policies through their staff intranet system, which extends to all school staff, including housekeeping, administration, etc. so that the whole school community is equally aware. One teacher found that when he first came to the school, the language policy included a lot of jargon yet spoke very little about real practices. The more time he spent at the school, he saw how many of the school's language practices were not properly reflected in the policy, such as school assemblies being conducted in the mother tongue. In an effort to better align policy with practice, he encouraged the school first to look more closely at current practices and then weave the policy around those practices to better reflect the context of their school. It was no longer sufficient for teachers to say, "yes" or "no" in the school self-reflection; rather they had to justify why or why not something would be good practice. One teacher insisted that in order to effectively move from written policy to classroom implementation, there needs to be more evidence demonstrating policy implementation. One aspect of implementing the school language policy is conveying to students the role that language plays as a tool in teaching and learning. Due to the range of English proficiency levels among students, teachers work to adapt their teaching to fit the various levels in the classroom, or a teacher may use another shared language to convey concepts to students who are struggling. Writing is strongly encouraged throughout the school, and there are ample opportunities for students to further develop their writing through exhibits, articles, and publications. Access to resources is also critical to language policy

implementation. The school's librarian has built close relationships with local libraries and e-libraries and involves teachers to make sure that they are up to date with the necessary resources. Also, they are connected to local newspapers and bring in student editions of news sources for classroom and student use.

The Use of Language and Learning in IB programmes (IBO, 2011) and Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy (IBO, 2012) in Language Policy Development and Implementation

The IB documents *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012) were a helpful reference both in the development and regular review of EAI's language policy. They are always looking for feedback on what they can do better as a school, so these documents provide a strong point of departure.

Additionally, with teacher turnover, these documents serve as a starting point to train new teachers and establish a shared understanding of language policy in schools. The self-reflection exercise has been utilized by the school in order to help them think more critically about their language policy practices and to improve upon them. While the school has used *Language and learning in IB programmes* throughout its language policy development, at times newer teachers have had difficulty getting past the academic jargon that is used in the document. Case studies are one element that would be a helpful addition to *Language and learning in IB programmes*, since they are lacking exemplars of how other schools have implemented a policy that is linked back to practice. Rather than just creating a policy and attempting to put it into practice, they could use support looking at their classroom practices and building a policy that serves as an accurate reflection of those practices.

Findings and Discussion

Through the interviews, it is clear that the school maintains an ongoing dialogue among administrators, teachers, and parents regarding more than just the language policy document.

There is a certain awareness that exists regarding language in India that is not the case in all national contexts, therefore many of the considerations around developing and implementing a school language policy are not new to this school, as it is already very much a part of their lives. The interviewees clearly expressed a nuanced understanding of how communities and individuals interact with language, and therefore what must be taken into account in the development and implementation of a school language policy. One teacher noted that half the job of teaching is done if you are able to teach students how to express themselves through language, and it is through a school language policy that one can formalize the centrality of language in learning.

Nevertheless, one area of continued concern among the administration is the role of mother tongue. As an IB coordinator noted, the concept of mother tongue is given a lot of importance in theory, yet theory does not quite translate to reality in practice and they are not able to build students' mother tongue proficiency as they envisioned. Some of the questions that they continue to struggle with are to what extent do they use mother tongue in the curriculum and should they be using it as a language of assessment.

References

Excellence Academy of India Language Policy, n.d.

IB Coordinator of Excellence Academy of India. Personal communication, May 23, 2014.

Language & Literature DP Teacher of Excellence Academy of India. Personal communication, May 18, 2014.

World Literature DP Teacher of Excellence Academy of India. Personal communication, May 16, 2014.

IB Case Study 8: Leadership School of Japan

The Leadership School of Japan was founded in 1929 as a private school with 111 students and 18 faculty members, and has grown into a comprehensive campus, including a K-12 academy, university, and graduate schools. As of 2014, the school enrolled about 10,000 students on its large campus. The mission of the Leadership School is to produce outstanding individuals who can contribute not only to Japanese society but also to the world.

The Leadership School houses the MYP and the DP, which aim to cultivate young people who can face the challenges of the 21st century with the knowledge, ingenuity, and international mindedness necessary to ensure a healthy and peaceful world for all. The IB MYP was introduced to the Leadership School in 2007, followed by the DP in 2010.

The Leadership School is an off-site case study. Three Skype interviews were conducted in order to study the development and implementation of the language policy at the Leadership School, interviews included the IB coordinator and two English teachers, as shown in Table 14.

Table 14. Interviews at Leadership School of Japan

Interviewee	Date	Length	Type of Interview	Language of Interview	L1 of Interviewee	Other Ls of Interviewee
English Teacher 1	June 29, 2014	60 minutes	Skype	English	English	Japanese
English Teacher 2	June 30, 2014	33 minutes	Skype	English	English	Japanese
IB Coordinator	June 30, 2014	37 minutes	Skype	English	English	Japanese

The School Context and Language Profile

The Leadership School's campus is situated on 59 hectares of beautifully landscaped property located about an hour from a large metropolitan area in Japan. The three interviewees unanimously state that Japanese is used almost exclusively in the neighborhood and on campus. Out of the 10,000 students at the Leadership School, about 120 students attend the IB MYP and

DP (Grades 7 to 12). Among the 120 IB students, a majority of them speak native-level Japanese; a couple of students speak other languages at home, such as Korean or Chinese. The English proficiency levels of the IB students are limited and diverse, but the average level is at the low beginner level according to the IB coordinator. Official program communication with stakeholders in the IB program is done in Japanese and/or English. In Japanese public schools, students start to learn English at Grade 4 or 5, but it is more of an exposure to English through singing songs or learning colors and the alphabet. Some schools intentionally do not teach English writing because they are afraid of intimidating and overwhelming students. As a private school, the Leadership School makes English a mandatory subject starting in Grade 1.

Language Policy

The language policy at the Leadership School was recently updated in 2013 and includes sections on language philosophy, school context, language instruction, supporting language development, and guidelines for progression. In the MYP (Grade 7-10), English is used as the language of instruction for some subjects: Art, English, Humanities, Design, Mathematics, MYP Interact, and Science. Japanese is used for all other MYP subjects. The MYP program serves to support students' English language development so that they will be successful for their DP studies in Grade 11 and 12. Except for Japanese language classes, the language of instruction for the DP subjects is entirely in English.

The language policy states that in order to support students in the early years of the IB MYP, the school makes every effort to develop their English proficiency, including allocating English/Japanese bilingual teachers to teach courses in Grades 7 and 8, and requiring some students to attend Morning Support classes if they need additional assistance. Morning Support classes run from 7:35–8:10am daily during weekdays. In addition, students are encouraged to use English at every given opportunity, both inside and outside of the classroom. Students are placed

into three different English classes based on their English proficiency levels when they entered the IB program. More proficient students will be placed in English A classes and all other students in English B1 or B2 classes. The proficiency levels were determined by a Cambridge test.

In addition to English classes, all students are placed into Japanese IB Language A and Language B classes. Language A classes are designed for native Japanese speakers and Language B classes are for non-native speakers. Students who need further support in Japanese language development are required to participate in supplemental extra-curricular individualized Japanese language support. Although the structure of the program supports primarily the development of English and Japanese proficiency, students with other home languages are encouraged to continue development of those languages.

Language Policy Development

The interview data indicates that the previous MYP coordinator revised the language policy in 2013, with some input from English teachers, especially on how the students are placed into different levels of English classes. English Teacher 2 mentioned that a survey was sent out to elicit suggestions on how to improve the language policy, but she is not clear about how the survey responses were used in the final revision. The final language policy was approved by the school administration.

Several challenges were discussed by the interviewees regarding the language policy development as well as the policy itself. According to English Teacher 1, the IB program staff should have elicited input from parents and students when developing and revising the language policy. However, in reality, the process only involved some teachers, staff, and administrators. English Teacher 1 suspects that this might be due to the cultural differences between the program administrators (all foreigners) and the Japanese parents. She mentioned that the previous MYP

coordinator had a good grasp on Japanese; however, he did not know about the nuances of Japanese culture, which hindered his communication with the Japanese parents and community. It has been a challenge for international staff to run an international program with international teachers in this very Japanese context. Furthermore, ideally, the IB program policy development should involve the school administrators. However, due to the huge size of the school, it is challenging to figure out whom to consult on language policy issues.

Language Policy Implementation

When asked whether and how they were introduced to the language policy, both English teachers did not remember if they were introduced to the language policy through emails or in formal trainings. English Teacher 1 stated that she received a few language documents, but she was never made clear about which one was the official language policy. English Teacher 2 said that she took some time off after she started teaching at the Leadership School six weeks ago, so she is not sure whether the language policy was introduced to new teachers or not. She did request a copy of the language policy from the MYP coordinator because she understands that language policies embody important guidelines for language teachers from her years of teaching experience in an international school. It took the MYP coordinator some time to locate the language policy.

As described in section 3, the language policy states that the School will make every effort to hire bilingual teachers for lower grades (Grade 7 and 8). In the implementation however, the interviewees revealed that not many teachers are fluent Japanese and English bilinguals. English Teacher 2 was surprised to see this statement in the language policy because even she does not consider herself a fluent bilingual though she has been living in Japan for 17 years and has a Japanese husband.

To support English development among students, the school established morning support groups, in which English teachers can help those who need extra assistance. However, it only lasts for half an hour or one hour per week. Students who need extra English support do not have any other time during the day to work on their English development. English Teacher 2 pointed out that there is no director for EFL or ESL programs at the Leadership School. So it poses a challenge to English teachers since they have no one to turn to when they have questions. She took the morning support group as an example. As a teacher responsible for the morning support group, she was not given detailed guidelines on how to implement this program and who to report to regarding students' English proficiency levels or needs. All of the interviewees mentioned the IB philosophy that all teachers are language teachers, which means that all subject teachers shoulder the responsibilities of students' language development. However, in practice, subject teachers only know the language of the discipline; they do not normally focus on developing students' English skills. For instance, they do not correct students' grammar errors.

Another challenge in the implementation process is how to address the various needs of the students as English learners. Students enter the IB MYP program with a wide range of English proficiency levels. How to provide support and differentiate instruction becomes a big challenge to English teachers. English Teacher 1 claims that this challenge is even harder to overcome while also honoring the IB's philosophy to support and nurture the development of mother tongue, which, in this case, is Japanese. Therefore in her English classes, she allows students to use Japanese. According to English Teacher 1, English teachers are discouraged from promoting English in the program due to the emphasis on developing mother tongue proficiency. In addition, students lack motivation to communicate in English, especially when the majority are native Japanese speakers. When students do not understand something in a content class, it is easy for them to turn to their neighbors and ask for clarification in Japanese. The context of the

Leadership School is different from that in other international schools, where students speak different home languages and thus have to rely on English to communicate with each other at school.

The Use of Language and learning in IB programmes (IBO, 2011) and Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy (IBO, 2012) in Language Policy Development and Implementation

Both English teachers claim that they were more familiar with *Language and learning* (IBO, 2011) and do not know much about *Guidelines for school self-reflection* (IBO, 2012).

English Teacher 2 specifically talked about the three hierarchies of language learning described in the document: learning about the language, learning with the language, and learning through the language. She commented that she finds this framework helpful in her teaching.

English Teacher 1 finds the *Language and learning* (IBO, 2011) inclusive, which is both positive and negative. She understands that this document needs to be applied to schools all over the world, so it has to be general and inclusive; however, it is too general to give direct and clear guidelines to teachers on how to apply the framework to their unique school context. So it will be helpful if IB can develop some practical guidelines for different school contexts. For example, in the Leadership School's context, it would be helpful and constructive to know how to better balance the emphasis on the development of Japanese and English, especially for the MYP 7th grade students whose English levels range from complete beginners to near-native speakers. English Teacher 2 suggests that IB give some practical and hands-on advice on how subject teachers can truly encourage language development in their classrooms. For instance, the statement "all teachers are language teachers" is not clear and concrete enough for subject teachers to incorporate into their content teaching.

Findings and Discussion

The Leadership School of Japan has a unique context of being a private school where the majority of students are native Japanese speakers but vary widely in their English proficiency levels. While the teachers and staff are working hard to accommodate the various needs of students' English development, they also need to balance it with the development of students' Japanese proficiency and home language, in certain cases.

The previous MYP coordinator revised the current language policy with some input from teachers, though it was never widely promoted and disseminated among the whole IB program community. During the interview, the current IB coordinator did express the intention to revise the language policy in the near future to reflect more of the current classroom practices and address some of the challenges the program currently faces.

Starting from 2015, the school will start a strand of bilingual classes in Japanese and English and will add one class in each subsequent year. How this will impact the students' language profiles is still unknown. Hopefully, as stated by English Teacher 2, the students will become more proficient in English so that they have enough language skills to absorb the content when they enter Grade 7 in the IB program. While teachers are familiar with *Language and learning* (IBO, 2011), they know little about *Guidelines for school self-reflection* (IBO, 2012). They suggest that more practical advice and specific guidelines be included in *Language and learning* (IBO, 2011) to help their language teaching given their unique school context.

References

- Leadership School of Japan Language Policy, April 2013.
- English Teacher 1 of Leadership School of Japan. Personal communication, June 29, 2014.
- English Teacher 2 of Leadership School of Japan. Personal communication, June 30, 2014.
- IB Coordinator of Leadership School of Japan. Personal communication, June 30, 2014.

Conclusion

This project set out to investigate the development and implementation of language policies in eight IB schools across the globe. The research objectives included (1) the process by which a school develops and implements its LP; (2) the extent to which the contextual factors of a particular school might influence the development and implementation of its LP; and, (3) the extent to which schools use, and align with, IB's published documents outlining school language development and implementation. Though a combination of language policy document analysis, interviews with key stakeholders, site visits, and classroom observation, project staff gained an understanding of each school's context and how various stakeholders relate to their respective school's language policy.

Our findings show that each school does indeed comply with IB requirements to have a school language policy. While all eight schools did have language policies, variation existed in the processes by which their language policies were developed and the extent to which they were implemented school-wide. The case studies ranged from instances where the policy was developed solely by a high-level administrator or IB coordinator to instances where the policy development process was a school-wide dialogue that included administrators, teachers, support staff, parents, and students. In cases such as the former, reactions of teachers regarding the school language policy and its development process ranged from little prior knowledge to some degree of familiarity. However, in cases where language policy development was taken on as a school-wide endeavor, interviewees demonstrated a higher level of comfort with and dedication to the school's language policy, as was demonstrated by Excellence Academy of India, which regularly convenes a highly inclusive and representative language policy steering committee. It

is also this sense of ownership among stakeholders that seemed to translate to maintaining a relevant, active school language policy.

Despite the fact that the majority of the schools in this study had a highly diverse and multilingual student population, only some of the schools expressed concern regarding students' proficiency in the language of instruction. In instances where interviewees noted this challenge, it seemed to be one of their most significant obstacles related to language and teaching.

Challenges relating to mother tongue development also came up frequently in interviews. Again, it was schools with highly diverse student populations that cited incorporating mother tongue into the learning environment as problematic. Some of these schools utilized strategies such as holding mother tongue celebrations and encouraging families to promote mother tongue development at home.

Interviewees had a positive response when they had attended professional development sessions related to language policy. Furthermore, those most familiar with IB guides and publications found them to be very informative and helpful when thinking through either the development or implementation of their school's language policy. When schools made language policy a school-wide priority, teachers seemed to feel more prepared to implement the policy and seemed more comfortable talking about the role of language in the classroom. Though Circle International School has faced some challenges in revising their language policy, it was clear through interviews that they have seen improvements as more teachers have embodied the philosophy that all teachers are language teachers, much in thanks to the help of an IB consultant. Similarly, Colegio Armadillo has made an effort to make all teachers aware of the philosophy that all teachers are language teachers, but they feel that teachers of subjects that are not English and Hebrew (the additional languages in their context) do not pay attention to the

language policy and do not feel a need to take on responsibility in implementing it. Therefore, teacher training must become a priority if teachers are expected to feel comfortable implementing the school's language policy. As noted by Wiley (2008), standard teacher training rarely equips teachers with the skills associated with language policy implementation and how to navigate a classroom where students represent diverse linguistic profiles, and so it cannot be assumed that handing teachers a language policy will mean that it is seamlessly implemented in the classroom. It is not enough just to tell teachers that "all teachers are language teachers;" they must receive the appropriate professional development to accompany such shifts. If they are expected to teach a diverse group of learners with various language backgrounds, they will do better if they have access to the appropriate foundational preparation (Wiley, in press).

Moreover, when teachers felt ownership about putting their school's policy into practice, they came up with some creative solutions. For example, Excellence Academy of India's language policy is the epitome of a flexible, working document. As a Google Doc, their policy is not only always available to staff but is perpetually open for new ideas, suggestions, and modifications. This strategy has led to a language policy embodied by the school as well as policies that reflect real practice. During interviews where teachers had little to no exposure to the school's language policy or the theories behind having a school language policy, interviewees did not feel that they had a responsibility as language teachers in addition to their content area.

It is notable to mention that different schools' approaches to language policy development and implementation often reflected the ways in which those schools understood "language," which was often a result of the role that language plays in the national or regional context where the school is located. According to Shohamy (2006), language can be "viewed as a closed,

stagnated and rule-bound entity” or “an open, free, dynamic, creative and constantly evolving process with no defined boundaries, involving multi-modal representations and different forms of ‘linguaging’” (p. xvii). IES Mar Blau and École du Centre Ville are similar in that both schools employ a politically-charged minority language as their language of instruction. As a result, the language of instruction in these two schools is part of an effort to promote and protect the status of a national minority language. Therefore, administrators, teachers, parents, and students have a more heightened awareness of how language is both a tool and a symbol of identity. Another example of highlighting language as a foundation of culture and identity came from Colegio Armadillo, which includes Hebrew in its curriculum to equip students with some linguistic competence in a language that carries much religious and cultural importance in their local Jewish community. Additionally, Excellence Academy of India is not overwhelmed by the prospect of multilingualism, and interviewees alluded to the fact that it is very natural for multiple languages to coexist without chaos, and therefore they embrace this multilingualism. There did not seem to be much difference in the way that continuum and non-continuum schools approached language policy development and implementation. Private schools exhibited a higher degree of freedom in curriculum and policy development since they usually did not have to adhere to any national or regional requirements. Colegio Armadillo was one exception as they did adhere to the national Ministry of Education’s educational requirements.

While schools were certain to note that the IB documents *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012) provided a strong theoretical framing that proved helpful, the document at times was not written in a way that was accessible for a general school audience or for parents. Some of the more fundamental questions regarding the development and implementation of a school

language policy were unanswered for these schools, such as how long a school language policy should be or how to incorporate mother tongue and local languages into the school. While many teachers and IB coordinators believe in the values of multilingualism and validating students' home languages and have incorporated them into their school's written language policy, they find the actual implementation of these practices in the classroom setting to be easier said than done. Interviewees suggested some of the following to supplement *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011): case studies of how other schools have approached language policy, examples of other written language policy documents, and examples of how other schools have put their written policies into practice.

Beyond just being an opportunity for reflection on the policy, *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012) could also provide a catalyst for administrators, teachers, and students to reflect upon their own experience and relationship with language. In addition to constructing school and student language profiles, teachers should be encouraged to think about their own language profiles (Menken & García, 2010). While this document encourages self-reflection on the positive and constructive qualities of a school language policy, there is merit in addressing the potential risks associated with language policy development and implementation, such as "How do language policies in school create inequalities among learners? How do policies marginalize some students while granting privilege to others?" (Tollefson, 2013), in hopes of avoiding these pitfalls which can have grave consequences.

At times well-intended policy goals are hindered by competing national or regional language policies or seem overwhelming due to the multitude of languages represented in the school and in the surrounding community. Many of these schools are in need of concrete strategies to employ in these challenging situations, as they feel ill-equipped to address them on

their own. For example, while teachers may understand their responsibility to act as language teachers, not all teachers feel confident or prepared to take on this role. Moreover, not only are all teachers language teachers, they are also policy makers (Menken & García, 2010). Some of these challenges stem from the problem inherent to school language policies — no two school language policies will be developed or implemented identically. On the one hand this means that language policies fit the school context when they are developed by the school, while on the other hand, there is no one written language policy that schools can rely on to ensure that they have a strong language policy or strategy for implementation. Several interviewees referred to this “uniqueness” as a fault and an unexpected consequence of their school context. Rather, schools need to understand that, particularly within the IB system, schools will vary considerably. As opposed to being a source of frustration, this “uniqueness” should be seen as a starting point from which to develop their language policy.

Recommendations

Many of the recommendations listed below mirror those suggested in *Language and learning in IB programmes* (2011). Based on the results of our eight case studies, IB programs follow these guidelines to varying degrees. Those schools that followed them most closely seemed to feel more at ease with the development of a school language policy and less overwhelmed by implementation at the classroom level. Therefore, it is recommended that IB require schools to meet certain criteria for language policy development and implementation based on the IB *Guidelines for developing a school language policy* (IBO 2011, Section 6) and the recommendations below. It is important for schools to keep in mind that moving from language policy development to implementation requires a process by which teachers must first develop awareness and build knowledge of the LP in order to successfully implement it in their classrooms.

Language Policy Development

1. Ensure that the school-wide LP is streamlined in its development and implementation across grade levels, particularly in continuum schools
 - a. Use backward planning to ensure that language and learning expectations build in a planful manner as students progress through the school
2. Further encourage the use of a LP Steering Committee:
 - a. The LP development process must include subject teachers along with administrators, coordinators, language teachers, parents, and community members. The perspective of subject and content teachers is a great asset to building a comprehensive language policy and lessens the burden of the LP development process on a few school representatives
3. Develop guidelines for dissemination of the LP school-wide to ensure that teachers and staff are aware of it and familiar with it
 - a. Disseminate the LP to the school community through emails, orientations, trainings, etc.
 - b. Make the LP available electronically and in hard copy—for example, display it in the school's library, in the staff lounge, and in department offices
4. Develop buy-in among teachers and staff as well as school-wide accountability for the success of the language policy
 - a. Raise the LP as an important issue with staff throughout the year in order to address the challenge of many teachers not being aware of the language policy and to reiterate the responsibility that all teachers have as language teachers

- b. Make use of any opportunity to build familiarity and understanding of the language policy among teachers and staff, such as during staff meetings, professional development training, or during other occasions when teachers meet
5. In order to maintain a relevant language policy, schedule regular LP reviews to ensure that the policy remains current and reflects the language profile of the school and of its students
6. As the LP is developed and revised, refer back to evidence of the school's practices – a language policy does little good if it is not reflective of school practices

Language Policy Implementation

7. Upon hiring, teachers are informed of and get information about the school language policy and how they are expected to implement it in their classrooms
8. Create guidelines for a minimum amount of PD related to the language policy for all teachers and staff, which incorporates their own language policy as well as the IB LP documents
 - a. The goal of PD sessions are threefold: 1) familiarize teachers and staff with the role of a school LP and their own role as language teachers; 2) orient teachers and staff to the current school LP; 3) promote dialogue and collect feedback for further strengthening the LP
 - b. Include PD that examines how language development relates to content learning in order to provide subject teachers with the strategies and skills to better address the learning needs of students with varying levels of proficiency in the language of instruction. The SIOP Model is one such example of PD that brings together the instruction of content and language in the classroom.
9. Provide strategies for bringing mother tongue and local languages into the classroom, particularly in highly diverse schools
 - a. Engage parents and local community members in school-wide language awareness
 - b. Encourage parents to promote their mother tongue at home
10. Make it clear in the LP what the processes are for collecting the feedback, evaluation, and evidence that inform revisions of the LP
 - a. Encourage schools to engage in more data collection exercises around the LP, including teachers, staff, parents, and students
 - b. For example, schools can conduct an anonymous survey of administrators, staff, and teachers to find out the extent to which they understand the school's language policy as well as the issues regarding language and classroom learning. From the survey results, schools can evaluate and revise the LP and create intervention strategies to assist in classroom implementation.

IB Language Policy Documents & Areas for Additional Study and Analysis

11. Supplemental questions to include in *Guidelines for school self-reflection on its language policy* (IBO, 2012), questions adapted from Corson (1999):
 - a. What are current teacher attitudes towards languages other than the language of instruction being used in the classroom and by students?
 - b. To what extent are teachers aware of the role that language plays in learning?
 - c. How can all teachers feel responsible and be accountable for students' language development?
 - d. How will the effectiveness of language policy implementation be monitored?
 - e. How are parents and the community able to support the language policy outside of school?

- f. How are teachers and staff informed of and sensitized to the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of students?
 - g. How do teachers incorporate the diversity of their students and their local context into their classrooms?
12. Make sample LPs available to IB schools as a point of reference from which they can build their own language policies
13. Incorporate mini case studies of how different IB schools have developed and implemented their LP based on their particular school context
14. Include “exemplar practices in language policy”—concrete, practical recommendations to complement the largely theoretical framing of the documents
 - a. Examples of steering committees
 - b. Building a working LP document in Google Docs
 - c. Convening school-wide mother tongue celebrations
 - d. Providing strategies to families that are trying to support mother tongue
 - e. Ideas for engaging the local community
15. Provide strategies and means of assistance for schools that are struggling to support students who are still gaining proficiency in the language of instruction, particularly at the DP level
16. Create a forum dedicated to LP development and implementation within the IB online community
17. Further differentiate how students might face challenges moving from one language, dialect, or social register to another while meeting the expectations of IB. For example, there are significant differences between Chinese and Romance languages. It is regulated in the guides that Language B Phase 6 students should be able to move to Language A classes. But for Chinese learners, there are huge gaps between Language B Phase 6 classes and Language A classes. In phase 6, students are required to write about 500 or 600 characters, but in Language A classes, students need to grasp 1,200 characters. This is an issue worth investigating further.
18. Reassure schools that their “uniqueness” in developing and implementing a school LP is indeed the norm and not a bad thing—no two school language profiles and contextual factors will be the same, therefore, no two school language policies will be the same

References

- Annamalai, E. (2013). India's Economic Restructuring with English. In Tollefson (Ed.). *Language policies in education: Critical issues: Second edition* (pp. 192-207). London, UK: Routledge.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism, 3rd Edition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences (4th ed.)*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Borman, K.M, Wiley, T.G., Garcia, D.R., & Danzig, A.B. (Eds.). (2014). *Review of Research in Education, 38*, Special Issue: Language policy, politics, and diversity in education. New York, NY: Sage.
- Corson, D. (1999). *Language policy in schools: A resource for teachers and administrators*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Corson, D. (2001). *Language diversity and education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- International Baccalaureate (2012). *Guidelines for school self-reflection on its language policy*. International Baccalaureate Organization.
- International Baccalaureate (2011). *Language and learning in IB programmes*. International Baccalaureate Organization.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2010). Foreword. In Menken & García (Eds.). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers*. (pp. xi-xiii). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hornberger, N., & Johnson, D. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(3), 509-533.
- Hult, F.M. & King, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Educational Linguistics in practice: Applying the local globally and the global locally*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Johnson, D.C. & Freeman, R. (2010). Appropriating language policy on the local level. In Menken & García (Eds.). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers*. (pp. 13-31). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kibbee, Douglas A. (1998). *Language legislation and linguistic rights*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Leibowitz, A. H. (1974, August). Language as a means of social control. Paper presented at the Eighth World Congress of Sociology, University of Toronto.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2010). Language policy and language planning. In N.H. Hornberger, & S.L.

- McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Education* (Ch. 6). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- May, Stephen A. (1997). School language policies. In Wodak & Corson (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of language and education: Language policy and political issues in education, volume 1* (pp. 229-240). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- McGroarty, M. (2013). Multiple actors and arenas in evolving language policies. In Tollefson (Ed.). *Language policies in education: Critical issues: Second edition* (pp. 36-58). London, UK: Routledge.
- Menken, K. & García, O. (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Moore, S.C.K. (Ed.). (2014). *Language policy processes and consequences: Arizona case studies*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Pennycook, A. (2002). Hong Kong and Governmentality. In Tollefson (Ed.). *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 91-110). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Phillipson, R. (2000). English in the new world order. In Ricento, T. *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 87-106). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Phillipson, R., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1996). English only worldwide, or language ecology. *TESOL Quarterly* 30(3), Special-Topic Issue: Language Planning and Policy, Thomas Ricento & Nancy Hornberger (eds), 429-452.
- Ricento, T. (2000). *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Ricento, T. (2005). *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ricento, T. & Hornberger, N. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), Special-Topic Issue: Language Planning and Policy, Thomas Ricento & Nancy Hornberger (eds), 401-427.
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Shohamy, E., Ben-Rafael, E., & Barni, M. (2010). *Linguistic landscape in the city*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1997). Human rights and language policy in education. In Wodak & Corson (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of language and education: Language policy and political issues in education, volume 1* (pp. 55-65). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic

Publishers.

- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy (Key topics in sociolinguistics)*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tollefson, J. (2013). *Language policies in education: Critical issues: Second edition*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Tollefson, J. & Tsui, A. B. M. (2004). *Medium of Instruction Policies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Wiley, T. W. (2000). Continuity and change in the function of language ideologies in the United States. In Ricento, T. *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 68-85). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Wiley, T. W. (2008). Language policy and teacher education. In May & Hornberger (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of language and education: Language policy and political issues in education, second edition, volume 1* (pp. 229-241). Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Wiley, T.G. (in press). Language Policy and Planning in Education. In W.E.Wright & O. Garcia. *Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Wright, W. E. (2010). *Foundations for Teaching English Learners: Research, Theory, Policy, and Practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.

Appendices:

- A: Case Study Matrix
- B: Interview Consent Form
- C: Observation Consent Form
- D: Interview Protocol: For Senior leadership member
and IB coordinator
- E: Interview Protocol: Teacher
- F: Observation Protocol

Appendix A:
Case Study Matrix

IB Case Study Matrix

	School Context & Language Profile	Language Policy	LP Development	Classroom Implementation	Use of IB LP Documents
1. IES Mar Blau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers the DP program • Publicly funded school • Spanish and Catalan are the co-official languages of the region • Catalan as the language of instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School has had an LP since early 1990s aimed to protect and promote the regional minority language, Catalan • Must adhere to local government language policies • Asserts Catalan as main language of instruction • Principal objective is that students are competent in Catalan and Spanish • English and French are the foreign languages of the school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee was formed, headed by the IB coordinator • Revisions are reviewed every year • Rotate teachers who are on the LP committee • Shared on the school's website, intranet, and Moodle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catalan is the main language of instruction, except in foreign language classes where the foreign language is the language of instruction • Some Spanish is used to help prepare students for IB exams, which they take in Spanish (not Catalan) • In IB physics, the teacher used Catalan as language of instruction, supported with materials in English and Spanish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used to construct the LP • IB Coordinator and teachers were familiar with <i>Language and Learning</i> document, not all were familiar with the <i>Guidelines</i> document • Documents were helpful, wanted to see more examples of other schools' LPs
2. École du Centre Ville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers the PYP & MYP • Publicly funded school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asserts the role of French • Aims to develop strong French 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised every 5 years by an IB committee • LP development/ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong emphasis on French • Opportunities for language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used to construct the LP • Generally

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students represent 28 different languages • 23% from French-speaking homes • French as the language of instruction 	<p>literacy and oral skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English & Spanish offered as additional languages • Home languages showcased during an annual cultural week 	<p>revision is limited to a select committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD is not mandatory 	<p>development outside of the classroom</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hope to further incorporate students' mother tongue in the future • General fear of the dominance of English in popular culture and in Canada 	<p>helpful to the IB coordinator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little familiarity of the documents among teachers
3. Mexico Colegio Armadillo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuum School • Privately funded school • Mother tongue of 99% of students is Spanish • School was founded by group of parents to provide trilingual education: Spanish, English, & Hebrew 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English and Hebrew as “additive languages” • English emphasized as preferred L2 • Hebrew as a language of culture and identity • Spanish remains the dominant language for most students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IB coordinator led the development effort • IB coordinator collects input from school administration and select teachers • Revised every year • Desires of parents have always been central to language teaching at the school (as they founded the school) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English classes conducted entirely in English • Spanish and Hebrew used in Hebrew classes, more Hebrew is gradually added each year throughout PYP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various IB documents used to develop the LP, though not specifically <i>Language and Learning</i> or <i>Guidelines</i>
4. Evergreen High School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers the MYP & DP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asserts the role of English 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised to meet the accreditation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No languages other than English were 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used to guide and revise the

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publicly funded school • English as the language of instruction • Students represent over 60 countries and 44 different languages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chinese, Spanish, & French offered as additional languages • Activities and clubs offered to develop students' sensitivity to their own and other cultural and linguistic heritages 	<p>requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP development/revision is limited to the IB program coordinators plus a small committee • LP not formally introduced to the community 	<p>used in classes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No opportunities for language development in other languages were observed 	<p>LP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally helpful to the IB coordinators • Little familiarity of the documents among teachers
<p>5. Happy Achievement International School</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuum School • Privately funded international school • English as the language of instruction • Students represent over 40 countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasizes the role of English • Chinese, Spanish, & Korean offered as additional languages • Encourages parents to maintain their children's mother tongue and facilitate a mother tongue language program to be taught by external providers outside the school day 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised by a language policy development committee of 15 to 16 representatives • LP shared with the school community through emails, website, and PD trainings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language teachers are more familiar with the LP • Subject and older teachers are less familiar with the LP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used to construct the LP • <i>Language and Learning</i> used in the annual teacher orientation to guide the framework of language teaching

<p>6. Circle International School</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuum School • Privately funded school • Value placed on diversity of languages • Host country has more than 60 local languages; English is widely spoken in the host city • Students represent 64 different nationalities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the understanding that all teachers are language teachers • Students' language learning is critical to academic success • English is the language of instruction • French & Spanish offered as additional languages • EAL Program provides support for ELs • Mother tongue development/ maintenance is a priority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed by small teams of teachers, IB coordinators, and administrators • Devoted staff development sessions to discussing the LP • Feedback was requested and incorporated • LP was significantly revised recently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty reconciling LP and admissions policy • Recent efforts towards building awareness of the LP among all teachers • Making LP implementation and language development a school-wide priority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide teachers and staff with a strong theoretical foundation in LP • School LP is modeled after these documents • These documents are not discussed widely among teachers • In need of more practical guidance regarding the challenges they encounter
<p>7. Excellence Academy of India</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers the PYP & DP • Privately funded school • Multilingualism is part of the school's reality • English as the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language and the LP play a central role • LP is viewed as a working document • LP is exhibited in the school library • Challenge to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP steering committee is broadly inclusive with 28 members • LP reviews take place every 2 years • LP revisions reflect the changing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP implementation allows for students to explore the languages most relevant to them • It is a priority that students understand the role that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents were helpful in LP development and review • Documents are used to train incoming

	<p>language of instruction, Telugu as the regional language, Hindi as a national language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students come from a variety of home language backgrounds • About one-third of students struggle with English proficiency 	<p>strike a balance between mother tongue support and developing English proficiency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The burden of LP implementation is spread among all teachers • Language is promoted through school-wide assemblies (Telugu, Hindi, etc.) • Encourages family involvement in mother tongue development 	<p>student population</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school would like to get more community involvement in the LP development • LP was developed through backward planning of language expectations in the DP • LP is available through Google Docs for suggestions and feedback 	<p>language plays in learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing strong writing skills is a priority • Many library and electronic resources are made available to students 	<p>teachers and staff to maintain a shared understanding of LP school-wide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At times the documents contain too much jargon for general accessibility
<p>8. Leadership School of Japan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers the MYP & DP • Privately funded school • English as the language of instruction • Students are mostly native Japanese 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English is primarily the language of instruction • English language support offered to develop students' English proficiency in MYP programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised by the MYP coordinator with input from English teachers • Survey sent out to elicit suggestions to improve the LP • Parents and students were not involved in the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support offered to develop students' English proficiency • Subject teachers normally do not focus on developing students' English skills • Most 7-8 grade teachers are not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers more familiar with <i>Language and Learning</i> • Hope that more practical and hands-on recommendations will be included to

	speakers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Japanese offered to all students • Students with home languages other than English and Japanese are encouraged to continue development of those languages 	<p>development process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP was not formally introduced to teachers 	fluent Japanese and English bilinguals, as stated in the LP	guide teachers
--	----------	--	---	---	----------------

Appendix B:
Interview Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a study about language policy in International Baccalaureate (IB) schools. This study is conducted by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). The purpose of the study is to identify how schools develop and implement good language policies.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will take part in a one-hour interview about how you implement language policy in your school/classrooms. The interview will take place at a time convenient for you. The interview will be audio recorded. You may review the recording and request that all or any portion of the recording be destroyed.

All information about you will be confidential. Only the CAL research team will have access to it. Researchers will never share any personal information about you with anyone else. Your name will not be used in reports or papers about this project. Your interview responses will not be shared with your school administration.

There are minimal risks for participating in this activity. You may find the activity tiring. If that happens, the researcher will let you take a break.

You will not receive direct benefits, but this research may improve language policies in IB schools. You will not be paid for participating in this study.

If you have any questions about this study, you may contact the co-Principal Investigators: Dr. Beatriz Arias at barias@cal.org or Dr. Na Liu at nliu@cal.org or 001-202-362-0700.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact CAL Institutional Review Board at IRB@cal.org or Laura Wright at 202-355-1544.

Print Name

Signature

Date

Appendix C:
Observation Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a study about language policy in International Baccalaureate (IB) schools. This study is conducted by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). The purpose of the study is to identify how schools develop and implement good language policies.

If you agree to participate, we will observe your classroom for two class periods at two different times. This activity will take place during the school day. We will take notes during the observation. You may review the notes and request that all or any of the notes be destroyed.

All information about you will be confidential. Only the CAL research team will have access to it. Researchers will never share any personal information about you with anyone else. Your name will not be used in reports or papers about this project. Observations from your classroom will not be shared with your school administrators.

There are minimal risks for participating in this activity.

You will not receive direct benefits from this study, but this research may help improve the language policies in IB schools. You will not be paid for participating in this study.

If you have any questions at any time about this study, you may contact the co-Principal Investigators: Dr. Beatriz Arias at barias@cal.org or Dr. Na Liu at nliu@cal.org or 001-202-362-0700.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact CAL Institutional Review Board at IRB@cal.org or Laura Wright at 202-355-1544.

Print Name

Signature

Date

Appendix D:

Interview Protocol for Senior leadership member and IB coordinator

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview today. My name is XXX and I am xxx (title) at the Center for Applied Linguistics, a non-profit research organization in the United States of America. This interview will take about one hour and will include around 10 questions regarding your experiences and opinions on the language policy in your school. The goals of this project involve identifying exemplary practices in school-based language policy implementation for the purpose of promoting multilingualism and linguistic diversity in schools and communities.

Could you please review and sign a consent form before the interview? I would like your permission to audio record this interview so I can accurately document the information you convey. If you do not wish to be recorded, it is fine. Your participation in this interview is completely voluntary and anonymous. If at any time during the interview you wish to discontinue the recording or the interview itself, please feel free to let me know and we will stop. All of your responses will be kept confidential and used only for research purposes. Do you have any questions or concerns before we begin? If not, with your permission we will begin the interview. I will begin recording now.

I. The first series of questions is about your school contexts.

- 1) Would you please describe the national or local language policies that impact your school?
 - a. What languages are used in the local communities where your school is located?
 - b. Please describe your student population and their language profiles.

II. The second series of questions is about the following IB documents: *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012).

- 2) In the development and implementation of your school's language policy, how are *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012) used?
 - a. To what extent are they helpful in the development of the school's language policy?
 - b. Are there elements in these documents that might be further developed to better support the development of schools' language policies?
- 3) Would you please describe any professional development opportunities associated with developing or implementing the school's language policy?
 - a. To what extent were these two documents used for these professional development sessions?

III. The third series of questions is about the development process of the language policy in your school.

Interview Protocol
For Senior leadership member and IB coordinator

- 4) Would you please describe the language policy in your school?
 - a. Could you describe how it was developed?
 - i. Did you establish a language policy steering committee? If yes, who is represented in the committee? What are their responsibilities?
 - ii. What elements and factors were taken into consideration when the language policy was developed?
- 5) What challenges did you come across in the development of the language policy?
- 6) To what extent does the language policy connect with other school-based initiatives, curriculum, and other official policies?
 - a. To what extent does the language policy connect to components of program frameworks and teaching/learning approaches in IB programs?

IV. The fourth series of questions is about the implementation process of the language policy in your school.

- 7) In terms of its implementation, would you describe how the language policy was introduced to various stakeholders within the school community?
 - a. How did its introduction involve establishing a shared understanding of the policy among different stakeholders?
- 8) Would you please describe the various strategies utilized to promote and maintain the language policy over time?
 - a. Would you describe the challenges you are aware of that may be faced by schools, administrators, and teachers related to the implementation of the policy?
 - b. Would you describe the supports that you are aware of that might positively impact implementation of the policy?
- 9) Would you please describe how the language policy is evaluated in terms of the types of evidence that might be collected and who is involved in the review process?

V. The final question regards additional thoughts.

- 10) Any final comments on the development and implementation of the language policy in your school or IB schools in general?

**Appendix E:
Interview Protocol for Teachers**

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview today. My name is XXX and I am xxx (title) at the Center for Applied Linguistics, a non-profit research organization in the United States of America. This interview will take about one hour and will include around 10 questions regarding your experiences and opinions on the language policy in your school. The goals of this project involve identifying exemplary practices in school-based language policy implementation for the purpose of promoting multilingualism and linguistic diversity in schools and communities.

Could you please review and sign a consent form before the interview? I would like your permission to audio record this interview so I can accurately document the information you convey. If you do not wish to be recorded, it is fine. Your participation in this interview is completely voluntary and anonymous. If at any time during the interview you wish to discontinue the recording or the interview itself, please feel free to let me know and we will stop. All of your responses will be kept confidential and used only for research purposes. Do you have any questions or concerns before we begin? If not, with your permission we will begin the interview. I will begin recording now.

I. The first series of questions is about your school contexts.

- 1) Would you please describe the national or local language policies that impact your school?
 - a. What languages are used in the local communities where your school is located?
 - b. Please describe your student population and their language profiles.

II. The second series of questions is about the following IB documents: *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012).

- 2) In the development and implementation of your school's language policy, how are *Language and learning in IB programmes* (IBO, 2011) and *Guidelines for school self-reflection on language policy* (IBO, 2012) used?
 - a. To what extent are they helpful in the development of the school's language policy?
 - b. Are there elements in these documents that might be further developed to better support the development of schools' language policies?
- 3) Would you please describe any professional development opportunities associated with developing or implementing the school's language policy?
 - a. To what extent were these two documents used for these professional development sessions?

III. The third series of questions is about the development process of the language policy in your school.

- 4) Would you please describe the language policy in your school?

- a. Could you describe how it was developed?
 - i. To what extent were you involved in the development of your school's language policy?
 - ii. What elements and factors were taken into consideration when the language policy was developed?
- 5) What challenges did your school come across in the development of the language policy?
- 6) To what extent does the language policy connect with other school-based initiatives, curriculum, and other official policies?
 - a. To what extent does the language policy connect to components of program frameworks and teaching/learning approaches in IB programs?

IV. The fourth series of questions is about the implementation of the language policy in your school.

- 7) Would you please describe how the language policy was introduced to you?
 - a. How did its introduction involve establishing a shared understanding of the policy among different stakeholders?
- 8) Would you please describe how you implement the language policy in your classroom?
 - a. Would you describe the challenges you are aware of that may be faced by schools, administrators, and teachers related to the implementation of the policy?
 - b. Would you describe the supports that you are aware of that might positively impact implementation of the policy?
- 9) Would you please describe how the language policy is evaluated in terms of the types of evidence that might be collected and who is involved in the review process?

V. The final question regards additional thoughts.

- 10) Any final comments on the development and implementation of the language policy in your school or IB schools in general?

Appendix F:
Observation Protocol

Teacher:	Date:
School:	Grade/Level:
Observer:	IB Program:

Class period or time of class	
Topic or topics	
Describe the classroom setting	
Describe the student population (number of students, ethnicities, etc. and language backgrounds)	
Describe how the teacher implements the school language policy	

Observation Protocol

Document what language the teacher uses for instruction and communication in the classroom	
Document whether and how the teacher encourages the use of languages other than the primary medium of instruction in the classroom	
Describe how the teacher scaffolds the content and make positive attempts to draw out the experience of students and use strategies to make the content comprehensible	
Note down any non-verbal behavior	
Surprises/concerns, especially related to the language policy or languages used in the classroom	