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ABSTRACT

The Importance of Professional Development for Secondary Content Area Classroom Teachers

In this applied project the focus is on the importance of professional development for secondary classroom teachers. The author first reviews some of the issues involved with educating English as a second language (ESL) students in public education. Then the importance of professional development for secondary content area teachers is addressed. Finally, a presentation, along with handouts, is presented about how a year of guided professional development can be used to help secondary content area teachers improve their instruction.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In U.S. schools, according to Waxman and Tellez (2002), “there are over 3.5 million ELLs [English language learners] … and these numbers have increased dramatically during the last few decades” (p. 1). This increase has had a notable impact on the instructional decisions that teachers make in their classrooms each school day. Waxman and Tellez go on to argue that, “the professional development of teachers needs to be seriously addressed in order to improve the education of ELLs” (p. 27). However, the allocation of time and resources allowed for professional development and education to the teachers of ELL students has not met the increase of student populations.

Statement of Problem

The academic achievement of ELLs and how to meet their diverse needs is the major focal point of many discussions among teachers, administrators, and parents. In order to improve academic achievement, Gandara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll (2005) asserted that, “teachers of English language learners need special skills and training to effectively accomplish this task” (p. 1). As stated by Gandara et al., the “greater preparation for teaching ELLs equaled the greater teacher confidence in their skills for working with these students successfully” (p. 12). Teachers are in need of more quality professional development to meet the needs of the ELLs in their classrooms. Along with the need for professional development, teachers of ELLs need a more concrete understanding of the legal aspects that guide the decisions made by states, school
Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) lays out specific requirements that states and districts are to meet in educating English language learners” (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2006, p. 1).

However, many teachers are unaware of the impact this regulation has on their instruction or how they will be held accountable.

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this project was to develop a quality collaborative professional development presentation for secondary content area teachers of ELLs. This professional development presentation includes the examination of: (a) the current achievement gaps in ELL students, (b) teacher accountability, (c) content standards, and (d) ELL instructional strategies. The professional development overview and presentation includes a process that uses professional discussions around research and authentic student work.

List of Definitions

A list of definitions will be useful to understand the various terms used in the realm of education and terms specific to teaching second language learners.

*Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)*: an individual state’s measure of yearly progress toward achieving state academic standards. Adequate Yearly Progress is the minimum level of improvement that states, school districts, and schools must achieve each year (Linn, Baker, & Betebenner, 2002, p. 1).

*Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA)*: the state standardized assessment used to measure the English language standards set by the state for the comprehension of reading, writing, speaking, and listening (Colorado Department of Education, 2005b, p. 1).

*English Language Acquisition (ELA)*: programs that provide services to English language learners (Linguanti, 1999, p. 1, para 2).
English language development, which includes: (a) content vocabulary development, (b) oral language development, and (c) the development of reading and writing (Linguanti, p. 1).

*English language learner* (ELL): student who participates in an English language acquisition program (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2000, p. 222).

*English as a second language* (ESL): a model of instruction providing services to English language learners through a variety of programs and instructional strategies (Echevarria, et al., p. 222).

*Limited English proficient* (LEP): student whose first or primary language is a language other than English, and whose English language ability is below a proficient level in listening, speaking, reading, or writing (Echevarria, et al., p. 223).

*No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB): the most recent authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is the principal federal law affecting K-12 teachers (Linn, Baker, & Betebenner, 2002, p. 1).

*The Bilingual Act (1968)*: enacted in 1968 established educational programs specifically designed to provide educational services to English language learners in public schools (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988, p.1).

**Chapter Summary**

It is clear that the increase of LEP students in public schools in the U.S. has begun to alter the landscape of classrooms all over the nation. Their diverse needs affect every facet of the educational system from district policy to classroom instruction. In Chapter 2, the Review of Literature, background information is presented on the history of bilingual education in the U.S. and its relation to the current achievement and accountability measures for teachers of ELLs. In addition, an overview of second language theories and their impact on instructional programs and strategies used in the education of ELLs are presented. Finally, a review of the current professional development opportunities for teachers and their attitudes toward professional development, as well as the attitudes toward ELLs will demonstrate the need for more
Chapter 3, Method, the procedures for the development of this project have been detailed.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A critical problem in the education system today, according to Waxman and Tellez (2002), “is the shortage of adequately qualified teachers of ELLs and the lack of appropriate preparation for credentialed teachers of ELLs” (p. 3). For instance, Gandara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll (2005), found that, “during the last 5 years, 43% of teachers with 50% or more English language learners in their classrooms had received no more that one in-service that focused on the instruction of ELLs” (p. 13). Therefore, the purpose of this project was to develop a collaborative staff development presentation that is relevant to the specific needs of North Middle School and its population of ELLs, in an effort to eventually increase student achievement in content academic areas of instruction. In a preparation for the professional development, the following chapter reviews: (a) the history of bilingual education in the United States, (b) the types of English language development (ELD) instruction in secondary classrooms, and (c) the impact of teacher accountability.

History of Bilingual Education in the United States

In order to understand the current state of Bilingual Education in the United States, teachers must first understand the history of Bilingual Education. Andersson and Boyer (1970, as quoted in Genzuk, 1998) identified four time periods of bilingual education in the U.S. Each of the following four periods are addressed in the following paragraphs:
1. 1550 to 1815: Bilingual Education for religion and conversion of native languages

2. 1816 to 1887: Bilingual Education for public school instruction and preservation of native languages

3. 1880 to 1960: Abatement of bilingual education for religious and public school instruction

4. 1960 to Present: Revival of bilingual education for public school instruction

The first period of bilingual education began in the Southwestern United States by Jesuit and Franciscan missionaries as a means of educating Native Americans the ways of Christianity (Genzuk, 1998). Also, during this period, bilingualism was accepted in many facets of the culture and even in the political arena where many official documents were published in German, French, and English. According to (Genzuk, 1998), “Like England, the United States had not adopted an official language. Evidence suggests that the framers of the U.S. Constitution believed that a democracy should leave language choice up to the individual” (p. 2).

During the second period of bilingual education, instruction was still centered on religious studies in private schools, and laws were passed in 11 states to allow for bilingual instruction in public schools.

During the third period, the largest group of non-English speaking immigrants appeared in the U.S., while English only statutes were enforced in most states, and the use of any language other than English was prohibited for instruction in public schools and many private schools. In some states, English only statues were established that allowed the state to revoke certification of any teacher “Caught in the criminal act of using any other language for instruction” (Genzuk, 1998, p. 2). Many of the
criminalization, of the use of any languages other than English for instruction, is of historical importance in order to understand the fourth and current period of bilingual education.

The fourth and current period of bilingual education began in 1960 with the arrival of Cuban refugees. The mass immigration forced the public schools in the city of Miami, Dade County to consider educational options for these students. A voluntary bilingual program was offered to students and, eventually, a monolingual option was no longer offered as an option to parents. From the early 1960s through 1975, bilingual programs were started in New Mexico, Texas, California, and Arizona; mainly, Spanish and English were used for instruction. According to Genzuk, “Approximately ninety percent of bilingual education assistance proposals submitted in 1968, involved these two languages” (p. 4).

**Legal Precedence**

Beginning in the 1960s (i.e., the 4th period) with the rebirth of bilingual education, “there was a growing recognition that language minority children needed some manner of special assistance if they were to have an opportunity to succeed in school” (Genzuk, 1988, p. 4). In 1968, Title VII of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, known as, The Bilingual Act, began to provide funds to support bilingual programs. This financial assistance was used to fund the educational agencies at the local level local and to develop and implement new elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet the special education needs of language minority students in the public schools (Genzuk, 1988, p. 5). Two years later, the Department of Health and Welfare (HEW;
“where inability to speak and understand the educational program offered by a school district, the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open up its instructional program to the students” (p. 5). School district staff who failed to provide this assistance would be considered in violation of the Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Finally, in 1974, the Supreme Court decision (Lau vs. Nichols, 1974, as cited Genzuk 1988) “required the establishment of special education programs for students whose primary language is other than English” (p. 5).

The Lau vs. Nichols decision led the staff of the U.S. Office of Civil Rights to develop a document know as the LAU Remedies (1975, as cited in Genzuk, 1988) which were used to help define and determine instructional practices that allowed for meaningful learning opportunities for nonEnglish speaking student. The LAU Remedies described and affirmed instructional practices that were proven through research and English as a second language (ESL) methodology. More recently, Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB; 2001, as cited in U.S. Government Accountability Office [GAO]; 2006) created specific federal funding to support the education of students with limited English proficiency. This federal funding was to be used to support not only instructional programs and activities for language instruction, but for the comprehensive professional development of these programs as well (p. 4). Now, armed with the provisions to implement instruction and professional development for ELLs school districts were now able to begin the process of ELD in classrooms.
The addition of many laws designed to provide appropriate language instruction for LEP students began to filter into the public school system. The LAU Remedies and specific federal funding from the NCLB guided teachers toward the use of ESL methodology instructional practices proven through research. However, it was further legal action that defined ESL instruction and the programs developed to meet the diverse needs of ELL students. First, a compliance system was introduced in order for the federal government: (a) to verify the quality of the programs, (b) allow for effective participation by ELL students, and (c) assure the training of teachers in the field of ESL instruction and the adequacy of resources available.

The common components in bilingual programs and educational programs are the use of a linguistic goal that supports ELD or the goal of bilingualism and the support of ESL trained teachers with experience in first and second language pedagogy and access to the appropriate teaching materials designed to meet the needs of the instructional program (Linguanti, 1999, p. 1). There are many ways to describe and define educational programs for language instruction for limited English proficiency (LEP); in the NCLB the reference used to define all programs that pertain to language instruction for LEP students is described (U.S. GOA, 2006). According to the NCLB Act, there are 10 types of educational programs for language instruction that include:

- bilingual education
- dual language or two way immersion
- transitional bilingual education
- developmental bilingual education
• sheltered English instruction
• structured English instruction
• specially designed academic instruction in English
• content based ESL
• pull out ESL

An explanation for each of these instructional models was provided under the heading of Bilingual Instructional Models: An Overview. With so many choices in instructional models, the schools and teachers much choose the one that will increase student achievement for the LEP population.

Teachers must understand the history of bilingual education in order to understand the misconceptions that may exist. In addition to the history of bilingual education, a background of the legal actions surrounding bilingual education will allow teachers the opportunity to understand the correlation between NCLB and bilingual education. Finally, understanding the variety of educational programs designed for ELL, will allow teachers and administrators to make educated decisions regarding programs used in their own schools and classrooms.

Academic Achievement and Accountability

Academic achievement and teacher accountability have begun to revolutionize the instructional practices content area classrooms. However, according to Abedi and Gandara (2006), “ELL students have historically lagged behind their English proficient peers in all content areas, particularly academic subjects that are high in English language demand” (Abedi and Gandara, 2006, p. 36). Based on the literature on the assessment of
performance gap: (a) parent education level, (b) inequitable schooling conditions, (c) poverty, (d) measurement tools that are poorly designed to assess their skills and abilities, and (e) ELL students are more likely to be taught by teachers without appropriate teaching credentials (Abedi & Gandara). These factors, which play a role in the achievement gap of ELLs, are important to understand. To further illustrate inequitable and poverty conditions additional research has found that schools with the highest concentration of low income, lowest student achievement scores and minority students often employ teachers with the least experience in content areas taught (Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, Rockoff, & Wyckoff, 2007). The types of assessment and their impact is the focus of the research presented in this review.

ELLs are spending more time in mainstream classrooms; as a result, ELLs are being instructed by mainstream teachers (Anstrom, 1997). Also, Anstrom stated that “At the national level, most academic fields, such as English language arts, history, science, and mathematics, have issued content or curriculum standards for their respective areas” (p. 5). With the enactment of NCLB (2001, as cited in U.S. GOA, 2006) and its subsequent revisions, content area assessments and achievement goals are now major factors in the determination of the quality of an LEP student’s education and achievement across content areas.

Limited English Proficient Academic Achievement Trends

In many school districts across the nation, LEP student enrollment is at an all time high. According to the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA; 2001, as cited in Kindler, 2002), the “Reported LEP enrollment levels continued to increase in 2000-2001,
increasing number of LEP students are enrolling in public schools, “An estimated 4,584,946 LEP students were enrolled in public schools, representing approximately 9.6% of the total school enrollment of students. . . . PreK through Grade 12” (p. 3). This is a 105% increase in LEP students since the 1990-1991 school year, while the general school population has increased only 12%. However, the actual academic status of LEP students in the nation is difficult to assess comprehensively due to the “fact that statewide assessments are generally only conducted in selected grades” (p. 13).

Therefore, this project focused on the state of Colorado to illustrate the achievement gap between LEP students and their English speaking counterparts. Rigorous standards have been created for both groups of students in content area assessments. In the state of Colorado alone, the LEP student enrollment in 1994-1995 was 26,765 students in comparison to the 2004-2005 enrollment of 90,391; this was an increase of 237.7%, compared to total student enrollment which had an increase of only 11.5% (National Clearinghouse for Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs, 2006, p. 1). In 2005-2006, the LEP achievement results, in the content areas of mathematics and reading for Colorado eighth grade LEP students, showed that only 48.70 % of LEP students scored proficient and advanced in mathematics and in reading only 64.30%; both percentages are well below the target gains in the state (Colorado Department of Education, 2007, p. 13).

One factor in the low achievement scores in the ELL population is the increased linguistic complexities used to create content area assessments (Abedi & Gandara, 2006). Linguistic complexities used in content area achievement tests include: (a) long
these are shown to “slow down the reader, and make misinterpretation more likely” (p. 39). Abebi and Gandara (2006) also argue that “Unnecessary linguistic complexity may hinder the ELL student to express their knowledge of the construct being measured” (p. 39). Thus, the achievement scores obtained frequently lead to ELLs being placed into class that provide remedial and low-level instruction, thus a creating a further disadvantage for the already disadvantaged learners (Huebert & Hauser, 1999).

Therefore, Abedi and Gandara (2006) maintained that these research findings “can help improve the existing assessment and accountability systems by identifying the sources of linguistic complexity of assessment by providing ways to reduce the level of unnecessary linguistic complexity” (p. 44) found in standardized assessments. The focus on student achievement and accountability led to the use standardized assessment based on the content standards found in all academic classrooms.

Teacher Accountability in Content Standards and Testing

Adequate yearly progress (AYP) is how the federal law measures the achievement of schools, districts, states, and students’ participation in state assessments and performance (U.S. GOA, 2006). AYP requires the disaggregation of data by different subgroups that include ELLs, and all subgroups must make the statewide targets in reading and mathematics. These tests are to provide the data necessary to increase student achievement and meet the national goal for proficiency; which is, all students will be proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014 (Colorado Department of Education, 2005a).
subgroups of students, the school is placed on: (a) a school improvement plan, (b) corrective action, and (c) perhaps restructure of the entire staff. No longer can teachers of these two content areas fail to meet the needs of ELL students, if schools and teachers are to meet the AYP goal of 2014, without the help of all mainstream teachers, who have ELL students in their classrooms. According to Anstrom (1997), “In mainstream settings, native language speakers, for whom English is nearly automatic, can focus primarily on the cognitive task of an academic assignment – learning new information, procedures, etc. . . however, the student with limited ability in English must focus on both cognitive and linguistic tasks” (p. 6). Therefore, teachers must focus on the cognitive and linguistic needs of LEP students when they plan instruction to ensure academic successes that are measured by state standardized assessments for each content area.

**Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA)**

The instructional approaches used in content area classrooms are dependent upon the data provided by states that assess English language proficiency based on English language development standards, much in the same fashion as other content areas are tested (Colorado Department of Education, 2005b). In Colorado, the Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA) is used to assess every identified LEP student for English proficiency and comprehension in: (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) speaking, and (d) listening. Each of the categories included in the test result is a proficiency score that identifies the student’s English fluency level as well as labels a proficiency level in three categories: “(a) nonEnglish proficiency with a beginning or early intermediate level of understanding, (b) limited English proficient with intermediate through midproficient
advanced understanding” (p. 12).

Academic achievement and accountability is a complex issue in regards to the ELLs in our public schools. This unique population of learners requires many teachers change their instructional practices in content area classrooms. In turn, the discussion around a change in instructional practices needs to be the focus of professional development that centers on an understanding in the many program options and the theory behind second language acquisition.

Second Language Acquisition Theory and Program Options

The direct correlation between social and cognitive development and its relationship to other language acquisition theories will enhance the teacher’s ability and to create a more complete learning environment for ELLs at all academic levels. Collier (1995), in order to answer the question of how long it takes to acquire a second language, conducted many carefully controlled studies, which included students’ background variables, and found that,

in U.S. schools where all instruction is given through the second language (English), non-native speakers of English with no schooling in their first language take seven to ten years or more to reach age and grade-level norms of their native English-speaking peers. Immigrant students who have had two to three years of first language schooling in their home country before they come to the U.S. take at least five to seven years to reach typical native-speaker performance. (p. 1)

In order to acquire a second language successfully, conditions similar to those present in the acquisition of the first language must be present to provide a focus on meaning rather than form (Krashen, 1982, as cited in Crandall, 1994). According to Cook (n.d.), there are five hypotheses in Krashen’s theory: “(a) acquisition learning hypothesis, (b) natural
In order to facilitate the acquisition of language with use of Krashen’s (1982, as cited in Crandall, 1994) five hypotheses, Reed and Railsback (2003) indicated that “one concept endorsed by most current theorists is that of a continuum of learning that is, predictable and sequential stages of language development, in which the learner progresses from no knowledge of the new language to a level of competency closely resembling that of a native speaker” (p. 8). These five proficiency stages of language acquisition are: (a) preproduction, (b) early production, (c) speech emergence, (d) intermediate fluency, and (e) advanced fluency.

According to Freeman and Freeman (2001, as cited in Reed & Railsback, 2003), “Current theories of second language acquisition are based on years of research in a wide variety of fields including linguistics, psychology, and sociology” (p. 15). All play a role in the education of students in Grades K-12, regardless of when they begin to acquire a second language.

During the first stage, preproduction which lasts anywhere from 10 hours to 6 months, the learner will gain a limited amount of English and rely on nonverbal communication such as gesturing and pointing. This stage, which is also known as, the silent stage, allows the learner to rely on listening as a strategy to gain understandings of the language rather than the production of speech.

The third stage of speech emergence can last for a minimum of another year and, potentially, could be the longest stage for the learner (Freeman & Freeman, 2001, as cited in Reed & Railsback, 2003). Behaviors will include a vocabulary of approximately 3,000
errors. According to Crandall (1994) during this stage, “individuals develop two types of language proficiency: basic interpersonal language skills and cognitive academic language proficiency” (p. 1).

Typically, during the fourth stage, acquisition of intermediate language proficiency takes another year of learning (Cummings, 1981, as cited in Crandall, 1994). The learner will: (a) begin to demonstrate academic language for content areas, (b) begin to use more complex sentences with fewer grammatical errors, (c) ask for clarification, and (d) participate in longer conversations. Finally, the stage of advanced language proficiency can last for about 5 more years, and the learner uses sophisticated sentence structures close to that of a native language speaker and a willingness to participate in classroom discussions. Understanding and comprehension of these stages of language acquisition is important for the classroom teacher in the planning of curriculum and instructional strategies to meet the needs of all ELL (Crandall, 1994).

Principles for English Language Learners

Mainstream teachers must employ several instructional strategies to meet the needs of the ELLs in their classrooms. According to James (1998, as cited in Reed & Railsback, 2003), there are “Four key principles that can be directly applied to the mainstream classrooms” (p. 23). They are: (a) an increased comprehensibility with the use of objects, demonstrations, and gestures; (b) an increase in interaction with the use of cooperative learning, study buddies, and project based learning; (c) an increase in thinking and study skills by the asking of higher order thinking questions in order to reinforce study skills and test skills; and (d) use of a student’s native language to increase
stages of language acquisition and the four key principles of ELL are important for classroom teachers to know when they plan appropriate content area instruction and make curricular decisions for ELL students.

**Bilingual Instructional Models: An Overview**

In the NCLB (2001, as cited in U.S. GOA, 2006), 10 educational programs for bilingual and English were identified as second language instruction. Each of these instructional models was used to provide a specific type of instruction with a specific language(s) development goal. Since the majority of public schools in the U.S. maintain that the educational goal is English only, those educational programs are highlighted. Each of these educational programs are listed in Table 1.

Table 1

**Educational Programs Identified by NCLB**

*Bilingual education:* the program in which two languages were used to provide the content instruction.

*Dual or immersion program:* is the use of two languages simultaneously to develop proficiency in English.

*Transitional bilingual education:* is an instructional program that developed English as a second language while the amount of native language decreases with proficiency in English.

*Developmental bilingual education:* is an instructional program that teaches content through two languages with the goal of bilingualism.

*English as a second language:* is an instructional program that uses a specifically designed curriculum to develop the use of English.

*Sheltered English instruction:* is an instructional approach in English that uses strategies to create an environment that is understandable to the ELL.

*Structured English immersion:* uses simplified English only for instruction in content
Specifically designed academic instruction: an academic program provided limited English proficiency students access to curriculum.

Content based English as a second language: is an approach to teaching English that uses instructional materials and learning tasks in content area classrooms while developing the English language.

Pull out English as a second language: is a program in which limited proficiency students receive additional language instruction outside of mainstream classrooms.

Bilingual education was an instructional model based on the use of two languages to develop content knowledge only (U.S. GOA, 2006). Another instructional model, the transitional bilingual education model, is used to prepare the LEP student for an all English instructional environment, while some native language is used to provide an opportunity to learn academic concepts (U.S. GOA).

Also in the NCLB (2001, as cited in U.S. GOA, 2000), the ESL instructional model is based on English language, not content, in conjunction with student placement in mainstream classrooms. In one of these programs, Sheltered English instruction, LEP students are provided with an academic content area that includes the use of various instructional strategies. Next, the structured English instruction model is used in a specific setting, and all instruction takes place in simplified English, while students are able to communicate in their native language. In another instructional model, content based ESL, the ESL student is taught through the curricular materials from other
students to be pulled from mainstream classrooms to receive ESL instruction.

Through guided discussions based on the second language theory, teachers can begin to identify students in their classrooms exhibiting the hallmarks of each stage of language development. The use of these new understandings, will in turn, allow each school or content program to then select the instructional program that will best meet the needs of the ELL population.

Secondary Schools: Meeting the Needs of ELLs

The middle school begins the language transition for many limited English students from the acquisition of the English language to the need for proficiency to gain content area curriculum. According to Meltzer and Hamann (2004), “In urban, suburban, and rural areas, significant percentages of students are entering high school with weak academic literacy habits and skills and then are not making adequate progress” (p. 3). It is paramount for all teachers to meet the diverse needs of the secondary student population on both academic and emotional levels. One subgroup of this demographic is ELLs. “In 2002, there were 1,146,154 ‘limited English proficient’ students attending grades 7 through 12 in U.S. public schools” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, p. 3). The number alone demonstrates the immediate need of classroom teachers to understand the impact these learners have on their classroom instructional practices. There are certain considerations that must be taken into account for the educational needs of ELLs. However, “In the case of ELLs, the issue of language becomes explicitly relevant because ELL students must also believe they can become proficient readers in this new language [i.e., English], a feat they may or may not have accomplished in their native
will allow them to become active learners in all content areas. Meltzer and Hamann (2004) stated, “Only then can the dual aims of academic literacy development and content area learning be met” (p. 13).

**English Language Development in Content Classrooms**

Typically, the teachers of content area classrooms must establish a risk free environment for the ELL. Meltzer and Hamann (2004) reported that there are “three aspects of responsiveness [which] emerge related to the psycho-emotional disposition of students to engage in academic literacy development and content area learning” (p. 25). These are: “(a) feeling truly safe to participate even with less than perfect English, (b) having teachers who can distinguish content comprehension problems from language comprehension problem and effectively address both issues, and (c) seeing choice of texts and hearing examples and discussion of issues that reflect ELL’s social realities” (p. 25). Thus, allowing the ELL to become a confident participant in the learning environment.

The use of specific instructional strategies facilitates the participation of ELLs in mainstream classrooms. The following instructional strategies commonly used for participation are: (a) flexible grouping; (b) intolerance of ridicule; (c) extended wait time; (d) inquiry based authentic projects; as well as, (e) instructional supports such as partnering, think alouds, practice before reading aloud, the use of word walls, graphic organizers to support the participation of ELL students (Pappamihiel, 2001; Waxman & Tellez, 2002; both cited in Meltzer & Hamann).
special attention to the motivation and engagement specific to their educational needs. Meltzer and Hamann (2004) noted that teachers in content area classrooms need to consider four ideas in the assessment of ELL students: (a) they need to note that assessments affect how students regard a classroom, a subject, and themselves as learners; (b) they need to carefully design assessments that are not culturally bound; (c) assessment results should reflect content area comprehension and not just language comprehension; and (d) they need to recognize and become sensitive to the knowledge and understandings of assessments that ELL students will bring from other cultures. Each of these ideas required a need for instructional practices that teachers provide with, or enhance, the instructional practices already in place in their content area classrooms.

ESL Practices in Secondary School Content Classrooms

The education of ELLs encompasses many facets of the schools resources, from assessment of language skills, to classroom placement to the specific teacher knowledge of ESL instructional practices. According to Kauffman et al. (1994), “Content-ESL classrooms often have both content and language objectives to teach LEP students academic content” (p. 1). This type of instruction allows the teacher to provide the access LEP students need in order to understand content area curriculum. Before any type of ELL instruction can begin, school staff must have a system for correct placement and use a state recognized proficiency test such as the Language Assessment Scales (LAS; CTB/McGraw Hill, 1990) or Secondary Level English Proficiency Test (SLEP; Educational Testing Services, 1993) to determine the amount of support needed for the student. These same assessments should be used, along with other bodies of evidence,
teacher observations that demonstrate English abilities to determine if the student can then exit the ESL program. Once the determinations are made to exit an LEP student, some type of monitoring program must be in place to ensure the ongoing success of the LEP student. Kauffmann et al. stated that “There are no universal standardized procedures for monitoring students after they have exited the ELL program” (p. 26). In addition, Kauffmann et al. provided examples of procedures from several schools that have high numbers of LEP students. For example, one school district in Texas had a committee that monitored student achievement scores for 2 years after exit, and a school district in New Mexico used classroom observation as a part of the monitoring process.

Regardless of the program or procedures used in a school or district, content and language development must remain at the core of instruction. Kauffmann et al. (1994) maintained that, “In mainstream classrooms, students use language for many purposes. . . and the demands of academic language are different from those of social language” (p. 28). Furthermore, Short and Echevarria (2005) reported, “Although most teachers address content objectives in their lessons, they rarely discuss language objects, a crucial area for ELLs” (p. 12). Therefore, the instructional approach, lesson objectives, and the activities must be carefully designed and implemented to allow access to the content, while the linguistic growth of the LEP student is supported.

Cooperative and interdisciplinary learning strategies are core elements of a successful learning environment for the ELL. According to Kauffmann et al. (1994), cooperative learning, used with heterogeneous grouping, is a strategy that allowed “second language learners. . . to negotiate meaning through the exchange of knowledge
cooperative learning strategy is “a modified jigsaw activity” (p. 50). This activity allows groups of students to segment a specific text, then report their findings to the different groups, “thus, reducing the burden of learning for all the ESL students” (p. 50). Another instructional strategy suggested by Kauffman et al. (1994) was interdisciplinary learning. Use of this strategy allows teachers or students to select a topic to study and integrate this into more than one academic content area. Kauffman et al. also suggested that this strategy “enables ESL students to unite content and language learning in meaningful contexts and make connections across subjects” (p. 57). Use of each of these strategies provides different instructional approaches for the curriculum in content area classrooms, but access must also continue to be integrated into each lesson.

In addition, Meltzer and Hamann (2004) stated that, “ELLs like many students learn best when they have a mix of individual, small group and whole class work (p. 28). Kauffman et al. suggested the following seven modifications for content area classrooms:

1. vary tasks during instructional time
2. organize content into chunks
3. write vocabulary and instructions on the board
4. use real objects or pictures for visuals
5. use students’ background knowledge through shared experiences
6. use facial expressions and gestures
7. increase the use of graphic organizers for content and vocabulary.

Also, Meltzer and Hamann stated, “Teachers who focus on engaging their students in substantive interactions with text and one another about content will be serving the
of instructional approaches, modification strategies and other accommodations for LEP students are only as good as the classroom assessments that are used to evaluate student progress.

The assessment of LEP students must provide the teacher with a clear understanding of both the content knowledge and the language skills (Kauffman et al. (1994). To meet this need, “Many content-ESL teachers draw upon alternative assessments to evaluate the progress of their students in English language skills and content knowledge” (p. 78). In addition, Meltzer and Hamann (2004) reported that, “Content area teachers need to remember that all tests are test for language, even if that is not the target area for measurement” (p. 27).

Two types of content and language skills assessments are portfolios and student projects. Portfolios should include work provided by the student and teacher that are a tangible record of progress over time. In addition, students’ projects are used to present their knowledge on a topic in more depth than a traditional test might allow. The use of these types of assessments “are often preferred [over standardized assessments] because these tools enable students to apply their knowledge and skills more extensively and systematically” (p. 107). The use of portfolios allows teachers to assess progress and address instructional needs more readily. Also, Melzter and Hamann suggested that “Involving students in rubric development is another way to respond to students’ need for voice and input as well as to learn what they value and respect in high quality written work or presentations” (p. 29).
diverse needs of LEP students, but programs are only as good as their implementation and teacher understandings. Therefore, ongoing professional development designed around the specific needs students is imperative to the education of the LEP students.

Professional Development for the Teacher of ELLs

The implementation of a professional development plan must move beyond the idea of one session by an uninvolved party, which does not address the specific population of students and their academic achievement and its direct correlation to the current instructional practices. Waxman and Tellez (2002), stated a “critical problem related to the underachievement of ELLs has to do with the current teaching practices. . . . most common in schools serving ELLs is the direct instructional model” (p. 4). In this model, whole group instruction is used in which the emphasis is on: (a) lecture, (b) drill, and (c) workbook practice. Fletcher and Cardona-Morales (1990, as cited in Waxman & Tellez) suggested that “instructional inadequacies or pedagogically induced learning problems may account for many ELL’s poor academic achievement and low motivation” (p. 5). In order to address the professional development needs of teachers, the following factors must be identified: teacher perceptions and attitudes toward language acquisition and its impact on learning and teacher perceptions and attitudes toward professional development. Only then can the idea of a professional development plan and the use of instructional coaching become a part of the educational process.

Teacher Perceptions and Attitudes Toward ELLs

Mainstream teachers influence the learning of all ELLs in secondary schools. Therefore, before any type of professional development on instructional practices must
Stanosheck-Youngs and Youngs (2001) surveyed junior high/middle school mainstream teachers to assess the perceptions and attitudes of mainstream teachers about the ELL students in their classrooms and how this impacted their understandings about ELL students’ learning. Stanoscheck-Young and Young stated that, “Mainstream teachers’ attitudes toward ESL students are likely to affect what ESL students learn” (p. 98). The relevance of attitudes and perceptions becomes all too clear when, as Reeves (2006) stated, “Secondary ELLs, particularly those in schools with small ELL populations, typically spend the majority of the school day in mainstream classes and attend ESL classes for one or two periods” (p. 131). This trend is not found just in schools with small populations, but in middle schools across the nation with populations as high as 51% of ELLs, who follow the same routine as those who attend schools with smaller percentages.

A notable finding in the study conducted by Stanoscheck-Youngs and Youngs (2001) found that “With regard to teaching ESL student, mainstream teachers were significantly more positive if they had lived outside the United States ($p < .06$)” (p. 112). Surprisingly, Stanoscheck-Youngs and Youngs concluded that it was not the amount of exposure to ESL students that accounted for positive attitudes; it was the diversity of contact that was significantly ($p < .01$) related to the teachers’ attitudes to the ESL group of students.

Reeves’ (2006) findings also supported the Stanoscheck-Youngs and Youngs (2001) findings and provided a more in depth look at teachers’ attitudes toward the inclusion of ELLs, as well as their modification of coursework for language and learning.
city in the southeastern United States.

The demographic information reported by Reeves (2006), stated that, 77.8% of the teachers had, at some point, in their teaching career taught ELL students in their classrooms. Of those teachers of ELLs, an alarming 90.3% of the respondents reported they had received no training to work with ELL students.

In regards to inclusion, Reeves (2006) reported that, “Teachers largely held a welcoming attitude toward the inclusion of ELLs” (p. 135). However, through further questioning on inclusion, Reeves found that more than 40% of the teachers believed that not all students benefited from the inclusion of ELLs, but, 75% of teachers reported that ELL students should be mainstreamed only when they had obtained a minimum level of English proficiency. Reeves concluded that “A discrepancy exists between teachers’ general attitudes toward ELL inclusion and their attitudes toward specific aspects of ELL inclusion” (p. 137).

The most notable finding in the Reeves (2006) study was related to the teachers’ perceptions toward a student’s native language and English language learning. A majority of teachers (82.5%) reported they “would support legislation making English the official language on the United States,” and 39% of the teachers reported that “ELLs should discontinue use of their native language” (p. 137). When asked to respond to the length of time that ESL students needed to acquire English proficiency, 71.7% agreed that “ESL students should be able to acquire English within two years of enrolling in U.S. schools” (p. 137). These results demonstrated that “Teachers are working under misconceptions about how second languages are learned” (p. 137).
The major focal point in many achievement discussions among teachers, administrators, and parents has been about how to meet the diverse needs of ELL learners. According to Gandara et al. (2005), “Everyone agrees that ELLs must learn English, learn it well, and meet rigorous standards [and] teachers of English language learners need special skills and training to effectively accomplish this task” (p. 1). The purpose of the Gandara et al. study was to identify the most prevalent challenges encountered by teachers of ELLs and how to support these teachers in instructional needs and strategies.

Gandara et al. (2005) conducted a study to identify the most prevalent challenges encountered by teachers of ELLs and how to support these teachers in instructional needs and strategies. The study involved 22 small, medium, and large school districts. Both online as well as pencil and paper surveys were completed by approximately 5,300 teachers, 4,000 of whom worked in a regular classroom setting (i.e., not a pull out program) with ELL students.

Gandara et al. (2005) concluded that “the greater the preparation for teaching ELLs, the greater the teacher confidence in their skills for working with these students” (p. 12). In fact, consistently, teachers with more professional development rated themselves higher than those teachers without the benefit of professional development. However, Gandara et al. (2005) found that, “during the last 5 years, 43% of teachers with 50% or more English learners in their classrooms had received no more than one in-service that focused on the instruction of ELLs” (p. 13). Further, the inservices and
uninformed presenter with little or no ELL experience” (p. 13).

*Effective Professional Development and the Role of Instructional Coaching*

The role of instructional coaches is to implement innovative and productive professional development proven to increase student achievement. Killion (1999) stated, “Myriads of programs masquerade as ‘staff development’ with little evidence that they are powerful enough to increase student achievement and are counter-productive” (p. 12). Furthermore, Killion claimed that participation in professional development sessions “abuse[s] teachers’ time, insult[s] their intelligence and even worse foster[s] resistance to professional development design and content that would allow them to become more effective educators” (p. 12). In order for all students to meet the NCLB (2001, as cited in U.S. GOA, 2006), the deadline of every student proficient by 2014, professional development for teachers must have standards to guide the development of high quality teacher training.

Foxworth (2003) stated that the “Titles I and II of the NCLB Act of 2001 contain requirements for teachers, paraprofessionals, and principals to receive high quality professional development” (p. 1). Foxworth identified eight components of high quality professional development activities that:

1. increased the knowledge and skill of teachers, principals, and others
2. sustained a classroom focus to have a positive impact on the teacher’s performance
3. were not 1 day or short term workshops
4. advanced teacher understanding of effective instructional strategies
others

6. were designed to provide the teachers of LEP children with the knowledge and skills to provide appropriate instruction

7. were regularly evaluated for their impact on increased academic achievement

8. included instruction in the use of data and assessments to inform and instruct classroom practice.

Foxworth cited Elmore (2002), and stated “With increased accountability, American schools are being asked to do something new, to engage in systemic, continuous improvement in the quality of the educational experience and that professional development should be designed to develop the capacity of teachers to work collectively on problems of practice” (p. 2). The question is not if professional development needs to take place, but what professional development model provides the best learning opportunities for mainstream teachers of ELL students.

Coaching Models: Peer and Instructional

Peer and instructional coaching is an important component of any successful professional development program. According to Galbraith and Anstrom (1995), “District administrators must offer mainstream classroom teachers a wide array of staff development activities” (p. 3). For example, these include: (a) training in theoretical areas such as ESL and bilingualism; (b) practical suggestions for sheltered English instruction; (c) integration of content and ESL; and (d) cooperative learning, all of which need to be teacher driven. Peer coaching was defined by Galbraith and Anstrom as, “a
improve teaching” (p. 4). Use of this model allows mainstream teachers to be paired with a supportive peer teacher who observed classroom strategies after which they offered specific feedback relevant to the students and classrooms. Galbraith and Anstrom (1995) noted that, in the peer coaching model, there are five functions for peer coaching success:

1. companionship for teachers to talk about successes and failures in the classroom
2. feedback that is objective and nonevaluative
3. analysis to extend control over a new approach to teaching
4. adaptation to meet the further special needs of students
5. support when a teacher begins to apply a new strategy.

King, et al. (n.d.) recommended the instructional coaching model as an option for coaching and stated that, “Instructional coaching is fundamentally about teacher, teacher leaders, school administrators and central office leaders examining practice in reflective ways, with a strong focus on student learning” (p. 3). Also they stated that a “well designed coaching system has three key components” (p. 3): (a) structural conditions that support effective coaching, (b) a guided and content based focus on adult learning in a school based professional learning environment, and (c) instructional leadership by coaches. Structural conditions included: (a) systematic measurements of work and impact, (b) a content focus, (c) dedicated time for meetings, and (d) clearly articulated goals directly linked to coaching outcomes. Finally, King et al. reported that instructional leadership includes: (a) multiple strategies to gather and analyze student evidence, (b) support through individual meetings, and (c) observation of instruction including
not only their content area, but also district reform goals, achievement standards, and adult learning and that they posses strong communication skills and interpersonal skills” (p. 3).

Chapter Summary

As demonstrated in this chapter, the literature on bilingual education in the U.S. is complicated and has many components. The most important issue faced by the teachers of ELL students is how to effectively address the diverse needs of this growing population. In order for a comprehensive professional development plan to be implemented, many factors must be considered. Foxworth (2003) provided this opinion,

Highly qualified teachers are defined as those who meet the requirements of certification and licensure. Quality teaching, on the other hand, refers to the way teachers practice the craft of teaching, the skill required to help every student achieve. One does not necessarily guarantee the other. In fact, there are many teachers who have met qualifications and the definition of highly qualified who are not successful in raising student achievement. (p. 1)

The knowledge of instructional practices is not sufficient to sustain a change in how mainstream teachers address ELL instruction in their classrooms. A fundamental change needs to take place. Effective and collaborative professional development is the key to student achievement. In Chapter 3, Method, target audience, and procedures for the development of this project have been described.
Chapter 3

METHOD

The purpose of this project was to develop an overview of a comprehensive professional development plan for secondary mainstream content teachers of English Language Learners (ELL) students. The ELL population at North Middle School is currently 51%, all of which are required to participate in the Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA; Colorado Department of Education, 2005b). The teachers specialized in instructional strategies are currently only servicing ELL students who have scored as beginning proficiency of English according to the scale score published by CELA.

Target Audience

All content area teachers (i.e., mathematics, literacy, science, and history) will participate in professional development as a part of the school improvement plan. The district and building administrators have been included in the logistical implementation, but will not participate in the professional development sessions in order to provide a risk free environment for all teachers. As of the writing of this applied project, there are no plans to include other content areas such as music arts, physical education, or visual arts.

Goals and Procedures

The goal of this project was to provide teachers with a learning environment where they can explore and apply instructional strategies to their curriculum and current teaching methods. An additional goal of this project was to provide an atmosphere of
open discussion formats will be used, based on teacher driven learning.

Peer Assessment

The author sough informal feedback from several colleagues. Additional feedback was requested from teachers for improvements and additions based on the conversations or student data drive the conversations and research.

Chapter Summary

The amount of research and information on professional development and the needs of ELL students in public education are extensive. However, there is a lack of information, on a small scale, of the single school communities and their learners, both students and teachers. Through the careful production of a complete and worthwhile professional development program, teachers will begin to understand and implement instructional strategies that are attainable, and more importantly, necessary for ELL student to close the achievement gap.
Chapter 4

RESULTS

Introduction

This professional development presentation demonstrates to teachers and administrators the need for an ELL professional development for secondary content area classroom teachers and the implementation of new instructional strategies using peer and instructional coaching models. The majority of this chapter consists of a PowerPoint presentation that can be given as an introductory understanding of theories, instructional strategies and achievement standards for second language learners. The slides in the PowerPoint present a brief overview of language acquisition theories, instructional strategies, demographics relevant to our district and specifically our school, assessment data and the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). Finally, recommendations and conclusions are presented.
Theory to Practice: What Every Content Area Teacher Needs to Know About English Language Learners

Kelle May-Garst – Regis University

Theory to Practice: What Every Content Area Teacher Needs to Know About ELLs
Fast Facts

- Aurora Public Schools ELL Facts
  - 37% of the district’s students are second language learners
  - 84 different languages are spoken by APS students
  - These students and their families are from approximately 105 different countries
Fast Facts

- North Middle School’s Fast Facts
  - 50% of the school’s students are second language learners
  - 12 different languages are spoken by North Middle School’s students including: Spanish, French, Akan, Chinese, Chuukese, Creole, Hmong, Igbo, Laotian, Marshallese, Oromo and English

Do you know who these students are in your classroom?
Second Language Terms

- *English Language Development* (ELD): the provision of direct instruction in English language which including: content vocabulary development, oral language development, and development of reading and writing
- *English language learner* (ELL): student who participates in an English language acquisition program
- *English as a second language* (ESL): a model of instruction for ELL students

Have a more comprehensive list of acronyms in packet for reference.
Terms Continued

- Limited English proficient (LEP): a student whose English language ability is below a proficient level in listening, speaking, reading, or writing.
- Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA): the state standardized assessment used to measure English language comprehension of reading, writing, speaking, and listening.
Thoughts on Language Acquisition

➢ Myth and Misconceptions of the Acquisition of a Second Language

This portion of the staff development will be interactive. Teachers will be given a copy of the Myths and True/False column to mark. True and False points of the room will be labeled and teachers will move to the area of true or false for each myth.
Myth One

- Many ELLs have disabilities, which is why they are often overrepresented in special education.
Studies find that current assessments that do not differentiate between disabilities and linguistic differences can lead to misdiagnosis of ELLs. Unfortunately, inappropriate placements in special education can limit the growth of ELLs without disabilities.
Myth Two

- Children learn a second language quickly and easily.
Reality

- A variety of socio-cultural factors can affect language learning for example:
  - Acclimating to a new culture and status that interfere with learning English.

Reality Two
Myth Three

- When an ELL student is able to speak English fluently, he or she has mastered it.
Some teachers may assume that students who have good oral English need no further support to succeed academically, but everyday oral language uses different rhetoric, structure, and vocabulary than that of academic language.
Myth Four

- All ELL students learn English in the same way.
ELLs’ prior schooling, socio-economic position, content knowledge, and immigration status create variety in their learning processes. Some ELLs speak languages with English cognates, while others speak languages with little lexical similarity to English; this changes the nature of how students learn content-specific vocabulary.
Myth Five

- Providing accommodations for ELL students only benefits those students.

Myth five to be read aloud
Research suggests that making mainstream classrooms more ELL-responsive will also make them more responsive to under-served learners generally.
Myth Six

- Teaching ELLs means only focusing on vocabulary.
Students need to learn forms and structures of academic language, they need to understand the relationship between forms and meaning in written language, and they need opportunities to express complex meanings, even when their English language proficiency is limited.

Small group discussion and journals for reflection on myths and realities and sharing of major points.
The SIOP Model: An Introduction

- Guide to teaching high quality sheltered instruction
- Content Objectives and Language Objectives
- Role of teachers, teacher leader, and administration

Day One: afternoon portion of the staff development

Remember this is a quick overview for introductions. All items discussed today will be discussed in depth tomorrow with examples and interactive group work.
SIOP & Sheltered Instruction

- Sheltered Instruction (SI) has the ultimate goal to make content area standards and concepts accessible to ELLS
  - Teachers scaffold instruction
  - Extends the amount of English instruction in the content area classrooms
  - Can include a mix of native English and ELLs
Content & Language Objectives

- Why both?
  - Concrete content and language objectives that identify what students should know and be able to do must guide teaching and learning.
Content Objectives

- Content Objectives
  - Tied to specific grade-level content standards
  - Need to be stated simply orally and written
  - Limited one or two per lesson
Language Objectives

- Language Objectives
  - Need to be stated simply orally and written
  - Support language development
  - Can focus on: vocabulary development, reading comprehension, the writing process, speaking and listening skills
  - Higher order thinking skills
  - Limited to one or two per lesson

Small group discussions on how the objectives currently are produced and what they say about the instruction taking place classrooms.
My Classroom

- What components of SIOP do you already incorporate into your instructional practices?
- What components do you want to work toward incorporating into your instructional practices?

Reflect in professional development journal
Roles of the Staff

- Content area teachers
- Teacher Leaders
- Administration

Roles of the staff
Role of Teacher

- Teachers will identify instructional practices that work and are in need of changes through a collaborative process as well as using the SIOP model.
  - This includes: lesson planning, content and language objectives, and the peer coaching process.
Role of the Instructional Coach

- The instructional coach will provide teachers with an increased understanding of theory based instructional practices to increase the ELL achievement in the content area classrooms, using the SIOP Model.
  - This will include: individual coaching, classroom observations with feedback, and data driven discussion.
Role of the Administration

- The administration will provide and support the logistical implementation of the professional development, use the SIOP lesson plan rating for classroom observations along with constructive and concrete feedback.
Krashen’s Theory of Second Language Learners and its relationship to the SIOP Model for Sheltered Instruction
Comprehensible Input & i + 1 Theory

- A second language is acquired much in the same way as a first language, the use of rich oral language.
  - Oral language comes in the form of the rich use of literature, and use of oral support in teacher modeling and student’s peers.
Language learners need input of the new language as well as clues as to what the language means.

- i + 1 is the use of rich language a little above the current level of understanding.
- Oral language comes in the form of the rich use of literature, and use of oral support in teacher modeling as well as from the student’s peers.
- Should be measured throughout the lesson to ensure understanding.
Acquisition and Learning

- Acquisition is the “soaking up” of the language from modeling.
- Learning comes in the form of a rich, natural hands-on approach.
  - The SIOP model will provide the classroom teacher many opportunities to develop a classroom for oral development through oral language activities, literature and group practice. Thus, allowing for the “natural process” of acquisition.
Affective Filter

- Emotions and feelings determine the acquisition of language.
  - What does this mean for content area teachers?
- Classroom environment:
  - Plan, plan, plan (shared plan and discussion time)
  - Low anxiety, low stress, and high motivation
  - Modeling of assignments and outcomes
  - Use beginning, beginning intermediate and advanced student outcomes
  - CELA levels, and conferencing notes
Students acquire grammatical structures in a predictable order.

- Don’t overtly correct grammar mistakes in oral language, instead repeat using correct form.
- When students self correct, you know they have made the transfer of knowledge.
The Stages of Language Development

- Language development has a predictable and sequential stages of language development, in which the learner progresses from no knowledge of the new language to a level of competency closely resembling that of a native speaker.
5 Stage of Language Development

- Preproduction
- Early production
- Speech emergence
- Intermediate fluency
- Advanced fluency
The preproduction stage, which lasts anywhere from 10 hours to 6 months.

- The learner will gain a limited amount of English and rely on nonverbal communication such as gesturing and pointing.
Early Production

- The early production stage can last an additional 6 months after the preproduction stage.

- This stage brings the use of English in one or two word responses, and the learner can demonstrate understanding and answer simple questions.
The speech emergence stage can last for a minimum of another year and, potentially, could be the longest stage for the learner.

- Behaviors will include a vocabulary of approximately 3,000 words to produce short sentences as well as longer sentences with some grammatical errors.
- BICS and CALP language begins to form.
BICS

- **Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills** represents the students' ability to converse fluently in about 3-5 years.
  - Every day language needs such as; asking questions about restroom, basic needs for classroom assignments, conversing (non-academically) with native and non-native English peers.
Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency is the development of the academic language necessary for content area classroom success. This development can take from four to seven years depending on many variables such as:

- language proficiency level
- age and time of arrival at school
- level of academic proficiency in the native language
- degree of support for achieving academic proficiency
Intermediate Fluency

- This stage of proficiency takes another year of learning. The learner will begin to:
  - demonstrate academic language for content areas
  - use more complex sentences with fewer grammatical errors
  - ask for clarification
  - participate in longer conversations
  - continued development of BICS and CALP
Advanced Fluency

- This stage of proficiency can last for 5 more years and will include:
  - a use of sophisticated sentence structures close to that of a native language speaker
  - a willingness to participate in classroom discussions
Discussion of Stages

- Why is the understanding of these stages important in planning for instruction?

Discuss and reflect about BICS and CALP, stages of language. Then discuss and share new learnings and how these stages and language usages impact the learning taking place in your classroom.

Break
Professional Development: Why?

With an increase in accountability, American schools are being asked to do something new, to engage in systemic, continuous improvement in the quality of the educational experience and that professional development should be designed to develop the capacity of teachers to work collectively on problems of practice.
Components of a Successful Professional Development Program

- has a sustained a classroom focus to have a positive impact on the teacher’s performance
- advances teacher understanding of effective instructional strategies
- developed with extensive participation of teachers, instructional coaches, and principals
- designed to provide the teachers of LEP children with the knowledge and skills to provide appropriate instruction
- are regularly evaluated for their impact on increased academic achievement
- include instruction in the use of data and assessments to inform and instruct classroom practice
Instructional Coach

- Instructional coaching is fundamentally about teacher, teacher leaders, school administrators and central office leaders examining practice in reflective ways, with a strong focus on student learning.
Instructional Coaching: Key Components

- systematic measurements of work and impact
- content focus
- dedicated time for meetings & support
- clearly articulated goals directly linked to coaching outcomes.
- a guided and content based focus on adult learning in a school based professional learning environment
- multiple strategies to gather and analyze student evidence
- observation of instruction including timely feedback
This model allows for mainstream, content area teachers to be paired with a supportive peer teacher who will observe classroom instructional strategies. Then offers specific feedback relevant to the that particular student group present in that classroom.
Small group discussion on components. Then staff will reflect in their journals with personal concerns and questions around peer coaching and instructional coaching to be addressed during individual coaching sessions.

End of day one
Day Two: A.M. Overview

Set up for teams and discussion groups. Have content area teachers sit in small groups to facilitate content area discussions around new instructional strategies. Need to have the following handouts:

1. Graphic Organizer for Content & Lang. Objectives
2. ELD Continuum
3. Content Area Continuums
4. Lesson plan exemplars in the SIOP book for discussion
Sheltered Instructional Model

- Lesson planning includes the following key elements:
  - clearly defined language and content objectives
  - modified curriculum
  - supplementary materials
  - provides oral language development
  - alternative assessments
Content & Language Objectives

- Content & Language Objectives are concrete objectives that identify what students should know and be able to do, must guide teaching and learning.
Individuals will refer to both content area and ELD continuum to create content and language objectives. Then as a small group evaluate this based on the 4-point rubric provided on page 37 numbers one and two. Share out to other content area groups.
Modified Curriculum Using Instructional Strategies for ELLs

- Focus on vocabulary development
  - word walls
  - semantic webs,
  - structural analysis can help students
  - organize the new words in meaningful ways
  - Illustrations & art projects
  - letting students select specific vocabulary words to study.
Instructional Strategies cont…

- Activate and strengthen background knowledge or schemata.
  - Schemata are virtually everything the learner brings to the classroom based on personal experiences.
    - Be aware of cultural references and differences for concept.

Take moment to outline concepts where cultural references might make a difference in learning and understanding concepts. Share with the group.
Supplementary Materials

- Supplementary materials are used to create context and support content concepts in content area classrooms. Examples include:
  - Manipulatives
  - Pictures/Photographs
  - Visuals
  - Multimedia
  - Demonstrations
  - Related Literature
  - Adapted Text (see next page)

Supplementary Materials List
Text Adaptation Strategies

- These strategies increase the accessibility ELLs have to the content area text.
  - Graphic organizers
  - Outlines
  - Leveled study guides
  - Highlighted text
  - Audio text
  - Jigsaw text reading
  - Marginal notes
  - Native language texts

Small group discussion around planning strategies for using these text adaptation strategies to create strategies to adapt content area texts relative to the classroom curriculum.
Oral Language Development

- Oral language development can help English language learners acquire literacy skills and access new information.

- Strategies for oral language development include:
  - Partner Sharing
  - Peer group discussions
  - Providing key phrases
  - Using open-ended questioning strategies
  - Safe environment

Key Phrases pg. 147 sentence starters always posted for students that need prompts for oral language development.
Alternative Assessments & Evaluation

- Assessment of knowledge needs to directly correlate to the lesson’s objectives.
- Informal Assessments is the gathering and synthesizing of information concerning student learning.
- Evaluation is the process of making judgments about student learning.
Informal Assessments

- Informal assessment provides ongoing opportunities for feedback on the learning taking place. These strategies can be used individually or in groups and can include:
  - teacher observation
  - monitoring notes
  - student to student or teacher to student conversations
  - exit slips

Key to informal assessments is to plan many and determine whether or not to move on in your instruction.
An evaluation of a student’s demonstrated performance should be based on particular goal, objective or standard. Alternative performance based tasks include:

- Portfolios
- Journals
- Project
Lesson Plan Review

- Ms. Chen’s unit lesson: The Gold Rush (4th grade) pg. 30
  - Look for the following SIOP elements
    - Content and Language Objectives
    - Content Concepts
    - Supplementary Materials
    - Adaptation of Content
    - Meaningful Activities
    - Assessment

Read lesson on pages 31-34 and using the 4-point rubric evaluate the lesson in your groups. Discuss your findings.
Create SIOP Lesson Plan

- Your lesson needs to include the following SIOP elements:
  - Content and Language Objectives
  - Content Concepts
  - Supplementary Materials
  - Adaptation of Content
  - Meaningful Activities
  - Assessment

Using the SIOP lesson plan and lesson plan outline templates on pages 212-213 the small groups will create an actual content grade level lesson plan using the SIOP elements. Each group will share out most challenging aspects of planning a lesson. Then individuals will reflect in their journals on possible elements to target for coaching.

Break for lunch
Data Driven Instruction

- CELA Testing
- CELA and CSAP Student Data
- Teaching/Learning Cycle
- Differentiated Instruction
Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA) is used to assess every identified LEP student for English proficiency and comprehension in: Reading, Writing, Speaking, Listening.

Each category is then given a score:
- non-English proficiency with a beginning or early intermediate level of understanding
- limited English proficient with intermediate through mid-proficient level of understanding,
- fluent English proficient with an upper mid-proficient to advanced understanding

Most teachers are familiar with the logistics, and scoring for CSAP. Therefore, no planned discussion will take place to explain CSAP testing.
Disaggregation of CELA & CSAP

- What does the data tell us about our ELL population?
- What does this data illustrate about the instructional practices in content area classroom?

These questions will guide discussions as the disaggregation of the data takes place in small groups.
CSAP Reading & CELA Data
CSAP Writing & CELA

CSAP Writing & CELA Data
CSAP Math & CELA Data
Reflections on Data

- Using the data for reading, writing, math and science answer the following questions:
  - How does the data for CELA and CSAP align?
  - What are the instructional implications for this data?
  - How are your lesson plans meeting or not meeting the needs of your students based on this data?

The small group discussions will be based on a prepared graphic organizer and reflections questions.
Reflect on the stages of language development and how this relates to instructional practices in your classroom and have a discussion in your groups.
Reflect on the stages of language development and how this relates to instructional practices in your classroom and have a discussion in your groups.
Reflections on Data

- What are the instructional implications for this data?
- How are your lesson plans meeting or not meeting the needs of your students based on the speaking and listening scores?
- What are strategies you can use to provide access to the content in your classroom?

The small group discussions will be based on a prepared graphic organizer and reflections questions.
Small group discussion comparing SIOP Model instructional strategies to the TLC. How does the TLC affect the planning for instruction in your classroom?
SIOP Model for Professional Development

- Book Study: for group professional developments
- SIOP protocol for all instructional and peer coaching for content area classrooms
- Dedicated time for professional and individual development
- Extended professional development opportunities throughout the school year.
This PowerPoint presentation served as a brief introduction to instructional strategies and theories for English as a second language learners in content area classrooms as well as the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). In Chapter 5, the discussion of the project is given, including the results of an informal feedback and recommendations for further study.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

Contribution of this Project

Many public secondary schools face similar issues surrounding ELLs in content area classrooms and the challenges to increase student achievement. This challenge becomes increasingly more complicated as our school ELL populations increase. This project contributes to the professional development needs of any middle school content area classroom teacher that has a large number of ESL integrated into their own classrooms. The project introduced and summarized language acquisition theories, instructional strategies and data driven lesson planning and combined this information with a plan for instructional and peer coaching.

Limitations

There is a plethora of information that could be used to initiate a staff development around issues of ESL, language acquisition theories and instructional practices to increase student achievement. The author of this report focused on the scaffolding of this information to create an informative yet, brief introduction of ESL instructional strategies, and theoretical approaches to language acquisition. This project was based on an assumption of the need for professional development in the area of ELL.

Peer Assessment

The PowerPoint presentation and appendix developed for this project were reviewed by a literacy and a history teacher, one teacher leader and one administrator for
the content of the presentation such as; minor grammatical changes for understandings, and missing relevant information on slides. Each reviewer agreed with the scaffolding of the content, research and results.

Recommendations for Further Study

Research in the areas of community and parental involvement in ELL education would be an interesting topic for follow up research. Another interesting study would be to look at the drop out rates in schools with committed to research based staff development of instructional strategies used to educate the ELL population, versus schools without this type of staff development.

Project Summary

In this report, the author presented a review of basic ELL instructional strategies, theory based instruction, language acquisition theory and peer and instructional coaching. A presentation and appendix provided can be presented to any middle school staff where there is a high percentage of low achieving ELLs. The author found that, a professionally planned staff development that uses peer and instructional coaching has the capability to increase student achievement.
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APPENDIX A

List of Definitions
This list of definitions will be useful to understand the various terms used in the realm of education and terms specific to teaching second language learners.

**Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):** an individual state’s measure of yearly progress toward achieving state academic standards. Adequate Yearly Progress is the minimum level of improvement that states, school districts, and schools must achieve each year.

**Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA):** the state standardized assessment used to measure the English language standards set by the state for the comprehension of reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

**English Language Acquisition (ELA):** programs that provide services to English language learners.

**English Language Development (ELD):** the provision of direct instruction in English language which includes: (a) content vocabulary development, (b) oral language development, and (c) the development of reading and writing.

**English language learner (ELL):** student who participates in an English language acquisition program.

**English as a second language (ESL):** a model of instruction providing services to English language learners thorough a variety of programs and instructional strategies.

**Limited English proficient (LEP):** student whose first or primary language is a language other than English, and whose English language ability is below a proficient level in listening, speaking, reading, or writing.

**No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB):** the most recent authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is the principal federal law affecting K-12 teachers.

**The Bilingual Act (1968):** enacted in 1968 established educational programs specifically designed to provide educational services to English language learners in public schools.
APPENDIX B

ELL Statements & True or False Worksheet
1. Many ELLs have disabilities, which is why they are often overrepresented in special education.

2. Children learn a second language quickly and easily.

3. When an ELL student is able to speak English fluently, he or she has mastered it.

4. All ELL students learn English in the same way.

5. Providing accommodations for ELL students only benefits those students.

6. Teaching ELLs means only focusing on vocabulary.
1. True: _________ or False:________

2. True: _________ or False:________

3. True: _________ or False:________

4. True: _________ or False:________

5. True: _________ or False:________

6. True: _________ or False:________
APPENDIX C

Venn diagram: Content and language objectives
Content and Language Objectives

Language Objective:

Content Objective:
APPENDIX D

Data Worksheets
<p>| Statements about the data | What is the evidence of this statement? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repres</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge patterns in our data</td>
<td>What is the evidence of this pattern?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern to Celebrate</td>
<td>What are the practices or behaviors that led to this success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Data that we will need to answer our questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions

- Data that we will need to answer our questions
- How can we collect this data?