

Successful Elements in Action: Towards an Integrated Learning Model in Pre-service Teacher Training

Resumen

Definir qué es éxito en educación bilingüe es una tarea compleja. La literatura sobre este tema se suele centrar en los resultados de aprendizaje, y más concretamente suele presentarlos en función de las mejoras lingüísticas y comunicativas de los estudiantes. Sin embargo, si el enfoque pedagógico CLIL supuestamente reporta un buen número de beneficios en nuestras clases, el éxito deberá ser medido teniendo en cuenta este aspecto. Este artículo hace referencia a seis componentes clave que pueden ser considerados como indicadores de éxito. Para ello, nos referiremos al caso del Centro Universitario Cardenal Cisneros, una institución privada de enseñanza superior que ofrece itinerarios bilingües en los Grados de Magisterio.

Abstract

Defining success in bilingual education is a complex task. Literature about the topic usually revolves around learning outcomes, and quite often measuring students' language and communicative gains. However, if the CLIL pedagogical approach is to bring a myriad of benefits in our classrooms, success should be then measured accordingly. The present article is referring to six effective components which may be considered as indicators for success. To do so, the case of Cardenal Cisneros University College, a private higher education institution offering bilingual itineraries in their Teacher Training Degrees will be shared and discussed.

Palabras claves

Liderazgo, programas bilingües, AICLE, educación superior, formación de futuros docentes.

Key words

Leadership, bilingual programs, CLIL, higher education, pre-service teacher training.

Introduction

With the advent of the new European Higher Education Space, universities were faced with the challenge of revising their programmes. This task involved the production of a list of competences undergraduates should reach for each university degree, as to fulfill the academic and/or professional profiles expected by the end of their studies. In the case of Teacher Education Degrees, it seemed blatant that students needed to reach a pluricultural and plurilingual profile parallel to the development of our societies, especially in Europe. However, and in the Spanish context, the number of ECTS devoted to the teaching of language had been drastically reduced. It is in this context that the Bilingual Project at Cardenal Cisneros University College originated.

The success of bilingual projects in Higher Education has been generally researched at a micro-level, analyzing students' learning gains in terms of linguistic competences in the additional language or focusing on students' attitude (see for example Dafouz et al. 2007; or Maíz-Arevalo & Domínguez, 2013). In Spain, and due to the recent inclusion of bilingual programmes at University level, there is a lack of studies focusing on elements indicating success at a macro-level, considering university policies, academic structure, lecturers' training, curricula organization or staff's involvement, among others.

Apart from an excessive attention towards the impact of bilingual programmes in the development of students' communicative competences in the additional languages, literature on the topic is of little use in certain contexts, such as ours in Spain. To start with, most publications suggesting key factors associated with success in bilingual programmes either come from the US context or else provide guidelines based on theoretical constructs. Thus, stakeholders and administration lack information coming from the real implementation of a project with and the follow-up analysis of its impact through considering multiple perspectives.

The present article aims to shed light on what is considered success in a bilingual programme, and will provide six key factors extracted from the bilingual experience at Cardenal Cisneros University College (Alcalá de Henares, Madrid), a Spanish private institution running an awarded Bilingual Project since 2009. Even though the model presented may not fit all contexts and interests, some key elements may be easily transferred and, more importantly, it is intended to spark discussion and reflection on the understanding and application of success in bilingual programmes worldwide.

Literature Review

Defining success is "a difficult and elusive task" (Brisk, 1999, p. 1). In the context of bilingual education in the US, Brisk considers that success has been traditionally linked to enhancement of students' performance in English academic areas. Success studies have since evolved, in her opinion, to identify characteristics of effective bilingual programmes, and, presently, to find the impact of bilingual programmes using in-depth case studies (p. 1). In Brisk's view, "a successful bilingual programme develops students' language and literary proficiency, leads them in successful academic achievement, and nurtures sociocultural integration". Standards for language and academic achievement are set according to the needs and context, and sociocultural integration is considered to be a functional skill, which allows students to participate in the larger and the heritage community (Brisk, 1998).

Once guidelines have been given as to ensure success in bilingual programmes, measures are taken to gather data and obtain information about their impact. Along this line, the U.S. has a long research tradition which needs to be considered is necessary to consider before looking at Europe's reality. Brisk (1999) performed an analysis of a good number of studies developed in

the 80s and 90s to measure success in bilingual programmes implemented in the US. She identified three types of studies: 1) those who are focused on the enhancement of students' performance in English academic areas; 2) those who are concentrated in finding out key characteristics of effective bilingual programmes; and finally, 3) case studies measuring the impact of a particular methodology or model. Brisk concludes that, considering those elements indicating success (fig. 1), most studies focus on the language of instruction and models but disregard the influence of programme characteristics and contextual factors (p.8).

Figure 1. Framework for Defining Success

DEPENDS ON	MEASURED BY	INFLUENCED BY
Program Characteristics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teacher preparation • curriculum • materials • instruction • assessment 	Students' Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • language and literacy development • academic achievement • sociocultural integration 	Contextual Factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students' characteristics • peer pressures • family's role • school characteristics • situational factors (historical perspective)
INPUT	OUTCOME	SUPPORT
QUALITY	SUCCESS	CHALLENGE

(From Brisk, 1999)

Along the same lines, Baker (2006) performed a thorough literature review of the field and found four areas from which the effectiveness of bilingual education should be discussed. These were, first, at the level of the individual child; second, within the same classroom; third, at the school level; and fourth, beyond the school level (pp. 260-261). In the context of a specific bilingual programme in the US, Glover (2008) researched the effectiveness of a bilingual programme developed in Kalamazoo Public Schools using a rubric produced by the Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA). This tool was designed to aid schools to evaluate their services to English Language Learners, based on items contributing to high academic performance, as expressed in Montecel & Cortez, (2002, p. 2). The rubric contains five dimensions: School Indicators, Student Outcomes, Leadership, Support and Programmatic-Instructional Practices.

In 1999, the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) founded the IDRA to identify 10 exemplary bilingual education programmes in schools in the US. After examining those, they identified 25 common characteristics and criteria that were responsible for the success of the programmes. Success was understood as evidence of academic achievement for LEP students in bilingual education programmes (INDRA, 2002¹). Her conclusions indicate that decisions on why a program is successful or not are usually made considering elements which do not exemplify big picture. Suggestions are made as to consider the community members, teachers and other staff, and to envision the model from a macro-perspective beyond test scores and academic performance. While it may be evident that the long tradition of bilingual education in the U.S. may not be in need of studies focused on success anymore, Navés (2009) indicates that:

¹ Information about this initiative can be found at <http://idra.org>

In the last two decades, while in Europe and Asia the main emphasis is still on describing the rationale and benefits of implementing content and language integrated (CLIL) approaches and methodologies, in North America the emphasis has shifted to further investigating the characteristics of efficient immersion and bilingual education programmes. (p. 36)

This tendency may be argued with latest research dealing with good practices in bilingual projects, therefore shifting the focus of attention to key elements which ensure quality and success in the implementation of these projects. That is the case of Lasagabaster and Doiz (2016) who have recently edited a volume on good practices in Primary and Secondary Bilingual Programmes.

Specialists involved in launching CLIL in Europe developed an international long-term project known as The CLIL Matrix (2004-2007)². This initiative, coordinated by David Marsh, aimed to support language and subject teachers in implementing CLIL successfully. To do that, the experts created an awareness-raising tool, which involves the user answering 80 questions based on 16 good practice indicators in relation to the 4 Cs framework. As it is, this tool considers that success in bilingual education using CLIL is basically underpinned by the teachers' role. This is also the opinion of De Graaff et al. (2007: p. 620) who presents five main indicators:

- Teacher facilitates exposure to input at a (minimally) challenging level.
- Teacher facilitates meaning-focussed processing
- Teacher facilitates form-focussed processing
- Teacher facilitates opportunities for output production
- Teacher facilitates the use of strategies

Success in CLIL has been more recently approach by Bertaux et al. (2009) with The CLIL Teacher Competence Grid³. Again, this tool consists of a number of “can do” statements directed to teachers involve in bilingual teaching through CLIL. The grid is divided into two sections, the first focused on those skills and knowledge necessary to launch the CLIL programme, and the second revolving around those needed to implement it. The grid contains macro-competences, such as: programme parameters, CLIL policy, language competences for teaching CLIL, course development and partnerships in supporting learning (first section), and integration, implementation, second language acquisition, interculturality, learning environment management, learner focus in the CLIL environment, learning skills focus in CLIL, learning assessment in CLIL, lifelong learning modelling, and innovative teaching and learning approaches. As the authors state in the webpage where the grid is available: “these competencies need to be further situated in the context of best practice in education in general” (page 1). Thus, CLIL is used as a springboard to help teachers improve their teaching quality in general terms, even when an additional language is not used. The grid, however, may appear too daunting for teachers wanting to embrace this pedagogical approach, and probably is too ambitious for practitioners who have just arrived to this context. In any case, the elements responsible for quality in CLIL are again the teachers.

As a follow up of this initiative, Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010) included a CLIL Tool Kit as a chapter in their publication. Even if the kit was presented as “a tool kit for teachers to map CLIL practice for their own context and learners” (p. 48), the model is much more ambitious than that

² The programme was produced by Anne Maljers (Netherlands), David Marsh (Finland), Stefka Kitanova (Bulgaria), Dieter Wolff (Germany), and Bronislawa Zielonka (Poland). More information available here: <http://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/CLILmatrix/index.htm>

³ The Grid can be found at: http://cell-eu.eu/cms02/fileadmin/daten/Dateien/Konferenzen/THE_CLIL_TEACHER_latest_version.pdf

and involves agents other than the teachers. The kit starts inviting institutions to have a shared vision for CLIL to begin with. Establishing ideal and global goals which are then shared and discussed will help everybody involved in the implementation of the project to know why they are embracing this pedagogical model and what they can get from it.

The second stage is ‘Analysing and personalizing the CLIL context’, inviting those agents responsible for CLIL in the institution to “construct a model (...) [which] reflects the local situation” (p. 52-53). In other words, see the relevance this programme may have in the context where it will be implemented as to foster a bi-, plurilingual community. This leads to stage 3, which is interested in providing the teacher with steps and tools, essentially based on the 4Cs Framework in order to plan their units. Actual preparation of materials and resources, as well as the organisation of tasks and activities, is carried out in stage 4, which is labelled ‘Preparing the Unit’. These stages are basically undertaken by practitioners.

Stage 5 has to do with the monitoring and evaluation of CLIL in action. In this case, the authors indicate that this “is not about assessing student learning” but about “understanding classroom processes as they evolve to gain insights which inform future planning” (p. 48). In this case, the need to reflect on practice and plan for improvement is encouraged. Finally, stage 6 is directed towards improving teachers’ professional development with the use of inquiry-based practice through LOCIT (Lesson Observation and Critical Incident Technique (LOCIT) (Coyle, 2005).

Also in the European Context, well-known CLIL author Keith Kelly provides a critical insight on the excessive responsibility given to teachers when implementing CLIL programmes. As he puts it, when you have a ‘perfect’ CLIL teacher, “then CLIL has a chance when the other variables [management, resources and learners] are missing or measure low on our scale” (2014, paragraph 6). In other words, as to have a picture perfect CLIL environment, we need to provide teachers with necessary, if not essential, support. To do that, he makes us reflect on management factors, teacher factors, resource factors and finally, student factors.

Kelly pinpoints critical elements to be considered in the designing and implementation of a bilingual programme. For example, the need to have governments involved, passing legislations which regulate not only curriculum content, but also methodology used, as well as teacher training requirements to enter the programme. Also, he highlights the need to provide teachers with training about the nuts and bolts of CLIL, which is considered a methodology by Kelly, while also guidance in the creation of didactic materials and resources. Another key component is to facilitate teachers becoming part of a community of CLIL practitioners by sharing and discussing their views beyond the classroom.

Another author dealing with key factors to be considered when implementing CLIL programmes is Muñoa Barredo (2012), whose work is based on the Ikastola’s experience in the Basque Country. These factors include the promotion of CLIL programmes by the whole school, and not just as an individual initiative; the need to support the program with didactic materials suitable to students’ needs; the need to emphasize teacher training as something more than changing the language of instruction; and finally, to organize how these programmes may be evaluated in order to measure whether aims stated have been reached. While teachers are responsible for most of these areas, there is also a call for educational authorities and political stakeholders to envision bilingual projects as a government responsibility in need of adequate addressing.

An attempt to offer an instrument to evaluate CLIL programmes has been recently made by Pérez Cañado (2016). The study presented describes the process of creation and validation of a set of questionnaires directed to language teachers, non-linguistic area teachers, teaching assistants, students, and parents to gather information about specific characteristics of different CLIL programmes. The author makes an important step when indicating the need to gather

information from different perspectives; however, questionnaires are based solely on perceptions, and the criteria included is sometimes difficult to assess without other tools, such as peer observation, self-assessment or students' progress evidences, to mention just a few. In any case, it would be interesting to see if experimental research carried out using these tools provides valid results and conclusions to the area.

In the area of Higher Education, Pavón and Gaustad (2013) puts forward the circumstances and requirements that launching a bilingual programme at the university level involve in the Spanish context. Also, the authors reflect on five elements a bilingual project in HE should consider: time sequence, teachers' training, coordination, language support and other complementary measures. In their conclusions, Pavón and Gaustad (2013) indicate that one of the main drawbacks of implementing this type of projects is the lack of linguistic proficiency teachers and students may have to launch the programme effectively. The work, however, is not based on any specific experience where these elements may be found.

More empirical-oriented research on the impact of bilingual programmes is generally directed to find out whether CLIL is having an effect on students' communicative competence and content acquisition. Bilingual projects running in Spain have recently reported their impact in students' learning. Two of these works will be highlighted for this article. The first one is the one conducted by Dobson et al. (2010) concerning the evaluation of the Bilingual Education Project developed by the British Council and the Ministry of Education since 1996. This project involves an integrated curriculum and an early start in the acquisition of the English language as its most outstanding characteristics. It involved 74 primary schools and 40 secondary schools. Observations, interviews and questionnaires were used, thus providing a good number of examples of interactions happening during lessons and literal responses given by students. Most items studied focused on students' language use and perception of their learning experience; however, there are also references to items signaling good practice in the classroom, such as judicious use of Spanish in the classroom, or the tendency to avoid spoon-feeding. It could be argued that these items may be crucial components in the development of CLIL practices.

Another study, still in progress, was conducted in 2016 by the regional government in the Autonomous Community of Madrid. The government shared the results of the First Evaluation Report of the Bilingual Programme in the region, which involves 494 educational centres (Primary and Secondary education) at this moment. The report showed that students involved in the Bilingual Programme obtained comparatively better results than their monolingual education counterparts in the University Entrance Exam (both in the content and English language areas) and in the TIMMS and PISA evaluations.

In the area of Higher Education, empirical research is generally focused on demonstrating students' learning gains when enrolled in EMI programmes at University. This is the case of Maíz-Arévalo & Domínguez-Romero (2013) who present self-reported perceptions of improvement of language skills, use of strategies, motivation and participation, and acquisition of disciplinary content in an EMI business administration and economics Degree at Complutense University. Results are positive, as students perceive this EMI experience as contributing to their learning, and not as an obstacle. In the same vein, Dafouz-Milne and Camacho-Miñano (2016) present results on the impact of EMI instruction in an Accounting Degree. This four-year longitudinal study found no statistical differences across groups, indicating that EMI is not affecting students' learning outcomes negatively. In a different area, Lasagabaster (2016) supports research focused on non-linguistic outcomes in EMI settings, and presents a study involving 189 students enrolled in EMI courses at a Spanish university, seeking information about students' motivation. Results showed that students' ideal L2 self and? their

attitudes to EMI and family influence were the best predictors of their intended learning effort. The majority of this body of research is set in the context of Business & Administration studies. Works dealing with in-service teacher training using CLIL in Spain are almost inexistent at the moment.

All in all, literature on success in bilingual education is more often than not stemming from theoretical constructs. There is thus a need to investigate and share successful characteristics spotted in bilingual projects which have been running for several years now, with the purpose of considering successful elements in action. Measuring students' communicative development in the additional language is, undoubtedly, one of the milestones of bilingual education, but falls short in considering the rich myriad of benefits CLIL purportedly brings into the classroom.

Characteristics of the Bilingual Project at Cardenal Cisneros University College

At the time the Bilingual Project was launched, 2009, bilingual programmes in higher education were still in their embryonic phase. Since then, universities have made clear efforts to deliver university degrees and postgraduate courses which favour students' additional language competences and improve internationalization (see Ramos García for a compilation of bilingual initiatives in Spanish Universities, 2013).

The Bilingual Project was launched in April 2009 with a general meeting where the coordinator of the project explained the main objectives of the programme, as well as the impact that the planned actions would hopefully have on trainees' training and experience. The Bilingual Project encompassed three areas, namely, University Lecturers' training, the creation of bilingual itineraries for the Teacher Training Degrees, and finally using research as a means to establish contact with schools, but also to get feedback from our teaching practice. The main philosophy behind the programme is that students' training should not be limited to language development but expanded to make them experience what they will later apply in the schools, as suggested by authors such as Coonan (2007), de Graaff et al. (2007), Mehisto (2008), and later by Coyle et al. (2010).

The university lecturers participating directly as teaching staff for the bilingual itineraries volunteered to participate in the programme. At that time, they had proved to have an advanced level of English, and committed to being trained in both language and methodology. This training was long-term and remains in place today. Institutions such as the British Council, NILE or experts from other universities, such as Do Coyle (University of Aberdeen) have been responsible for the delivering the contents (see Johnson, 2013, to see the whole training programme).

The bilingual itineraries were designed as a progressive delivery of subjects in English and through CLIL. Students start by taking one bilingual subject per semester and may take more than 50% of their credits in English by the end of their studies, when they choose the English specialization. The itinerary thus covers 33% to 50% of the credits delivered and includes a compulsory teaching practice period conducted either in a bilingual school or in a school in an English-speaking country.

It is important to highlight that CLIL is seen here as a pedagogical approach, and not as a bilingual context. Even if we understand that CLIL has been defined as an 'umbrella term', it is our belief that this metaphor tends to foster ambiguity and misunderstandings when dealing with the approach in practice. Therefore, we consider that delivering a subject in an additional language for less than 50% of the class time is not enough to state that CLIL is being used, or that this is a CLIL context. In our view, CLIL is not being used if there is not a methodological change which allows students to access learning by providing them with a variety of resources,

techniques, materials and strategies which prevent language from becoming an obstacle in the classroom.

Since 2010, bilingual itineraries have been successfully developed and implemented in Cardenal Cisneros University College. The programme has been recognized by Cambridge ESOL and the Federation of Catholic Schools with the recognition 'BEDA CUM LAUDE' (year), and it has also been awarded with the European Languages Label (Ministry of Education), which acknowledges initiatives promoting cultural awareness and languages learning. In 2016 the project was also recognized by Cambridge ESOL for its efforts and services to integrate Cambridge exams in the programme.

Research on the development of the programme, although scarce at this moment, is quite positive. Johnson (2012) conducted a case study with five university lecturers where teachers' beliefs were investigated. Using questionnaires at the beginning of the programme and three years after, the researcher found out that the CLIL teacher training programme had made an impact on teachers' epistemological beliefs about teaching-learning, modifying their teaching skills towards more inclusive and student-centred classroom dynamics, and giving them a sense of empowerment.

From the perspective of students, Fernández and Johnson (2016) performed an analysis of students' responses to a questionnaire about their perceptions and experiences. From 23 participants, 91% stated they knew what CLIL was and could identify it in practice. They claimed to have improved their listening skills and vocabulary greatly, while their grammar and writing were also better. Comparing subjects delivered in Spanish and in English, students claimed that bilingual subjects offered them more opportunities for autonomy, reflection, physical movement and interaction, without increasing the level of difficulty. Therefore, students recognize a change in the methodology used, and the fact that language was not an obstacle for them.

Success factors explored

In what follows, six main elements which may lead to success in bilingual programmes will be further analysed and explained. As the context of the present article is set in Higher Education and, more specifically, in Teacher Education degrees, efforts have been made to highlight aspects which may be transferable to other contexts and educational levels.

A project for all

This first success elements run parallel to the 'shared vision of CLIL' suggested by Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010), and also the "promotion of CLIL programmes by the whole school" proposed by Muñoa Barredo (2012). In our institution, it was the head department together with a few specialists who decided to put bilingual education at the front of teachers' training. When they considered the organization of the project, they established that one of the risks would be related the fact that it would only involve agents who would be directly responsible for it. In the case of bilingual projects, the chances are that it will be just the English-speaking teachers who feel 'inside' the project. This may create controversies regarding English teaching as an intromission more than as an opportunity and challenge.

As far as possible, everybody should have the opportunity to contribute and participate in an innovation project. This can be achieved by conducting at least two general meetings per year inviting people to participate (including administrative staff); offering learning community opportunities for English language learning and professional development, and creating a sense of ownership and opportunity (celebrating awards, creating challenges, and seeking

opportunities to share and discuss our practices). In other words, implementing an innovation project could (and should) be an opportunity to enhance our institution as a Professional Learning Community.

More specific measures promoting a shared vision may include:

- Encouraging institutions leaders, principals or directors to set objectives for the programme which go beyond linguistic parameters.
- Organising informational events for the entire educational community to share their views and know any new initiatives and changes.
- Offering information channels which may increase the participation of the community in the creation of the project (students included)
- Revising, at least every year, how the programme is evolving, with the aim of checking whether objectives have been reached or need further revision.

University Lecturer Training

The second indicator has been barely dealt with in the literature about the topic (see Pavón & Gaustad, 2013, who also mention this element). It may be taken for granted that university lecturers are fully qualified to deliver content lessons in an additional language granted they have an advanced competence in the language. However, this does not hold true, as the literature in the topic states the need to make a methodological shift. Therefore, specialized training in CLIL is essential to implement a bilingual project which will involve training future teachers.

In the case of Cardenal Cisneros University College, training was designed to cover three main areas: language development, methodology and supporting the group. The first area was almost completely covered by the British Council, delivering intensive on-site courses for our teachers, preparing them to certify their level of English with IELTS academic and/or Cambridge exams. We also included a module on Literacy to promote language awareness.

The second area, methodology, was designed and delivered by the coordinator of the project with the help of external experts. Prof. Ana Halbach, from the University of Alcalá, was a key expert who supported lecturers in this process, giving them the chance to create their own philosophy around bilingual teaching. Apart from this on-site training, lecturers also completed two stays in England, completing a tailor-made course on CLIL teaching and language-across-the-curriculum delivery. These training experiences were also undoubtedly essential for creating a sense of group. Finally, seminars and workshops delivered by experts were also offered. There were sessions on culture, assessment, literacy teaching and other key topics. Lecturers were often asked about areas they wanted to cover so that the training offered could satisfy their needs.

Last, training was also designed to support lecturers when facing the challenge of teaching a subject in an additional language. If we want an innovation project to run smoothly, it is important to care for lecturers' well-being and support. The coordinator of the project organized monthly meetings to discuss hot issues or problems, share materials, reflect together, and to identify training needs. These discussions were also good opportunities to discover synergies among the participants, and increased personal bonds which facilitated coordination and understanding.

This training and time for sharing contributed to the 'shared vision of CLIL' that Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010) talk about. This does not mean that lecturers learned about CLIL, but make CLIL theirs, adapting it to their context, teaching style, and students' needs. Their shared vision can be accessed in a recent publication (see Fernández & Johnson, 2016), where they unveil the

key features of CLIL in their context. Also, a group of teachers involved in the project have published a volume focused on helping teachers navigate CLIL in their classrooms (see Llull et al., 2016).

Specific actions concerning the teachers' training should revolve around their initial beliefs and misconceptions regarding bilingual education and CLIL. Once this background has been explored and shared, the specific needs of bilingual contexts should arise, and strategies to cope with those should be put forward. Scaffolding techniques to support input and output in the classroom, as well as strategies to deal with texts in the classroom are of paramount importance. Teachers should also understand how they use language in their classrooms, and how they should incorporate and integrate language as an essential tool to create favourable learning conditions in their classrooms. Learning how to deal with CLIL is 'a journey' and it is always encouraged to help teachers to work together, have time to coordinate, share and to build their own CLIL project. This process also entails what can be called 'human scaffolding' (Fernández Fernández, 2014), understood as the need of others to progress in teachers' professional development.

Language awareness

Most literature indicates that having a C1 level of English makes teachers capable of delivering a subject through CLIL. This point is also covered in other CLIL documents, such as the CLIL Teacher Competence Grid (Bertaux et al., 2010). We would like to raise awareness on what type of language is necessary to deliver a subject effectively, and how we can make teachers responsible for language in their subjects. In our experience, all language teachers belong to a particular community related to their disciplines and areas, and they are in charge of the language of this area. This is what Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2010) label as 'language of learning'.

Apart from this, teachers should also be aware of the language related to the task at hand. If we are asking students to discuss in groups, they need to know the appropriate language to give opinions, agree and disagree, support others' views or illustrate with examples. Much of the teacher's frustration when implementing CLIL may originate from their lack of training on using this 'language for learning'.

Finally, it is important to notice that some language needs arising in the classroom are completely unexpected. This is what Coyle, Hood and Marsh identified as 'language through learning' (2010). Non-native teachers may find it difficult to cover these areas, as they may go beyond their areas of speciality or knowledge. It is in these situations where language assistants should have an active role in the classroom.

In the Bilingual Project at Cardenal Cisneros University College, resources have been created to scaffold language in all areas. One particular resource is 'the language fan' consisting of several cards containing useful language structures to apply in different subjects. Students find this especially useful when they start to take subjects in English in the first year of their degree. Some teachers, like the social sciences specialists, have developed specific cards for their content areas, which address the 'language of learning'. With this, the teaching staff aims to demonstrate to students that they can create resources for primary students that are adapted to their needs and contexts.

Another distinctive feature of the project is the language assistants' profile. In our view, language assistants should not only be native speakers of the language, but also have a good training in EFL teaching and CLIL as a pedagogical approach. Our language assistants' profile

thus differs from those commonly found at schools, and it is our belief that the LA's training should be at the core of the development of a successful bilingual programme.

Also, and as part of our curriculum for undergraduates completing teaching degrees, we offer training in academic competence in the mother tongue. There is a specific programme dealing with academic skills which is integrated during the four-year degree, and there are two specific training sessions to improve the competence in the Spanish language. It is our belief that language development should not be limited to the additional language. Promoting good practices in developing academic literacy in the mother tongue will greatly benefit bilingual students (see Cummins 1978, 1979).

Actions that institutions should consider in relation to language awareness may include:

- Facilitating coordinated work among teachers in charge of linguistic areas so as to set the type of cognitive academic language proficiency students need.
- Creating shared materials and resources to work on language for learning, which is crucial to create adequate learning conditions in the bilingual classroom
- If possible, asking for specific professional profiles when hiring Language Assistants. Native speakers with a good knowledge of the educational system they are in, and trained to use CLIL in the classroom, would be very helpful.
- Using the CEFR for languages as a guide to understand how students may be supported to progress in their learning. As CLIL will meet students' linguistic needs as they appear, a good contribution to this would be to guide them with "can do" statements helping students to set their progress.

Going beyond the classroom: touching real practices

One of the main tenets of the bilingual project at Cardenal Cisneros University college is working on experiential learning. Students should be exposed to CLIL provision as the main pedagogical approach used in the classroom, however, they should also be in contact with the myriad of bilingual realities the world may offer. To this effect, students taking the bilingual itinerary have a compulsory 6-week bilingual teaching practice period in the 3rd year of their studies. They may choose to complete it either at a bilingual school in Spain or in a school in an English-speaking country. These teaching placements are always monitored by a teacher belonging to the bilingual teaching staff, and include observation and practice of CLIL skills.

Students are also involved in projects where children are participating. This includes collaboration with schools belonging to the Marist institution, schools in the vicinity of the university and also groups of children enrolling in activities organized by students with the help of a lecturer. Some of these activities are now considered micro-teachings that students develop as part of the tasks in subjects. For example, there are interdisciplinary projects involving subjects such as 'Science of Matter and Energy' and 'Foreign Language II' where students design a lesson plan to teach a CLIL Science lesson to primary school students. They later implement their plan with groups of children, and then conduct a reflection session identifying strengths and weaknesses in their original planning. This leads students to put their knowledge and skills in practice, monitored by their lecturers, and helped by their peers.

As part of our student training, the university launched a plan called 'Training Trip' in the 2016/2017 academic year. This encompasses a series of actions aimed at helping to fill many of the learning gaps that the university curriculum cannot cover, and which the university management has considered as essential to complete the professional profile we seek in our students. This training trip includes expert sessions, workshops, complementary training in areas such as cooperative learning, bilingualism, language development, etc. Students are invited to

participate in these sessions, and are awarded with a digital badge or certificate when is then included in their digital learning portfolios.

Finally, opportunities are given to establish contact with primary bilingual practitioners through different initiatives: training excursions, meetings, and seminars. It is worth mentioning that the university holds a training course, known as the Bilingual Campus, each year with the purpose of sharing knowledge and meeting professionals from different areas and perspectives. Also, publications on the topic are fostered, such as the latest monograph volume of the university magazine, *Pulso*, published in 2016⁴, which focuses on CLIL.

This item is more closely related to our context, as we are training future teachers. In the context of other educational levels, interaction among different courses may also be promoted. Programmes concerning literacy development where older students help young children to read may be a good model. Also, equally important are activities where children from different levels have the opportunity to share their learning using with different approaches such as theatre plays, science exhibitions, P.E., and other inclusive activities. Break times may provide a useful setting to carry out these activities.

Also, we encourage the collaboration of schools with teacher training university colleges whenever possible. The administration and political stakeholders should facilitate this joint work which will benefit undergraduates, teachers and pupils alike. Moreover, these types of initiatives should be recognized and praised, as they will lead to an increase in educational quality throughout the whole system.

Towards the Growth Mindset

The Growth Mindset is a term coined by Carol Dweck, a well-known Stanford University Psychologist, who was interested in finding out why some people were more inclined to be successful than others. During her extensive research, she discovered that people may show fixed or growth mindsets (2006). People with fixed mindsets want to look smart and therefore tend to avoid changes, give up easily, see effort as fruitless, ignore useful feedback and feel threatened by others. However, growth mindsets are led by a desire to learn, and have a tendency to embrace challenges, persist despite obstacles, see effort as a path to mastery, learn from criticism, and be inspired by others' success.

Unexpectedly, the development of this bilingual project led us to think that growth mindsets were being attracted and/or created. In the case of university lecturers, Johnson (2012) demonstrates that lecturers found CLIL as an interesting add-on to their teaching skills, even despite their initial reluctance, and incorporate it as an opportunity to deliver high quality instructions. In the case of students, Fernández Fernández (2014) presented data supported by teachers' perceptions that students on the bilingual itinerary are prone to show growth mindset characteristics, and that these are developed and expanded during their studies. This unexpected finding has led a group of experts from Cardenal Cisneros University College to design a study to prove this with an ongoing longitudinal study which will be published shortly.

This shift in teachers' and students' perceptions and beliefs about their teaching and learning may be decisive for strengthening the educational system. If practitioners are aware of the need to get updated training and incorporate strategies to offer an even better learning experience, the educational system will be renewed and refreshed every now and then, and opportunities for successful educational measures will be provided.

⁴ The electronic edition of this volume can be accessed at: <http://revistas.cardenalcisneros.es/index.php/PULSO>

Specific work in this area may entail researching teachers' and students' beliefs and feelings both during and after their participation in bilingual programmes (and thereafter). Surveys, interviews and observations may be helpful for gathering data about how learning in a bilingual context may lead to changes in our self-perception and self-esteem.

Promoting research

Research was incorporated to the original Implementation Plan for the Bilingual Programme at Cardenal Cisneros University College. At that time, it was envisioned as an area the teaching staff was responsible for. The production of literature around this area has been steady since the beginning of the programme and works can be classified into five different categories: To begin with general research on bilingualism, resources and practices, such as Fernández Fernández & Halbach (2009), Fernández Fernández (2014, 2015), García Esteban (2013, 2015); Johnson (2015), Llull et al. (2016) or Urraca (2011). those dealing with action-research in their classes (such as Fernández Fernández (2011); Aguado et al. (2016); Llull (2012, 2014), or García Esteban (2014). Also, the Bilingual Programme has been researched in terms of teachers' beliefs (Johnson, 2012), and students' opinions, perceptions and attitudes (Fernández Fernández & Johnson, 2016). Another area of interest is the analysis of practices, training needs, and resources in bilingual schools, included in studies such as García Esteban (2015), Fernández Fernández & Halbach (2011); Laorden & Peñafiel (2010), Palacios & Peña (2012) and Palacios (2015). Finally, the Bilingual itinerary is giving lecturers the opportunity for interuniversity projects to happen, as the initiative on Art Education developed together with a Finnish University (see Ulkuniemi & Palacios, 2015).

However, and unexpectedly, research was also a point to be made in students' curriculum. One of the main challenges when proposing the bilingual itinerary for the Teacher Training Degrees was to incorporate the subject 'Final Degree Dissertation' in the programme. This subject, which is included in the official curriculum for the Degrees in Primary and Infant Education, revolves around a personal project students develop in the last semester of their studies. The programme developed in our University entails 12 ECTS and is supervised by a tutor.

Teachers lecturing in the bilingual itinerary have offered a variety of research topics students can choose to conduct their FDD research. These involve areas such as Literacy, Content-subject specific didactics, CLIL Teacher Training, etc. Engaging students in finding out more about bilingual education and CLIL has proved to be a great opportunity for them to expand their knowledge and to provide them with research skills which will be essential in their work as teachers. Also, students who are not taking the bilingual itinerary can choose these research lines and explore this area. A good example of this is the work conducted by Cabezuelo & Fernández Fernández (2013), which is based on Cabezuelo's FDD on Bilingual Teachers perceptions and needs. Apart from content acquisition, language development is also essential in the development of the FDD. Students who are taking the bilingual itinerary carry out the oral defence in the English language, and can optionally write their dissertation in English. In this way, students need to show an appropriate command of both written and oral skills in an academic setting.

Higher Education institutions offering bilingual programmes should articulate the ways in which research on bilingual education would be offered to both teachers and students. These may include establishing research groups, providing teachers with adequate training on research tools and methodologies, allowing sufficient time for coordination and debate, and encouraging teacher-students research. Also, and when possible, final dissertations should be considered as

an opportunity not only to help students know more about this area but to fill some research gaps in the literature while also giving a different perspective about bilingual practices.

Conclusion

The present article attempts to make the case of what we understand as success in a bilingual project. As has been mentioned, most literature on the topic concerns either checking students' communicative abilities after having been exposed to a bilingual project, or justifying the need for bilingual education in different contexts. The time is now ripe for the directors and coordinators of bilingual projects to share key elements which have been essential to develop a programme successfully. These elements should be considered from a macro-level, focusing on the learning community, and showing evidence about how they may be crucial for other contexts.

With the aim of filling this gap, the experience at the Cardenal Cisneros University College has been discussed. This centre implements a bilingual project using CLIL to train future infant and primary school teachers, and has spotted six key elements which have been decisive in ensuring success. First, a shared vision promoted since the project was launched, and built among all the educational community. Second, CLIL methodological training for lecturers. Third, language awareness work, for which language assistants have been of paramount importance. Fourth, the need to take undergraduates closer to their future work contexts and exposing them to different bilingual programmes. Fifth, the need to promote research among teachers and students. And finally, to understand the importance of cultivating a growth mindset, which may be favoured by this type of CLIL provision.

The existence of these factors may be further explored by experts working in similar contexts, and this list may be increased and enriched with other experiences involving the implementation of bilingual programmes. Universities should find opportunities to share initiatives and strategies, promoting joint programmes which will enrich students' learning profiles beyond the acquisition of language competences in the additional languages. The evaluation of success should therefore have a wider scope, considering that CLIL can have an impact on many areas, which may surpass the academic arena.

Bibliography

- Aguado, J.; Llull, J.; Palacios, A. (2016). Diseño de una herramienta para la co-evaluación de la docencia universitaria en el CUCC desde el enfoque CLIL. In R. Fernández and A. Palacios (Coords). *CUCCInnova '15. I Jornadas de Experiencias educativas innovadoras en el Centro Universitario Cardenal Cisneros*. Alcalá de Henares: Centro Universitario Cardenal Cisneros.
- Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bertaux, P., Connan, C.M., Frigols, M.J. and Mehisto, P. (2010). *CLIL Teacher Competences Grid*. CLIL CASCADE NETWORK.
- Brisk, M.E. (1998). *Bilingual Education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brisk, M.E. (1999). Quality Bilingual Education. Defining Success. *Lab Working Paper N. 1*, 1-11.
- Cabezuelo Gutiérrez, P. and Fernández Fernández, R. (2014). A case study on teacher training needs in the Madrid Bilingual project. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 7/2, 50-70.

- Chostelidou, D. & Griva, E. (2014). *Measuring the effect of implementing CLIL in Higher Education: An experimental project*. *Procedia- Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 116, 2169-2174.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P. & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL. Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coyle, D. (2005). *Developing CLIL: Towards a Theory of Practice*, APAC Monograph 6, Barcelona: APAC.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, 49, 222–251.
- Cummins, J. (1978). Bilingualism and the development of metalinguistic awareness. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 9, 131–149.
- Dafouz, E., Núñez B., Sancho, C. Foran, D. (2007). Integrating CLIL at the tertiary level: Teachers' and students' reactions. In D. Wolff and D. Marsh (Eds.). *Diverse Contexts Converging Goals: Content and Language Integrated Learning in Europe*, 4, (91-102). Peter Lang: Frankfurt.
- Dafouz-Milne, E. & Camacho-Miñano, M.M. (2016). Exploring the impact of English-medium instruction on university student academic achievement: The case of accounting. *English for Specific purposes*, 44, 57-67.
- De Graff, R.; Yulia A. & Gerard W. (2007). An Observation Tool for Effective L2 Pedagogy in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10 (5), 603-624.
- Dweck, C. (2006). *Mindset: the new psychology of success*. New York: Random House.
- Fernández Fernández, R. and Halbach, A. (2009). Uncovering the approach to literacy of Spanish textbooks used in a CLIL context. In S.A. Ditzel and A. Halbach (Eds.) *Bilingualer Sachfachunterricht (CLIL) im Kontext von Sprache, Kultur und Multiliteralität*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.
- Fernández Fernández, R. and Halbach, A. (2011). Analysing the situation of teachers in the Madrid bilingual project after four years of implementation. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., J. Sierra, and F. Gallardo del Puerto. *Content and Foreign Language Integrated Learning* (pp. 241-2170). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Fernández Fernández, R. (2011). A bilingual literacy experience in tertiary education: a study. *Humanising Language Teaching Magazine*, 13/2.
- Fernández Fernández, R. (2014). Who's afraid of poetry in the CLIL Classroom? *The Teacher (Poland)*, 35, 49-52.
- Fernández Fernández, R. (2014, October 24). Lessons learned from the journey. A Roadmap to implementing CLIL in the Primary and Infant Education Degrees [Unpublished] *II Congreso de Educación Bilingüe*. Instituto Franklin. Alcalá de Henares.
- Fernández Fernández, R. (2015). Reader's Theatre in the CLIL classroom. In Nicolás Román, S and Torres Núñez, J.J. (Eds.) *Drama in CLIL* (pp. 141-166). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Fernández Fernández, R. & Johnson, M. (Eds.) (2016). *Enseñanza Bilingüe en la Educación Universitaria. El enfoque CLIL del Centro Universitario Cardenal Cisneros*. Alcalá de Henares: Centro Universitario Cardenal Cisneros.
- Fernández Fernández, R. & Johnson, M. (2016). Opinions, perceptions and attitudes of a group of students taking a Bilingual Infant Teacher Training Degree: an empirical study", *Pulso*, 39, 59-78.

- García Esteban, S. (2013). Three Frameworks for Developing CLIL Materials In Infant and Primary Education. *Encuentro: revista de investigación e innovación en la clase de idiomas*, 22, 49-53.
- García, Esteban, S. (2014). Using virtual tools for developing autonomous learning and teaching communicative English for professional purposes in Primary Education Degree. *Pulso*, 37, 249-273.
- García Esteban, S. (2015). Soft CLIL in Infant Education Bilingual Contexts in Spain. *International Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics: Special Issue (Bilingual Education)*, 1, 30-36.
- Glover, J. (2008). *Description and Analysis of Bilingual Programs Implemented in Kalamazoo Public Schools*. Honors Theses, Paper 1005. Retrieved from: http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/honors_theses
- Johnson, M. (2012). Bilingual degree teachers' beliefs: a case study in a tertiary setting. *Pulso*, 35, 49-74.
- Johnson, M. (2015). Doing CLIL. In G. Sánchez and J.A. Núñez (Eds.). *CLIL for teachers: from theory to practice* (pp. 27-45). Madrid: CEU Ediciones.
- Kelly, K. (2014). *Ingredients for successful CLIL*. <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/keith-kelly-ingredients-successful-clil-0>
- Laorden Gutiérrez C. and Peñafiel Pedrosa, E. (2010). Proyectos bilingües en los centros de la Comunidad de Madrid: Percepción de los directivos. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 28/2, 325-326.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2016). The relationship between motivation, gender, L1 and possible selves in English-medium instruction. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13, 315-332.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Doiz, A. (Eds.) (2016). *CLIL Experiences in Secondary and Tertiary Education. In Search of Good Practices*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Llull, J. (2012). CLIL in University Context. Teaching Geography to Bilingual Teacher Trainees. *Bilingual teaching-globalization, regional Geography and English integration*. Torun, Poland: EUROGEO – Association of Polish Adult Education.
- Llull, J. (2014). Comics and CLIL: Producing quality output in social sciences with Hergé's Adventures of Tintin. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 7/1, 40-65.
- Llull, J.; Fernández, R.; Johnson, M. & Peñafiel, E. (2016). *Planning for CLIL*. Madrid: CCS.
- Maíz-Arevalo, C. & Domínguez Romero, E. (2013). "Students' response to CLIL in tertiary education: The Case of Business administration and economics at Complutense university". *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas*, 8, 1-12.
- Marsh, D. (2002). CLIL/EMILE – *The European dimension. Actions, trends and foresight potential*. European Commission.
- Montecel, M. & Cortez, J. D. (2002). Successful bilingual education programs: Development and the dissemination of criteria to identify promising and exemplary practices in bilingual education at the national level. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26, 1-21.
- Muñoa, I. (2012). *Key Factors to be considered by CLIL teachers*. Retrieved from: <http://www.eleanitz.org/sites/default/files/Articles/Key%20factors%20to%20be%20considered%20by%20CLIL%20teachers.pdf>

- Navés, T. (2009). Effective content and language integrated learning (CLIL) programmes. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & R.M. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning. Evidence from Research in Europe* (p. 22-40). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Palacios, A. and Peña, N. (2012) Developing an arts curriculum for a bilingual school through a collaborative action-research project. *Proceedings from the 11th InSEA European Congress*. Lemesos, Chipre.
- Palacios, A. (2015) *Inventando Mundos. Diálogos Creativos con David Gamella*. Madrid: Centro Universitario Cardenal Cisneros.
- Pavón, V. and Gaustad, M. (2013). “Designing Bilingual Programmes for Higher Education in Spain: Organisational, Curricular and Methodological Decisions”. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 2 (1), 82-94.
- Ramos García, A. M. 2013. Higher Education Bilingual Programmes in Spain. *Porta Linguarum*, 19, 101-111.
- Ulkuniemi, S. and Palacios, A. (2015). People and Heritage: an Art Education Project between students from Finland and Spain. In A. Saldanha, C. Trigo, M.J. Agra, and T. Torres de Eca, T. (Eds.) *Risks and opportunities for Visual Arts Educators in Europe. Proceedings from the Regional InSEA 2015-Congress*. Lisbon: APECV.
- Urraca, A.S. (2011). Trastornos del Lenguaje y Bilingüismo. En *Retos de la Educación Bilingüe*. Madrid: Secretaría General Técnica, Subdirección General de Documentación y Publicaciones del Ministerio de Educación.

Fecha de envío: 30/05/2017

A rellenar por el Consejo editorial:

Fecha de recepción 30/05/2017

Fecha de aceptación: 17/06/2017