

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation EXAMINING NON-ESOL CLASSROOM TEACHER
KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICES FOR EDUCATING
SECONDARY ENGLISH LEARNERS

Contina Quick-McQueen, Doctor of Education, 2017

Dissertation directed by Professor Margaret J. McLaughlin
Professor Drew Fagan
College of Education

When describing English learners (ELs) at the secondary level, it is important to note that there can be two distinct groups of students: students with limited or interrupted formal education (SLIFE) and Long-term English learners (LTELs). The Long-term English learners are defined as students who have been in U.S. schools for at least seven years and learned English during their elementary school years. Some, nonetheless, reach secondary levels without having mastered English or the home language and may be caught in a state of semi-literacy, which is hard to escape. Adolescents newly arrived to the United States come during the critical period of adolescent development. For a majority of newly arriving adolescents, their past educational backgrounds have not prepared them for studies in core content areas at the secondary level in any education system. These learners have to work harder than their native English-speaking peers and even harder than their more literate EL peers to meet the same accountability goals. Only

educated in the United States for a brief period, these students need to learn a new language, develop literacy skills in the new language, and master content area standards simultaneously.

One of the most complex challenges facing educators when working with secondary ELs is how to meet their academic, cultural, and linguistic needs. The purpose of this descriptive study was to examine non-ESOL teachers' knowledge and practices when working with secondary ELs. Participants were high school teachers in one rural school district in Maryland. Data for the study were gathered utilizing an online survey-questionnaire. The findings showed the knowledge non-ESOL teachers possess and instructional practices they use to support secondary ELs in content area courses. This study also revealed teacher perceptions of professional development needs and the willingness these teachers demonstrate to do whatever it takes to help their students.

EXAMINING NON-ESOL CLASSROOM TEACHER KNOWLEDGE AND
PRACTICES FOR EDUCATING SECONDARY ENGLISH LEARNERS

by

Contina Quick-McQueen

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the College of Education of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education
2017

Advisory Committee:

Professor Margaret J. McLaughlin, Co-chair
Professor Drew Fagan, Co-chair
Professor David Imig
Professor Elisa Klein
Dr. Helene Kalson Cohen
Professor Patricia Richardson

© Copyright by
Contina Quick-McQueen
2017

ACKNOWLEDEMENTS

I dedicate my dissertation work to my family because without their love and support, this would not be possible. To my loving parents, whose words of encouragement taught me that nothing worth having in life will ever be easy. To my late brother J.R., whose words rang with pride each time we talked. I love you big brother for always believing in me and being there to listen. To my late brother M.R., who was a positive influence in my life inspiring me to work hard and dream big. I love you and I know you are in heaven cheering me on.

To my loving husband and son who are my cheerleaders in life. I love you both so much and thank you for all the support you gave me with keeping our family balanced as I attended classes and completed school work. Thank you for being a sounding board when I was tired, and overwhelmed, and just could not see an end in sight.

A special thank you to Dr. McLaughlin and Dr. Fagan for all of your targeted feedback and guidance during my research and writing. Thank you for your most recent support in encouraging me to keep marching to the end despite all I have endured personally this past year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Content	iii
List of Tables	v
Section 1: Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Scope of the Problem	4
Scope of the problem in Maryland.	7
Identifying English Learners (ELs) in Maryland.	9
World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment.	9
Assessing the WIDA standards.	11
Instructional supports for ELs in Maryland.	11
Scope of the problem in RSD.	12
Efforts to Address the Education of ELs in RSD	15
Literature Review	20
Federal policies affecting ELs.	20
Classification of ELs.	26
Classification of secondary ELs.	28
Barriers to academic achievement: The secondary language acquisition process.	29
Barriers to academic achievement: Learner motivation.	35
Barriers to academic achievement: Demands of academic content areas.	36
Meeting instructional needs of secondary ELs.	38
<i>Cultural relevance of curriculum.</i>	42
<i>Sheltered Instruction and SIOP.</i>	43
<i>English for Speakers of Other Languages models.</i>	44
<i>Bilingual and dual language education.</i>	45
Building teacher capacity.	47
<i>Teacher responsibilities for ELs in the classroom.</i>	48
<i>Teacher perceptions, attitudes, and knowledge.</i>	49
<i>Culture of collaboration.</i>	50
Summary	51
Section 2: Study Design	54
Purpose and Research Questions	54
Design	54
Participants	55
Methods and Procedures	56
Human subjects review.	56
Instrument.	57
Data collection.	58
Analysis.	58

Section 3: Results and Conclusions	59
Results of the Survey	59
Return rate and background.	59
Perceptions of working with ELs.	60
Teaching ELs.	60
Professional development.	62
Findings Related to Research Questions	63
Research question #1: <i>To what extent do secondary teachers report having knowledge of educating ELs in content, language acquisition, and cultural needs?</i>	63
Research question #2: <i>What instructional practices do teachers report they use to meet the needs of secondary ELs?</i>	65
Research question #3: <i>What do teachers report to be important to their professional development needs to further build their capacity to meet the academic, linguistic, and cultural needs of secondary ELs?</i>	67
Conclusions	68
Implications	70
Limitations of the Study	73
Future Research Implications	73
Policy Implications	74
Appendices	
Appendix A: Participant Consent Form	75
Appendix B: Participant Survey-Questionnaire	78
Glossary	85
References	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	WIDA English Language Development Standards	10
Table 2	RSD Data: English Language Proficiency Assessment: ACCESS for ELs	14
Table 3	Eight Components of SIOP	44
Table 4	Teacher Competencies for Secondary Teachers of ELs	50
Table 5	Participant Teaching Experience	59

Section I: Introduction

Few civil rights are as central to the cause to human freedom as equal education opportunity. – Former U.S. Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan

The United States experienced phenomenal growth in the number of English learners (ELs) over the first decade of the 21st century, expanding the need in many public schools to provide special language instruction. In 2003-2004, 8.8% of public school students in the United States were designated as ELs. By 2013-14, that percentage had grown to 9.3% (Editorial Projects in Education Research Center, 2011). As a result, content-area teachers are more likely than ever to have ELs in their classrooms. At the same time, education policymakers and researchers are increasingly calling for improved academic literacy development and performance for all adolescents (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005). Many school districts are faced with the challenge of helping students become proficient in English while also providing them with a demanding academic education. According to the U.S. Department of Education, students who are designated as ELs in secondary education settings are generally older, non-native English speakers who have gained proficiency in their native language and are now learning English in addition to mastering academic content. The population of secondary ELs is expected to grow to 40% by 2050 (Weyer, 2016).

One of the most complex challenges facing many secondary teachers in their efforts to educate students is how to meet the needs of adolescent ELs in content area classrooms such as English language arts, math, science, and social studies. ELs at the secondary education level can be divided into two groups. The first includes those who

were born in the United States or arrived early, but who speak a language other than English at home. The majority of these students exit out of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) ¹ services during elementary school and prove to be proficient in academic English content by the time they enter high school; however, some have only acquired social language skills (i.e., basic reading and conversational skills) and are less proficient in the level they need for school tasks such as reading textbooks, participating in content-related classroom discussions, and expressing themselves in the formal writing required for essays and research reports (Echevarria, Short, & Power, 2006; Kim & Garcia, 2014).

The second, larger group of ELs at the secondary level consists of newly arrived students or Student with Limited and/or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE). Some adolescent ELs enter school with strong academic preparation and can transfer their knowledge to the courses they are taking as their English proficiency develops. Others have limited formal schooling. Approximately 20% of all limited-English-proficient students at the high school level and 12% at the middle school level have missed two or more years of schooling since age six (Ruiz-de-Velasco, Fix, & Chewell, 2000). These students enter secondary schools with minimal to no English proficiency, interrupted or limited formal schooling experiences in their home country, and limited literacy even in their first or primary language (Rance-Roney, 2009).

These Students with Limited and/or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE) come with diverse languages, cultures, and experiences. They also vary in their social and educational backgrounds and personal histories, leaving their countries to escape poverty,

¹ Although both ESL and ESOL may be used to refer to second language programs, in this study ESOL is utilized for consistency.

to flee war or political persecution, and /or to seek better educational and economic opportunities. Some came directly to the United States while others arrived after harrowing escapes followed by years in refugee camps (Walqui, 2000).

As a final note of introduction before proceeding to the background, procedures, and results of the study, it is important to observe that acronyms abound in the field of education and within the narrative of this study. Acronyms used will be identified appropriately at first use. In addition, for the convenience of the reader, a glossary is included at the end of the document.

Purpose of the Study

Secondary schools in Rural School District (RSD) are facing many of the challenges noted above with respect to educating ELs. The district is experiencing an increase in the numbers of ELs enrolling across the grades. In addition, ELs in RSD have many of the same characteristics and academic problems that the literature identifies for ELs across the United States. Specifically, lack of English proficiency causes many secondary ELs to struggle in academic content classes required for graduation, such as English language arts, math, science, and social studies. According to RSD student enrollment data for 2012-2015, the district's ELs have not met state targets for Annual Measureable Achievement Objective I (AMAO I) which assesses students' learning of the English language.

With the growing number of ELs at the secondary level in RSD, it is important for administrators and teachers to understand how to meet the educational needs of these students to support positive educational outcomes. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate, Non-ESOL teachers' knowledge of the language and cultural

backgrounds of the ELs and their implementation of practices which have a direct impact on meeting the linguistic, academic, and cultural needs of secondary ELs.

Scope of the Problem

Over the past 10 years, the number of ELs in the nation's schools has increased by 95% (Carrier, 2005). According to Calderón (2008), ELs are a large portion of the 58% of Hispanics who do not graduate from high school. Graduation hurdles are also high for most ELs. Ujifusa (2015) points out that the 2014 national graduation rate was 82%. The rate of ELs graduating, however, was 62%, a 1% increase from 2013. Despite the increase, the percentage of ELs graduating high school within four years still trails other subgroups, including students with disabilities and those who come from low-income families (Amos, 2013). In 2012, the U.S. Department of Education released standardized, state-by-state four-year graduation rate data. While half of the states graduated at least 80% of their students, the numbers also demonstrated that states are struggling with ELs. In 2013, the graduation rate for ELs in the state of Maryland was 57%, 4% below the national EL graduation rate of 61% (Scott, 2012). Gandara (2015) points out that the poor performance of this student population on standardized assessments fuels the belief that ELs are fundamentally deficient and in need of remediation. On average, ELs score lower on academic achievement tests than almost any other subgroup except special education students. This remains true across most grades. For example, the 2013 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) found that 69% of ELs were below basic proficiency in eighth-grade mathematics, compared to just 25% of non-ELs. Eighth-grade reading scores were similarly deficient, with 70% of ELs scoring below basic, compared to 21% of non-ELs. Scores at the fourth-grade level were also similar. With ELs

graduating at lower rates, these students face a dismal future without a solid educational foundation. As is the case for all dropouts, the economic costs for ELs who fail to earn a high school diploma are “steep,” both to the individual who must navigate the adult labor market without a base set of academic credentials, and to the society at large that must incorporate an inadequately prepared individual into its economic and civic spheres (Amos, 2013). The educational outcomes of ELs can either translate to a more productive multi-lingual force or to higher levels of academic failures and dropouts, with the attendant social costs (Flores, Batalova, & Fix, 2012).

ELs, particularly SLIFE, who enter secondary school often lack the English proficiency and academic literacy skills needed to be successful in academic classrooms. By the time these students enter high school, they lag far behind their classmates in achievement (National High School Center, 2006). According to Slama (2012), adolescent ELs who have not developed adequate academic language skills to be successful in school are at elevated risk of dropping out before graduation, compared with their non-immigrant peers. ELs who have failed to acquire sufficient academic English may be unable to meet the core academic credit requirements and/or pass high school exit exams that are required to receive a secondary school diploma in the United States. For example, data from the Nation’s Report Card (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010) indicate that in 2009, ELs earned fewer credits in core academic areas than their non-EL peers and were significantly below their peers in meeting the minimum number of credits in the core areas needed for graduation. These students leave school ill-prepared to compete in the new global economy.

For most secondary students classified as ELs, two-year colleges are the only viable post-secondary education option because of weak preparation in high school as well as the costs of attending other higher education institutions (Martinez-Wenzl, 2014). Unfortunately, most who enter two-year colleges do not complete a degree; instead, they end up simply incurring college debt without seeing the increase in earning power that a college degree provides (Huelsman, 2015).

In response to these factors, educational researchers and policymakers are increasingly attuned to two major issues in secondary education: (a) the growing need to attend to adolescent literacy development if all students are to demonstrate content-area mastery across the curriculum, and (b) the imperative to attend to school improvement for ELs at the secondary level (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005). The latter is a growing priority because of poor educational outcomes for ELs (in aggregate) and the current unprecedented level of enrollment of ELs throughout the United States.

The Alliance for Excellent Education estimates that six million middle and high school students, including ELs, are reading below grade level and are “at risk” or “struggling.” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005). ELs at the secondary level face many challenges as they work to learn English and master content simultaneously. Their struggles with learning are directly connected to their lack of literacy development. The literacy struggles for adolescent ELs is significant because of their alarmingly poor performance on indicators of literacy such as the NAEP (Echevarria, Richards-Tutor, Chinn, & Ratleff, 2011).

According to NAEP data, reading scores were lower in 2015 than 2013 for students in Grade 8 across the performance distribution. In math, scores for students in

Grade 8 were lower compared to 2013 by an average of two points. Scores were also low for 12th graders who took the 2015 assessment. In reading, 37% of the 18,000 12th graders who took the reading assessment performed at or above the proficient level. In math, 25% of the 13,000 12th graders who took the math assessment performed at or above the proficient level.

Scope of the problem in Maryland. As it has throughout the nation, the number of ELs in Maryland has been increasing. U.S. Census data from 2012-2013 show that ELs comprised 8.5% of the nation's K-12 students at that time (Center for Public Education, 2016). The same data indicate that ELs made up 5-9% of Maryland's total K-12 population (Ariel, Hooker, & Batalova, 2015). Zinshteyn (2014) explains that the U.S. Census and the U.S. Department of Education measure English language proficiency differently. Census data rely on self-assessments of whoever in the home fills out the decennial forms, a method which may lead to an inflated or deflated sense of English proficiency. The U.S. Department of Education collects its data from state information that includes the number of students whose test results show they are in need of EL programming. Despite this difference, data from the U.S. Department of Education further confirms the rising number of ELs in Maryland. According to the *Digest of Education Statistics* (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014), the number and percentage of public school students participating in programs for ELs in the state of Maryland doubled from 27,311 (3.2%) in 2002-03 to 55,343 (6.4%) in 2012-13.

The educational outcomes of ELs in Maryland also mirror those of the nation. Murphey (2014) finds the achievement gap between ELs and non-ELs —about 40 percentage points in both fourth-grade reading and eighth-grade math— essentially has

not changed since 2000. Gaps exist in the graduation rate as well. The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) reports the four-year cohort graduation rate for all students reached 86.39% in 2014, more than four percentage points better than the 81.97% rate registered in 2010, and more than 1% over the 84.97% achieved in 2013. At the same time, dropout rates for ELs have fallen to new lows. While gaps in graduation rates between student groups remain, the numbers improved for all groups in 2014. Although some of these facts are encouraging, other data for Maryland's ELs demonstrate the achievement gap. The graduation rate for ELs dipped from 57.3% to 54.1%. It should also be noted that many ELs spend an additional year in high school. The five-year cohort graduation rate for ELs in 2013, the most recent year with complete figures, stood at 67.48% (Maryland State Department of Education, 2015b).

The U.S. Department of Education, which administers NAEP, encourages states to achieve a goal of at least 85% participation among those who are identified as ELs in their test sample. During the 2013 fourth-grade NAEP reading assessment, eight states including Maryland did not meet the 85% goal. For the 2013 eighth-grade math assessment, three states including Maryland and the District of Columbia did not meet that goal. Nevertheless, results from the 2013 NAEP in Maryland clearly show gaps in achievement. In fourth-grade reading, 31% of all students met the standards, but only 16% of fourth-grade ELs met the standards. In eighth-grade math, 25% of all students met the standards; 4% of ELs met the standards (National Council of La Raza, 2014).

In the 2015 Maryland Report Card, NAEP Performance for Maryland in Grade 4 reading data show 65% of ELs scored below basic compared to 32% of non-ELs. The same data show Grade 8 reading scores for ELs placed 64% below basic compared to

25% for non-ELs. In math, the percentage of ELs scoring below basic in Grade 4 and Grade 8 math were 45% and 70% respectively compared to 21% and 29% respectively for non-ELs.

Identifying ELs in Maryland. In Maryland, local education agencies are required through a Home Language Survey to ask all students upon enrollment if they speak a language other than English. This requirement is intended as a means of identifying students who communicate in a language other than English, students whose families use a primary language other than English in the home, or students who use a language other than English in daily non-school surroundings. Having another language spoken in the home or routinely used in other settings is not an automatic identification of a student as an EL. The Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) provides the criteria of the Home Language Survey and defines criteria for EL identification in COMAR 13A.05.07.02 and COMAR 13a.05.07.03. A student's eligibility for services is based on the English Language Proficiency placement assessment. Each local education agency must inform parents if an EL child is identified for participation in the district's ESOL program no later than 30 days after the beginning of the school year for students who enter at the start of the school year or within the first two weeks of attendance for those children who have not been identified as EL prior to the beginning of the school year. Recent data from MSDE show a total of 61,013 ELs in the state of Maryland for 2014-2015 (Maryland State Department of Education, 2015a).

World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment. Maryland joined the WIDA consortium in 2011 and adopted the WIDA English Language Development (ELD) Standards. The WIDA grade-level ELD Standards directly correspond to the grade-level

Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards (Common Core State Standards) and are comprised of the five English Language Development Standards listed in Table 1 (WIDA, 2012). Standard 1 recognizes the importance of social language in student interaction with peers and teachers in school and the language students encounter across instructional settings. Standards 2–5 address the language of the content-driven classroom and of textbooks, language which typically is characterized by a more formal register and a specific way of communicating (e.g., academic vocabulary, specific syntactic structures, and characteristic organizational patterns and conventions).

Table 1

WIDA English Language Development Standards

WIDA English Language Development Standards	
Standard Level	Standard
ELD Standard 1	English language learners communicate for Social and Instructional purposes within the school setting.
ELD Standard 2	English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of Language Arts.
ELD Standard 3	English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of Mathematics.
ELD Standard 4	English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of Science.
ELD Standard 5	English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of Social Studies.

The WIDA ELD Standards serve as a critical resource for understanding the linguistic needs and abilities of ELs, creating ESOL instructional models, writing curricula,

designing assessments, and monitoring the progress of ELs as they move through the five stages of language proficiency.

Assessing the WIDA standards. From February 25 to March 23, 2012, Local education agencies in the state of Maryland administered a new English language proficiency assessment, *ACCESS for ELs*. In the summer of 2012, a linking study was conducted of ELs' results on the new ACCESS for ELs as compared to results on the Language Assessment Scales (LAS), the previous English proficiency assessment, for domain scores (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) and composite scores. The next step included analyzing the results of the study with the goal of setting AMAO I and AMAO II targets for 2012 through school year 2015-2016. In 2015-2016 WIDA administered ACCESS for ELs 2.0, a secure large-scale English language proficiency assessment administered to Kindergarten through 12th grade students who have been identified as ELs. An online assessment replaced the earlier paper-based assessment, ACCESS for ELs, although a paper-based assessment will continue to be available according to each state's guidelines and will be given annually to monitor students' progress in acquiring academic English.

Instructional supports for ELs in Maryland. Maryland school districts provide several language instruction educational programs that are English-only or that use both English and another language. English-only language instruction educational programs include structured English immersion, sheltered English instruction, specially designed academic instruction in English, content-based ESOL, and pull-out ESOL programs. The Pull-out ESOL Program provides language development using a variety of methods to build progressive skills in English listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Instruction

includes content-based reading to ensure that students are exposed to academic language as soon as possible. The ESOL classroom allows ELs a risk-free environment for expressing themselves. The Sheltered ESOL Content Program allows for ELs to be taught in content classes by dual certified teachers to ensure that students develop academic language skills. This approach is used in conjunction with an ESOL language class in the secondary grades, especially for students at lower proficiency levels. The Push-in ESOL Program has classroom teachers modify materials, team teach, and use peer tutors along with instructional aides to provide ESOL instruction. Specialized ESOL staff work closely with classroom teachers to provide services. Another program, Bilingual Education, provides intensive English language instruction, but students get some portion of their academic instruction in their native language to prepare for content classes without falling significantly behind. Dual language programs provide two languages of instruction for both English speakers and heritage language speakers, beginning with early grades. The dual language programs are motivating for both target language groups, and lead to gains in literacy in both languages. The Newcomer Program (for schools with a large cohort of recently arrived ELs) provides intensive, additional ESOL classes based on strategies for literacy development. Classes also target orientation to U.S. schools, and build basic academic content vocabulary.

Scope of the problem in RSD. The enrollment of ELs in RSD increased from 189 in 2010 to 228 in 2015. According to the RSD Office of Learning Management Systems, the EL enrollment has remained at 1 to 1.5% of the total enrollment for the past six years making RSD a “low-incidence” school district for its EL population. A “low-incidence” district is defined as one in which the enrollment of a specific subgroup of

students is less than 1% of the total student population. The following are cited by Dirnberger (2010) as deficiencies within a low-incidence districts such as RSD: 1.) the lack of remedial and special programs, as well as program models for structured language instruction; 2.) the absence of academic support programs and foreign language immersion programs that are present in high incidence schools; 3.) the use of native language instruction to maintain a students' language or teach them in the content areas; 4.) less racial diversity among principals and staff than in high incidence schools; 5.) less likelihood that teachers hold ESOL, bilingual certification; and 6.) the absence of standardized means for identification of ELs. Districts that enroll small numbers of ELs face unique challenges in implementing strategies for working effectively with what is often a new group of students in the district. According to Flynn and Hill (2005), when ELs arrive in rural areas, they often do so initially in small numbers which poses a challenge in and of itself. The impact of this population of students in RSD is felt most in the classrooms where limited staffing and funding translate into many teachers not having the training and experience needed to work with ELs.

In 2012, RSD implemented the WIDA ELD Standards as a basis for developing curricula incorporating a scope and sequence that can be adapted to individual program requirements and its EL population. The WIDA grade-level ELD Standards correspond directly to the grade-level Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards (Common Core State Standards). The ELD Standards utilize five English proficiency levels: entering, emerging, developing, expanding, and bridging. These provide a basis for measuring an EL's progression in English language development. The school system also administers

ACCESS annually to assess each of the four language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Table 2 presents data to show how well ELs are progressing in meeting the standards in RSD since the implementation of those standards. AMAO I measures the progress of ELs in learning English; AMAO II measures the number of students who attain English proficiency during the school year. As the data show, since the implementation of standards in 2012, ELs in RSD have yet to meet the state target for AMAO I for progression in learning English. This ultimately impacts students' ability to be successful in English only classrooms that require English skills for reading, writing, speaking, and listening in English language arts, math, science and social studies in order to meet state graduation requirements.

Table 2

RSD Data: English Language Proficiency Assessment: ACCESS for ELs

English Language Proficiency Assessment: ACCESS for ELs				
Administration Year	State Target AMAO I	RSD Score AMAO I	State Target AMAO II	RSD Score AMAO II
2012	52%	43.75%	10%	15.65%
2013	54%	47.06%	11%	15.88%
2014	55%	52.71%	12%	15.27%
2015	56%	52.79%	14%	16.74%

The RSD 2015-2016 data from ACCESS 2.0 show that ELs at the secondary level continue to struggle with meeting the requirements of AMAO I. This demonstrates the

need to continue to focus on providing the instruction and support needed to help students learn English and gain the literacy skills required to meet with academic success and complete graduation requirements. ELs who have not made progress in learning English by the time they enter high school will continue to struggle academically and lag behind their non-EL peers, leading to poor educational outcomes.

Efforts to Address the Education of ELs in RSD

The RSD district documents from 2014 indicate that over the past four years the school district has fully embraced the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards/Common Core State Standards. As a result, RSD established a set of shared goals and expectations for what students should understand and be able to do in grades K-12 in order to be prepared for success in college and the workplace. RSD has achieved a record-high 93% of students graduating from high school in four years or less for the class of 2015. An ongoing examination of all aspects of the instructional program has focused on keeping students in school and moving to graduation. In the effort to close the achievement gaps among groups, specific attention has been giving to increasing success among ELs.

Over the past six years, RSD has focused on continuous improvement of teaching and learning for ELs. RSD district documents from 2008 indicate that in school year 2007-2008, 107 ELs took the summative Language Assessment Scales (LAS) Test and 85% made progress toward English proficiency compared to 43% in 2006-2007. This increase of 42% for AMAO I was significant. For example, 9 out of 12 students at the secondary level scored 15 scale score points higher on their overall test in spring 2008 as compared to their pre-test scores in October 2007.

In 2007-2008, 73% of ELs met or exceeded the targets for AMAO II compared to 33% in 2006-2007.

In an effort to build on this progress, in September 2008, RSD began training ESOL teachers and non-ESOL teachers in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) which provided an opportunity for a push-in model for students who could benefit from having more time in their content class. ESOL and non-ESOL teachers had collaborative planning time as well as opportunities for team teaching. The pull-out model continued for students who could benefit from smaller classes and more direct instruction. With the training and implementation of the SIOP push-in model that took place at the beginning of 2008, ELs had more time in their content classes and ESOL teachers increased collaboration with the academic content teacher.

Content teachers and school-based administrators continued to embrace SIOP and participate in professional development related to the model as indicated in RSD district documents from 2009. This training increased collaboration and opportunities for the ESOL teacher and non-ESOL teacher to team-teach in a sheltered classroom. In addition, it provided focused attention on providing the direct, explicit instruction that secondary ELs needed as well as a team approach to developing lesson plans that reflect the SIOP components. The ESOL teacher, depending on the student's individual needs, in a pull-out or push-in setting, provided direct services. In addition, ESOL teachers were trained to use the Performance Matters data warehouse system to access benchmark assessment data to identify areas of deficiencies to be targeted in instruction and to monitor the progress of students who were in reclassified status.

RSD district documents from 2009 further show that to address listening and speaking challenges, Non-ESOL teachers worked collaboratively with ESOL teachers to develop content and language objectives in their instructional planning and implementation. The rate of speech (e.g., slower rate, enunciation) during instruction and the extent to which teachers provide clear explanations for tasks were the primary focus areas. At the secondary level, ELs used companion texts for RSD core reading texts. To address challenges in the areas of reading and writing, teachers validated the culture of the ELs by selecting text to which the students could relate. For beginners with very limited English vocabulary, explicit instruction focused on vocabulary to increase their conversational fluency.

RSD district documents from 2010 address on-going efforts to improve the achievement of ELs. Training in the SIOP components continued to be offered at least once a year prior to the beginning of school. Title III and local funds were used to provide the necessary resources for the training. Beginning January 2010, mid-year data from the Language Assessment Scale (LAS) benchmark assessment was utilized to determine modifications needed with instruction and to identify students in need of additional support. Title III funds were used to provide substitutes so teacher could attend data review meetings. In addition, collaborative planning time was provided during the school year for academic content teachers and ESOL teachers using the SIOP model. Teachers who needed to meet after school hours were provided stipends using Title III funds.

In 2009-2010, three ESOL tutors (two public, one non-public) provided small group instruction to very limited or beginning ELs. Parents of students in the ESOL

program were notified of RSD's failure to meet AMAO I. This information was provided in a letter and parents had an opportunity to discuss this further during a parent meeting if needed. For ESOL-eligible students who entered after the beginning of the school year, the parents were informed of the district's failure within two weeks of the student being placed in the program. Every effort was made to meet the AMAO targets at the end of the 2009-2010 school year.

ESOL staff continued to monitor the progress of students in non-ESOL classes and continued to collaborate with academic content teachers to ensure targeted, aligned, and direct instruction. An EL Parent Conference Night was held to showcase student work and to talk with parents or guardians about ways to help their child at home. Resources available to parents of ELs learning English were shared. The focus continued to be on increasing the participation of ESOL teachers in targeted professional development with academic content teachers. ESOL teachers met at least twice per year with academic content teachers of ELs who had an Individualized Education Program (IEP) and participated in IEP meetings to review goals in the IEP and to monitor the students' progress. The pull-out model was used for students who benefit from smaller classes and direct instruction. Parents or guardians of ELs received quarterly updates on the progress of their child and had an opportunity to meet with teachers at the Back to School Night. ESOL teachers monitored consistently the progress of their students in non-ESOL classes, making it possible to identify areas of need and to target specific areas when planning instruction. RSD district documents from 2011 note increased collaboration between academic content teachers and ESOL teachers to ensure that targeted, aligned, and direct instruction was provided for ELs.

For the 2014-2015 school year, quality professional development was offered to ESOL and academic content teachers. Recognizing the continual increase of ELs in RSD, there was an awareness of the need to make certain that ESOL and academic content teachers remained in collaborative working relationships. Training was offered which provided resources and direction on how to best plan lessons based on the English proficiency level of students. RSD hosted collaboration workshops (once in the fall and once in the spring), which placed special emphasis on the ELD Standards. School teams had the opportunity to work together to create learning targets merging language with content goals and objectives for ELs.

The number of ELs continues to grow in districts across the country. RSD faces the complex challenges of helping ELs become proficient while providing them with a high quality education. A major challenge at the secondary level is how to meet the needs of adolescent ELs in content area classrooms such as English language arts, math, science, and social studies. ELs in RSD have many of the issues common to ELs in other districts including lack of English proficiency and limited literacy skills in their own native language.

Although there has been an increase in the number of ELs graduating from high school, it is worth noting that this subgroup of students continue to lag behind their non-EL peers in achievement specifically in earning the credits necessary for graduation. According to 2009 RSD district documents, ELs in RSD experience difficulty with understanding grammar concepts and usage. In reading, there is difficulty with comprehension, attributable in part to the EL's insufficient knowledge about and exposure to the culture of the people who speak the target language. Writing activities

also tend to have some relationship to culture, making it difficult for ELs to write in the same manner as the native speakers. Oftentimes, this insufficient knowledge about the culture of the native speaker interferes with the EL's ability to write a suitable response. Challenges also exist with ELs acquiring the academic language which is very much needed to meet with success on the Maryland State Assessment, the Maryland High School State Assessment, and the more recent Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Assessments.

Indeed, to support positive educational outcomes, ELs need extensive academic and cultural support as they learn the English language. It is equally important for teachers to implement practices that meet the linguistic, academic, and cultural needs of ELs. In the next section, I examine literature illustrating how districts can support the educational needs of ELs as they work to become proficient in English while also ensuring that all ELs receive a high quality education.

Literature Review

To situate the current study, I review federal policies that affect ELs, classification of ELs, and barriers to academic achievement as addressed in the second language acquisition and teacher education literatures. Strategies for meeting the instructional needs of secondary ELs and for building teacher capacity to implement those strategies are also presented.

Federal policies affecting ELs. Over the last 40 years, U.S. English language education has been shaped by a variety of legal and legislative decisions. In 1968, the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII) acknowledged the educational challenges ELs faced and allocated funds to support their learning. Title VII was amended and reauthorized a

number of times, and in 2002, the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act) replaced the Bi-lingual Education Act. Title III is the part of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) that authorized funds for English-language-acquisition programs. NCLB required that schools report adequate yearly progress (AYP) for four subgroups of students, one of which is ELs. The NCLB definition gave states considerable flexibility in defining their EL subgroup, which led to inconsistency across districts and schools regarding the designation of ELs (National Council of Teachers of English, 2008).

According to the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Justice (2015), federal legislation has increasingly recognized the need to support both English language proficiency and academic achievement. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) originally supported English language acquisition and held states and districts accountable for improving English proficiency through Title VII, Bilingual Education. When NCLB was enacted in 2002, Title III, Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students, continued this approach through funding programs such as bilingual education and ESOL. However, NCLB also introduced a new provision for overall academic achievement by ELs. NCLB's Title I requirement of reporting EL state assessment results mandates districts to ensure that ELs learn the same academic content as their English-speaking peers.

NCLB increased support for ELs, but the law also brought to light the low academic achievement levels of these students across the country. Although many districts found the testing requirements of NCLB helpful in demonstrating the needs of their ELs, test outcomes showed that a significant gap in achievement persisted between

ELs and non-ELs. In 2007, eighth-grade ELs scored an average of 37 points lower on the math section of the NAEP and an average of 42 points lower on NAEP's reading section.

Federal legislation, for its part, has continued to provide minimal guidance. For instance, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) supports states in developing data and assessment processes to accurately measure the achievement of all students, including ELs. In this way, the law authorizes additional funds for states to further comply with NCLB requirements for assessing ELs. However, ARRA and other legislation do not mention best practices or strategies for improving EL performance (National Council of Teachers of English, 2008). In 2012, the Obama administration began granting flexibility to states regarding specific requirements of NCLB in exchange for rigorous and comprehensive state-developed plans designed to close achievement gaps, increase equity, improve the quality of instruction, and increase outcomes for all students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015).

In December 2015, President Obama signed into law the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This legislation seeks to further address the needs of ELs. ESSA presents a new opportunity for ELs, their families, and the educators who support them. ESSA significantly strengthens accountability provisions while at the same time authorizing substantial increases in funding targeted toward English learners. Now, under ESSA, all schools must demonstrate that they are improving the English language proficiency of their ELs. Improving English language proficiency is a required indicator in every state's school accountability system, which will help make sure that the schools where these students are struggling get the right kind of support. Importantly, these changes signal to

states that helping ELs gain the skills they need to be successful in academic classes must be a priority (Sargrad, 2016).

Sargrad (2016) reports that ESSA authorizes \$737 million for Title III with steady increases in Title III funds until 2020 when they will jump to \$885 million. ESSA also greatly changes accountability systems; Title III accountability no longer exists, but districts will still collect data on ELs' growth toward and attainment of English proficiency (i.e., the old Title III accountability metrics). The major change is that poor performance on these indicators will not affect the Title III dollars schools or districts receive. States are now required to build English proficiency into their Title I accountability systems, with the perception that including these students in a bigger funding stream will get them more attention.

According to Klein (2015), under ESSA, MSDE and its local education agencies will have two choices when it comes to newly arriving ELs and when they should be tested. Option A gives ELs test scores after they have been in the country a year, the same as the provision of the current law. Option B states that during the first year, test scores will not count toward a school's rating, but ELs will need to take both the reading and math assessments and districts must report the results publicly. (The current law only requires ELs to take math assessments in the first year.) In the second year, the state would have to incorporate EL results for both reading and math, using some measure of growth. When ELs have been in the country for three years, their proficiency scores are treated like those of any other student. The compromise would shift accountability for ELs from Title III (the English-language acquisition section of the ESEA) to Title I (which covers accountability for all other students).

Pompa (2015) points out that under ESSA, state education agencies will have to include English Proficiency in their accountability system under Title I, which governs accountability for all students. Previously, accountability for growth in language proficiency was under Title III, which provides resources to ELs. The legislation provides critically needed support for EL services and performance in states with scattered or small numbers of ELs. Placing EL scores in a central place in accountability systems should ensure that EL outcomes are regularly scrutinized.

As MSDE and RSD move forward with how to best meet the needs of ELs, it is important to examine how the new ESSA Plan will focus on those needs. Maryland has established long-term goals and interim measurements of progress in achieving English Language Proficiency. The state adopted the WIDA framework of English Language Development Standards which distinguishes six levels of language proficiency defined by specific criteria: 1-Entering, 2-Emerging, 3-Developing, 4-Expanding, 5-Bridging, and 6-Reaching. Maryland uses an overall composite proficiency level and a literacy composite proficiency level on ACCESS 2.0 to determine the English proficiency of ELs. ELs in every local school district are considered to have attained English proficiency if their overall composite proficiency level is 5.0 and literacy composite proficiency level is 4.0 or higher. In Maryland, students who attain lower than a 5.0 on their Overall English Language Proficiency level and lower than a 4.0 English Language Proficiency level on Literacy continue to receive ESOL services. Level 6 is not served in ESOL programs.

WIDA's framework for ELD Standards addresses four language domains: listening, speaking, reading and writing. This organization of the standards by domain helps educators plan balanced opportunities for language learning and takes advantage of

stronger English language skills in one domain to support their development in the other domains. The Maryland State Board of Education formally adopted WIDA's framework for English Language Development Standards and they became a part of regulations in September 2016.

Additionally, alternate assessments were adopted that align with the challenging state academic standards and alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Alternate ACCESS for ELs 2.0 is an assessment of English language proficiency for students in grades 1-12 who are classified as ELs and have significant cognitive disabilities, disabilities related to the brain-based skills needed to carry out any task from the simplest to most complex. Lack of cognitive abilities prevent meaningful participation in the ACCESS for ELs 2.0 assessment. This alternate assessment was created to meet federal accountability requirements and to provide educators with a measure sensitive to English language proficiency growth of ELs with significant cognitive disabilities.

ACCESS for ELs 2.0 is a large-scale language proficiency test for K–12 students and is one component of WIDA's comprehensive, standards-driven system designed to improve teaching and learning for ELs. The purpose of ACCESS for ELs 2.0 is to monitor student progress in English language proficiency annually to serve as a criterion to aid in determining when ELs have attained language proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing comparable to that of their English-proficient peers. The test is carefully designed to be representative of the social and academic language demands within a school setting as exemplified in the WIDA ELD Standards.

Maryland is currently exploring the use of assessments in languages other than English. In doing so, MSDE has gathered meaningful input on assessments in languages other than English; collected and responded to public comment; and consulted with educators, parents, and families of English learners, and other stakeholders. Several groups, including the English Learner/Title III Supervisors, English Learner Task Force, and English Learner Advisory Council have been consulted to gain input regarding the use of assessments in other languages. These groups consist of school-based administrators and teachers, local education agency supervisors, family engagement specialists, advocacy groups, educators from the state education agency, and representatives from institutions of higher education. In addition, several local education agencies piloted the use of the translated/trans-adapted Spanish PARCC Mathematics assessments to gain insight and to establish promising practices for the selection of the accommodation as well as for test administration. Furthermore, since Maryland participates in the administration of the PARCC assessments, the input provided during group meetings and the peer review process have provided valuable input into the use of assessments in other languages.

Classification of ELs. The classification of ELs, based upon their oral language proficiency skills, determines eligibility for services in schools. Students may be classified as initially fluent English proficient, limited English proficient, or reclassified English proficient. Such classifications help to better serve ELs whose academic achievements have been below their monolingual English-speaking peers (Hagan, 2010). Echevarria et al. (2006) report that although the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides an official definition of an EL, the act leaves it to states to operationalize the

definition and to determine procedures for identifying students in need of Title III services. Every state has an initial identification process whereby it identifies the pool of linguistic minority students; assesses their level of English language proficiency using either a brief assessment (usually called a “screener” or a “placement test”) or a full-scale proficiency assessment; and determines which linguistic minority students are ELs and, therefore, in need of Title III services. All states also have a process to annually assess the progress of ELs in learning English, determine when they no longer need these services, and provide procedures for reclassifying students as former ELs.

In programs for ELs, researchers found that the average student had less than a 40% chance of being reclassified as English proficient within 10 years (The Center for Public Education, 2007). Pressure to speed up the process has resulted in increased rates of reclassification, but even so, students rarely achieve this goal within a year or even two. In any case, one might ask why educators and policymakers do not pay more attention to the quality of the programs offered to ELs, rather than simply focusing on the speed at which students escape them (Gandara, 2015).

Reclassification is often based on oral proficiency rather than academic language proficiency and does not guarantee readiness to succeed in the English-only classroom. Studies estimate that, on average, ELs take five to seven years to become proficient in academic English, referring to Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), which is the basis for a child’s ability to cope with the academic demand of language used in textbooks and educational settings but not necessarily in social situations. The language skills needed for social situations are referred to as Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS), which are the skills of listening and speaking that are

typically acquired quickly by many ELs who have language backgrounds similar to English. ELs who require Title III services are exited from EL services and are monitored for two years to ensure these children continue to make progress in meeting challenging state academic content and student academic achievement standards (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001). As noted earlier, under ESSA, ELs are to be monitored for four years beyond exiting ESOL services, thus extending the amount of time ELs who have already demonstrated English language proficiency can be included in the EL subgroup. In turn, schools continue to get credit for improving students' academic performance after they have already passed the English language proficiency assessment (Klein, 2015).

Classification of secondary ELs. When describing ELs at the secondary level, it is important to note that there can be two distinct groups of students: students with limited or interrupted formal education (SLIFEs) and Long-term English Learners (LTELs). The LTELs are defined by Kim and Garcia (2014) as students who have been in U.S. schools for at least seven years and learned English during their elementary school years. Some, nonetheless, reach secondary levels without having mastered English or the home language and may be caught in a state of semi-literacy, which is hard to escape. For the most part, when non-native English speakers enter school, they do not have the same language skills and background in English as do native speakers from English-speaking homes. When native English-speaking children enroll in school, they have some oral proficiency and an understanding of the grammatical system. Some have knowledge of the alphabet and may have initial skills in reading and writing. Curricula and instruction build from the expectation that students know some English when they start school and rely especially on oral language proficiency. Yet ELs who enter school at

all grades rarely have the level of proficiency in English found in native English-speaking students in kindergarten or first grade (Klinger, Boardman, Eppolito, & Schonewise, 2012).

SLIFE are newly arriving middle or high school age ELs with little or no formal education or whose education began but has been interrupted by war, migration, lack of educational facilities, and cultural or economic circumstances (Kim & Garcia, 2014). These students perform several years or more below their age/grade appropriate level in school- related knowledge and skills. These students also often have low literacy skills in their native language making it even harder for them to simultaneously learn English, develop academic language skills in English, and master grade level content in English (Tuchman, 2010).

Barriers to academic achievement: The second language acquisition process.

ELs come to U.S. schools with many resources to share in classrooms, including linguistic resources from their native language. However, educators, policymakers, and the public should understand that all students who are learning English as an additional language are not alike. They enter schools with a wide range of language proficiencies (in English and in their native language) and of subject-matter knowledge. ELs differ in their education backgrounds, expectations of schooling, socioeconomic status, age of arrival in the United States, and personal experiences coming to and living in the United States (Echevarria et al., 2006; Stewart, Araujo, Knezek, & Revelle, 2015).

Carrier (2005) states that research has identified some key issues that underpin how best to meet the needs of ELs. One of these issues is the acquisition of language. While it takes one to three years for ELs to develop social language proficiency in

English, they need five to seven years to develop *academic* English, the English needed for reading, writing, listening, and speaking in the content areas. Another issue is that ELs are doing two jobs in the academic classroom; they are learning the English language as well as the academic content. The third issue is using multiple modes for making input and output comprehensible for ELs.

Slama (2012) reports in his longitudinal analysis of academic English proficiency outcomes for adolescent ELs that academic English and its entailed mastery of reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills is required for school success, yet presents a challenge to native speakers as well as to second language learners. Well-developed proficiency in these four areas is required for students to communicate effectively in everyday and academic situations. Academic performance is closely linked to the academic English language development of ELs and is an important predictor of high school completion.

Haynes (2007) further notes that ELs who speak English well in social situations are not necessarily prepared for academic tasks in the classroom. Some ELs develop fluent conversational skills and the day-to-day language needed to interact socially with other people, BICS, fairly quickly. ELs employ BIC skills when they are on the playground, in the lunchroom, on the school bus, at parties, playing sports, and talking on the telephone. Social interactions are usually context embedded. They occur in a meaningful social context. They are not very demanding cognitively. The language required is not specialized. These language skills usually develop within six months to two years after arrival in the United States. Problems arise when teachers and administrators think that a child is proficient in the language when they demonstrate good

social English. However, their academic skills, CALP, may continue to lag behind grade norms for a considerable length of time. It is crucial for educators to understand the difference between BICS and CALP. CALP skills include language for formal academic learning and for written texts in content areas such as English literature, math, science, and social studies. CALP skills encompass reading, writing, and thinking about subject-area content material. Students also use CALP skills to compare, classify, synthesize, evaluate, and infer.

Jim Cummins coined the terms BICS and CALP in 1979 and has continued his research in this area. In his writings, he explains that the BICS and CALP distinction highlights the difference between conversational fluency and academic language proficiency as conceptually distinct components of the construct of “language proficiency.” Cummins goes on to note that this is a conceptual distinction rather than an overall theory of “language proficiency” and there was never any suggestion that these were the only important or relevant components of that construct (Cummins, 2008).

Additionally, Cummins’ discussion of the evolution of theoretical constructs points out explicit distinctions of how BICS and CALP have evolved. According to Cummins, discrete language skills involve the learning of rule-governed aspects of language including phonology, grammar, and spelling. Cummins believes discrete language skills can be taught in isolation; therefore, students who can “read” English fluently may only have a very limited understanding of the words they can decode. Cummins also considers the embedding of the BICS/CALP distinction within a broader framework of academic development. For example, teacher-student interactions are seen to be critical to the process of negotiating identities, reflecting to varying degrees

coercive or collaborative relations of power in the wider society. Ultimately this socialization process determines student engagement to gain access to the academic registers of schooling.

Recent developments in education policy in the United States have focused attention on language and literacy, especially for bilingual learners in U.S. schools who will have to meet the demands of the Common Core State Standards. That assertion coupled with Cummins' recent theoretical distinction has led to alternatives to the BICS/CALP dichotomy due to the fact that the BICS/CALP dichotomy is viewed by some scholars as a deficit theory. The concept of second language instructional competence (SLIC), for example, has been widely referenced as a potential improvement to the BICS/CALP framework for language development among bilingual learners (Rolstad, 2015). Scholars seeking to make sense of the school experiences of minority students have often posited dichotomies of language proficiency as a lens through which academic and, ultimately, socioeconomic outcomes should be understood. MacSwan and Rolstad (2003) further argue that once children have learned English sufficiently well to understand content through all-English instruction, they have developed SLIC. Unlike CALP, SLIC does not apply to native language development and does not ascribe any special status to the language of school. A child who has not developed SLIC is not considered cognitively less developed; he or she has simply not learned enough of the second language to effectively learn through it. SLIC allows the focus to stay on providing the child cognitively challenging instruction that he or she can understand during the time needed to achieve second language instructional competence.

The need for strong academic language skills does not stop at Grade 12. Rivera, Francis, Lesaux, Keiffer, and Rivera (2006) point out that the need for well-developed academic language skills runs well beyond high school graduation. Many learners, especially those from minority backgrounds who graduate from high school and enroll in post-secondary education, often need additional support and remediation to succeed in their post-secondary classrooms. This highlights the importance of academic English as it relates to oral language, reading skills, and writing. Supporting the development of academic English skills requires a systematic and concerted effort on the part of educators who serve adolescent immigrants or newcomers.

The group that perhaps faces the greatest barriers to academic achievement and language acquisition is secondary age students who come to U.S. schools with limited formal schooling and are below grade-level literacy in their first or primary language. Indeed, SLIFEs are most at risk for educational failure (Echevarria et al., 2006). Students placed in traditional ESOL and bilingual programs generally need five to nine years of instruction before their academic scores reach the average level of native English-speaking students. That longer length of time is particularly difficult for educators to provide for secondary students who face graduation course requirements and high school exit examinations (Echevarria et al., 2006).

In discussing SLIFE issues, Echevarria et al. (2006) report that 20% of all ELs at the high school level and 12% of ELs at the middle school level have missed two or more years of schooling since age six. Newly arriving ELs are more likely to live in poverty than other groups of students (Beldon, Snow, Manno, & Short, 2015). Among Hispanic students aged 15–17, more than one-third are enrolled below grade level. Those students

are not literate in their native languages and have not had schooling experiences such as changing teachers according to subject or taking a standardized test. They have significant gaps in their educational backgrounds, lack knowledge in specific subject areas, and often need additional time to become accustomed to school routines and expectations. They need literacy skills, English-language development, and content-area knowledge. The interruptions in education for SLIFEs have often been caused by traumatic experiences. Some of these students may require therapy or other treatment as a result.

Robertson and Lafond (2009) report that although the needs of SLIFEs may overlap with those of the ELs in general, this particular group of learners need additional support and instruction in basic skills for a number of reasons. One reason is that SLIFEs may suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder or may be completely overwhelmed by the need to assimilate to a new school environment in a new language. Additionally, there are gaps in literacy and in academic experience. Students may not know how to read or write in their native language and may also lack the basic concepts, content knowledge, and critical thinking skills their peers have mastered. Robertson and Lafond (2009) state that ELs can become highly frustrated when they realize just how far they are behind their peers, which can impact learner motivation.

According to Haynes (2014), best practices for literacy with ELs are important to support desired educational outcomes. Haynes recommends several strategies teachers need to learn to support ELs in the classroom. First, teachers should determine content and language objectives for each lesson. Doing so will help students apply academic language with technical vocabulary through reading, listening, speaking, and writing.

Next, teachers need to connect content to ELs' background knowledge to make cultural connections and also ascertain what students do not know. ELs who spend most of the day in general education classrooms should receive comprehensible input from their content area teachers and peers. Another recommendation encourages teachers to allow ELs to learn by doing using auditory, kinesthetic, and visual strategies. Teachers also need to modify vocabulary instruction to allow ELs to engage in holistic activities to practice new vocabulary in context. Haynes goes on to say that cooperative learning strategies will give ELs authentic opportunities to use academic vocabulary and discuss key concepts. ELs can be assigned roles in cooperative groups and be monitored to ensure participation and understanding.

Barriers to academic achievement: Learner motivation. Motivational factors and experiences have the potential to influence students' attitude and anxiety toward English language learning (Hashwani, 2008; Wesley 2009; Wesley, 2010). According to Lopez (2010), students who are disengaged from learning are exhibiting a motivation dynamic that results from repeated attempts to engage in learning that lacks validation. It is crucial for teachers to engage ELs in the learning process to increase the chances of success for these students. Second language acquisition is related to achievement and motivation is the driving force that enables learners to expend the continuous sustained effort language learning requires (Moskovsky, Alrabai, Paolini, & Ratcheva, 2013).

To support learner motivation, teachers should incorporate motivation strategies to support second language acquisition. Moskovsky et al. (2013) point out that motivational strategies fall into two categories: (a) instructional interventions applied by the teacher to elicit and stimulate motivation and (b) self-regulating strategies used

purposefully by individual learners to manage the level of their own motivation. A study by Wesley (2010) adapted Gardner's Attitude/Motivation Test Battery. Gardner originally designed the test to assess the non-linguistic goals of learning a second language, such as improved understanding of the other community, desire to continue studying the language, and an interest in learning other languages. The test is a set of subscales measuring different aspects of L2 learning motivation and comprising Likert-type scale questions. These subscales reflect the components of language learning motivation as defined by the socio-educational model of second language acquisition. The socio-educational model was the first model of motivation to look at the impact of the cultural and social setting where learning takes place.

Barriers to academic achievement: Language demands of academic content areas. Faltis, Arias, and Ramirez-Marin (2010) observe that adolescent ELs placed in academic subject area classes taught in English need extra support to participate in and benefit from classroom learning experiences in ways that promote membership into academic communities. According to Short and Fitzsimmons (2007), literacy development is a particular problem for the ELs who enter the educational system in later grades, especially in high school. Not only do these students have to master complex course content, usually with little context or understanding of the way that American schools are structured and operate, but they also have fewer years to master the English language. In addition, they are enrolling at an age beyond which literacy instruction is usually provided to students, and some have below-grade-level literacy in their native language. Despite these circumstances, they are usually placed in classes with secondary teachers who are not trained to teach basic literacy skills to adolescents.

Haynes (2007) explains that at the secondary level, cognitive academic language skills are both abstract and context reduced. Information can be read from a textbook or presented by the teacher with few verbal cues to help students grasp its meaning. Some ELs struggle to comprehend what they read and have difficulty expressing what they know orally or in writing. Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) is more than understanding vocabulary and learning academic facts for a test. CALP also requires students to sharpen their cognitive abilities and learn new concepts. As students' progress in school, teachers are more likely to present material in a lecture format. The content also becomes more cognitively demanding and the vocabulary becomes more specific to each subject area. New ideas and concepts are presented to the students through context-reduced language. Textbooks may be written beyond the language level of an EL. Moreover, ELs may have limited background knowledge for subjects such as U.S. history. Further complicating the challenges, an instructor's teaching style can affect how ELs develop CALP skills.

Pappamihel and Mihai, (2006) assert that in order to create a learning environment to take ELs to a higher level of performance, there should be adaptations to classroom assessments to accommodate the linguistic and cultural needs of ELs until they are able to fully participate in classroom assessment without adaptation. Offering practical help, Pappamihel and Mihai suggest five questions to serve teachers as a starting point for making the determination about mastery of content objectives more valid:

- 1.) Do I know my students' English language proficiencies?
- 2.) Have I designed a test that mirrors classroom objectives, strategies, and

activities?

3.) Have I made use of all relevant and available visuals and graphics?

4.) Have I incorporated true accommodations to level the playing field for my ELs?

5.) Have I created a clear scoring rubric that will allow me to provide culturally sensitive and useful feedback?

In a study from 2004, Lee concludes that English language proficiency involves knowledge and effective use of the conventions of literacy, such as vocabulary, syntax, spelling, and punctuation, in social and academic contexts. Lee goes on to say that English language proficiency also requires the ability to apply non-technical terms to establish unique meaning in academic disciplines. Additionally, considerations should be given to the use of language support strategies to enhance comprehension of academic content and to develop English language proficiency. Lee also notes that the use of the students' home language in academic content areas will create a learning environment where students' cultural experiences can be integrated to explore content. Students' lives at home and in the community, students' cultural artifacts, culturally relevant examples, community resources, and culturally-based ways students communicate and interact in their home and community can all provide independent and collaborative opportunities for learning.

Meeting instructional needs of secondary ELs.

We have to give teachers strong, consistent support in the best strategies and methods to reach, inspire, and teach English language learner students. – NEA President Dennis Van Roekel

Many ELs come to school with a variety of academic needs and educators must work collaboratively to meet those needs and support the students. Programs for ELs must help them develop both English language proficiency and academic skills (Vialpando, Yedlin, Linse, Harrington, & Cannon, 2005). Such programs vary according to many factors including the number of students, their grade levels, their home language(s), and state laws governing education. In some programs, English is the only language used for instruction. Other programs use the children's home languages to keep students from falling behind in their academic classes. Yet other programs strive to support academic language and literacy development in English and another language.

For ELs, the introduction of the Common Core State Standards poses new challenges as these standards require students to demonstrate new ways of applying knowledge and include using language in different disciplines, a critical component of developing literacy in English (Koelsch, 2006). According to Bunch, Kibler, and Pimentel (2013), in order to address how the opportunities presented by the Common Core Standards can be realized for ELs, the focus of instruction should be on three particular areas emphasized in the standards as necessary for career and college readiness: using evidence in writing and research, speaking and listening in order to work collaboratively and present ideas, and developing the language to do all of the above effectively. These skills represent a shift from how language and literacy instruction for ELs has often been approached, both in non-ESOL content classes in English language arts and in

separate English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) classes. However, teachers face a number of challenges in developing and implementing instruction.

DelliCarpini (2006) points out that one challenge that teachers of ELs face is teaching mixed ability classes. Issues that emerge are differentiating instruction successfully, implementing successful grouping strategies, creating well-structured cooperative learning activities, and integrating meaningful content for older learners who may struggle with first and second language literacy skills. It is important for educators to provide equitable education for all students. One of the most important steps in that process is assuring that teachers have a solid understanding of how to best meet the diverse cultural and linguistic needs of ELs. Knowing what students know and are able to do will allow teachers to implement effective practice and intervention. This will increase the effectiveness of progress monitoring so decisions regarding growth, or lack thereof, are appropriate.

Hill and Flynn (2004) developed a resource guide for rural districts such as RSD that have a low-incidence of ELs. Recommendations in this guide point out that school districts need strong leadership in place to implement programs and practices for ELs. Districts need to make all staff aware of legal requirements for serving ELs. Teachers need to be supported in their instructional efforts, which include collaborative dialogue and planning. Additionally, professional development should be a priority so teachers can learn to incorporate effective research-based strategies that include both ELs and English dominant students (Flynn & Hill, 2005).

Further recommendations emphasize that resources should be allocated equitably. For example, leaders should determine what resources are needed in order to provide adequate instruction for ELs. In a rural setting, all staff should be considered resources, not just EL instructors. A program to assist students in acquiring English should be well integrated in the overall school operations. Additionally, to ensure ELs are showing adequate progress, the EL program should be monitored and evaluated (Flynn & Hill, 2005).

Reeves (2006) notes that techniques considered effective for English-proficient students might not render content comprehensible for students learning English. For example, classrooms that follow a traditional knowledge-transmission model of instruction represent an exclusionary learning climate for ELs, particularly those with low levels of English proficiency. To allow ELs access to the curriculum, educators must adapt traditional approaches to instruction or, at a minimum, supplement their methods.

Language difference is just one, and perhaps not even the most important, of many reasons for the achievement gaps seen among ELs, although the way schools treat language differences certainly plays an important role in sustaining them. For example, many schools insist on teaching academic classes in English from day one, even though students may not yet understand what their teachers are saying. Furthermore, many schools neglect to assess what their ELs know and can do in their primary language, and thus often assign perfectly capable, even high-achieving, students to remedial courses solely because their English is weak (Gandara, 2015). Walqui (2006) notes that ELs are often supported in their language development, but not necessarily in their social-emotional development. ELs report higher levels of risk in social-emotional learning

outcomes (acculturative stress and social-emotional resiliency) than non-ELs.

Cultural relevance of curriculum. Rivera et al. (2006) state that many related factors influence EL academic outcomes, including educational history, cultural and social background, length of exposure to the English language, and access to appropriate and effective instruction to support second language development. For ELs, it is a process that is facilitated, alongside formal instruction, by first language skills. For example, students who possess knowledge of a concept in their first language need only to learn its label in the second language, whereas students who lack the concept in both languages must learn both the concept and the label in the second language, a key point when working with secondary ELs.

Cloud, Lakin, and Leininger (2011) delineate several strategies for increasing outcomes for adolescents enrolled in middle and high school. One key strategy is personalization. These researchers report that belonging has been associated with a host of positive effects, the most important of which are increases in motivation and academic achievement. Maintaining a strong, positive ethnic identity is associated with high self-esteem, a commitment to doing well in school, a sense of purpose in life, confidence in one's own self-efficacy, and high academic achievement. Gomez and Diarrassouba (2014) report in their study that teachers who were culturally responsive were effective in their ability to connect with students from diverse cultural backgrounds. Culturally responsive teaching moves beyond tolerance toward acceptance, which helps students incorporate their linguistic, cultural, and background resources into all aspects of schooling.

Sheltered Instruction and SIOP. Sheltered Instruction (SI) is one approach to meeting the instructional needs of ELs. The SI model considers the importance of differentiating instruction to meet the needs of students (Calderon & Zemora, 2014). The term “sheltered instruction” is used to describe those instructional practices that help teachers make grade-level academic content in areas such as social studies, mathematics, and science more accessible and comprehensible for ELs by incorporating specialized strategies and techniques that accommodate the second-language acquisition process. SI teachers use the regular core curriculum and modify their teaching to make the content understandable for ELs while promoting English language development (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2006; Short, Fidleman, & Louguit, 2012).

The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) introduced earlier is one SI method which is both research-based and field-tested. SIOP began as an observation tool for researchers to measure teachers’ implementation of sheltered instruction techniques (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Short, Fidelman, & Louguit 2012). Teachers who used the SIOP checklist for lesson planning became more proficient in linking language and content in their instruction, felt more in control of their professional development, and increased their ability to accommodate different levels of proficiency in their classrooms (Wallace, 2004).

SIOP consists of eight components (see Table 3). Most educators agree these features are important for SI to be successful with ELs. Daniel and Conlin (2015) note that educators often interpret the SIOP model as more teacher-centered than intended. To make this model more student-centered, authors suggest that teachers need sufficient training and support to help them integrate strategies to build on student thinking.

Table 3

Eight Components of SIOP

Components of SIOP	
1	Preparing lessons with content and language objectives and meaningful activities and materials.
2	Building background knowledge of students through linking concepts with prior knowledge and emphasizing key vocabulary.
3	Providing comprehensible input with clear speech and a variety of techniques.
4	Using strategies to scaffold and question learners and get them to practice learning strategies.
5	Providing opportunities for student interaction.
6	Developing manipulatives and activities for students to practice and apply content and language knowledge.
7	Delivering the objective-aligned lesson with appropriate pacing and high student engagement.
8	Reviewing key concepts and vocabulary assessing student comprehension.

English for Speakers of Other Languages models. The English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) models can pull students out of general education or "push" ESOL services into the non-ESOL classroom. Pull-out programs remove students from non-ESOL classrooms for a portion of the day in order to give them specialized instruction in English typically with a certified ESOL teacher. Pull-out ESOL is most common in elementary schools where a designated ESOL teacher works with small groups of children. While this is not necessarily different from content-based ESOL, pull-out programs do not usually incorporate the lessons going on in the English class. For many ESOL teachers, the 30-45 minutes of pull-out seems insufficient time for effective

instruction. ESOL teachers frequently work with a variety of students who often speak different languages, are of different ages, and attend different schools. While each of these students is attending ESOL, they will all be missing different subjects in their main class, making it difficult for ESOL teachers to incorporate content-based lessons into the ESOL curriculum. These difficulties are accentuated by the fact that pull-out programs are the most expensive and least effective models of the ESOL and bilingual education programs (Dawson, 2014).

Push-in is a program built on the idea that pulling students out of their classrooms is an inefficient use of time and can prevent students from fully integrating into the classroom (Dawson, 2014). With this program model, ESOL teachers or aides work with ELs within the non-ESOL classroom. Push-in means that the ESOL teacher comes into the classroom to provide services to students for the mandated time. Ideally, the ESOL teacher and the classroom teacher will work together during the planning of the lesson in order to make the most of classroom time; however, it is often very difficult to do this because not all teachers will provide lesson plans in advance and time for collaborative planning is often limited. Collaborating with the classroom teachers is the most difficult aspect of this model (Dawson, 2014).

Bilingual and dual language education. Bilingual education is an umbrella term for many types of programs in which two languages are used for instruction. Biliteracy is the ability to read and write in two languages. Lapayese, Huchting, and Grimalt (2014) show that biliteracy increased cognitive flexibility and adaptability among Latina/o students. Those who argue against bilingual education have an English-only and xenophobic perspective that promotes the dismantling of bilingual programs. Most

programs that exist are transitional bilingual education programs where the goal is to transition students into all English instruction as soon as possible instead of developing students' bilingualism (Dworin, 2011).

Collier and Thomas (2004) identify three major models of bilingual education: transitional bilingual education, developmental bilingual education, and dual language. In the transitional bilingual education model, ELs are placed into a bilingual program for no more than three years and then are placed into non-ESOL classes where they receive ESOL support if still required. The goal of this type of program is to transition students into English as quickly as possible. This is considered a subtractive form of bilingualism because while the native language is used initially, the final goal is for no use of the native language. Developmental bilingual education occurs when ELs are placed into a bilingual program for several years. The major goal of this program is to encourage students to maintain their native languages as they learn English. This is considered an additive form of bilingualism because the program works to develop skills in both the native language and in English. Dual language programs allow ELs and native English speakers to be placed in the same classroom where they are taught bilingually. The major goal of this type of program is to create students who are fully bilingual in both English and the native language of the ELs. This is also considered an additive form of bilingualism because the program works to develop skills in two languages.

Dual language programs have been shown to be successful with Latino students. Lindholm-Leary and Hernandez (2011) point out that several dual language programs have analyzed school outcomes and have shown that dual language programs are more successful in developing proficiency in English, in achieving passing scores on high

school exit exams, and in demonstrating improvements in reading and mathematics compared to placing ELs and Latino students in non-ESOL classes taught only in English. According to Lindholm-Leary (2012), challenges in dual language programs often relate to program design and implementation. One study of student language use in the classroom showed that although students did develop bilingual skills, they did not develop highly proficient or balanced bilingual skills because they felt more comfortable speaking in English than in Spanish. Another study showed secondary students felt they did not receive sufficient opportunity or support to develop high levels of Spanish within the dual language classroom.

Building teacher capacity. The National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth found that it is critical that teachers modify instruction for ELs in order to address their specific language needs (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Teachers of ELs often face unique challenges of their own. As noted earlier, ELs come from very different backgrounds and often face multiple challenges in the classroom. To complicate matters further, teachers lack practical, research-based information, resources, and strategies needed to teach evaluate, and nurture ELs, whether those students were born in this country or elsewhere, or whether they are first, second or third generation to attend an American school (NEA Education Policy and Practice Department, 2008).

Unfortunately, the rapid growth in the EL population has not been matched by sufficient growth in teachers' understanding of how to best educate these students. As a result, many districts across the country are buckling under the weight of having to meet the needs of ELs who are not demonstrating proficiency in academic areas such as reading, writing, and math. ELs pose unique challenges for educators because federal

mandates under ESEA, the nation's main education law, require that all students have access to the core curriculum and meet specific academic targets. In addition, ESEA requires that states measure and report English proficiency for all ELs. Today schools face federal and state demands for improving student performance with limited funding and inadequately prepared teachers (Center for American Progress, 2012).

In this age of accountability, teachers need to be knowledgeable about the scientifically based evidence that underlies their teaching decisions. Teachers not only have to make informed pedagogical decisions about teaching their ELs, they have to be ready to justify their decisions to administrators, parents, and teacher colleagues as well. This responsibility can be a difficult one precisely because of the lack of preparation in the teaching profession regarding how best to serve students who are simultaneously learning English and academic content (Carrier, 2005).

Teacher responsibilities for ELs in the classroom. Molle (2013) notes the increase in the EL population, coupled with a growing awareness that inclusion in non-ESOL classrooms is preferable to, and in many cases cheaper than, the provision of pull-out services, has brought a much larger number of teachers in contact with linguistic minority students. ESEA prohibits ELs from being pulled out of core academic content instruction. Therefore, general education teachers responsible for core content are also responsible for providing effective, comprehensible instruction to ELs. Although this requirement has been in place since 2001, appropriate in-service professional development continues to lag behind the needs of educators. Samson and Collins (2012) point out that all teachers working with ELs must have a strong understanding of oral language development, academic language, cultural diversity, and inclusivity.

Teacher perceptions, attitudes, and knowledge. Many teachers lack the knowledge or attitudes necessary to provide effective instruction for ELs. In a study by Gomez and Diarrassouba (2014) participants reported feeling oftentimes inadequate and helpless when they could not assist their diverse students who were experiencing difficulties understanding content related concepts. Another study by Reeves (2006) demonstrates that teachers hold misconceptions about how second languages are learned and lack the attitudes necessary to facilitate student achievement. The same study also indicates that many teachers believe students should be able to acquire English in two years and should not use their native language when learning English. Secondary content teachers often feel limited responsibility for the success of the ELs in their classes. Petit (2011) found that high school ESOL students were viewed as the responsibility of the ESOL program and teacher. In Petit's view this is a critical issue because when the task of educating ELs is left to ESOL teachers and no modifications are made in non-ESOL educational structures to accommodate diversity, the interactions that pupils experience in non-ESOL classrooms are unlikely to promote either academic growth or affirmation of pupil identity.

Professional development opportunities can help teachers change their perceptions and practices. In 2013, Molle conducted a study in which teachers participated in CLIMBS, a professional development program where teachers are exposed to new and relevant information about the teaching and learning of ELs through readings and collaborative activities. Teachers then were given opportunities to relate the information to their classroom context. Molle cautions that professional development for educators working with ELs creates rich opportunities for learning only if it situates

discussions of instructional strategies that support the academic success of language minority students within ideologically and politically grounded discourses.

To develop appropriate professional learning opportunities, school districts need to focus on the knowledge and skills most critical for teachers working with ELs. Specific to secondary ELs, Faltis et al. (2010) identify six categories of secondary teacher competencies as a result of the analysis of what secondary teachers of ELs need to know and be able to do (see Table 4).

Table 4

Teacher Competencies for Secondary Teachers of ELs

Teacher Competencies for Secondary Teachers of ELs	
1	Understand second-language acquisition as participation and identity.
2	Plan for and use theme-based content where concepts, genres, and specialized vocabulary are spiraled and used in multiple ways.
3	Build on student's background knowledge and experiences.
4	Know and advocate for legal rights of English learners.
5	Adjust instruction for variation in schooling experiences of English learners.
6	Mix English learners with native English speakers to ensure social and academic integration.

Culture of collaboration. Professional development for teachers should not focus on the isolated implementation of strategies for ELs, but should offer opportunities to have discourse which involves deep pedagogical and ideological implications for working with ELs. According to Russell (2012), collaborative school cultures can lead to improved academic outcomes for ELs because these environments encourage the ongoing

interaction between ESOL teachers and academic content teachers. A study by Short, Cloud, Morris, & Motta (2012) describes how teachers from two districts came together with one common goal of educating ELs. Teachers in the cohort got to know one another, recognize the extent to which they shared students due to the high mobility across districts, and became familiar with commonalities in their classrooms regarding curriculum and instruction. The collaborative sessions helped to normalize the common challenges they faced. DelliCarpini (2008) concurs asserting that since ELs spend most of their time in non-ESOL classrooms, collaboration between ESOL and English Language Arts teachers is critical. ELs benefit when they see the interconnectedness of materials and skills presented in different classes. However, DelliCarpini goes on to point out that collaboration does not occur naturally in most secondary schools.

Short, Cloud, Morris, & Motta (2012) report that one significant result of their study of collaboration was that ELs were brought to the forefront of decision-making at the district and school levels. The ESOL and newcomer curricula led to better scheduling of students, which maximized learning and provided students with scaffolded exposure to other academic content. A portfolio committee was formed to provide a more equitable means of assessing ELs as the students worked to meet graduation requirements. Overall, collegiality among non-ESOL teachers, ESOL teachers, ESOL directors, and building and district administrators was enhanced.

Summary

There is a growing body of research on effective instruction for ELs at the secondary level. From their research Brown and Doolittle (2008) report that of the 56% of U.S. public school teacher who have at least one EL in their classes, less than 20% are

certified to teach ELs. Although current literature exists related to knowing and understanding the competencies secondary teachers need to effectively work with secondary ELs, there is still much to be learned about effective practices for working with secondary ELs who have limited or interrupted formal education. Research shows there may be overlapping practices for meeting the needs of ELs, but SLIFE require additional support to ensure their academic, linguistic, and socio-cultural needs are met.

English language education has been shaped by a variety of legal and legislative decisions. Federal legislation has recognized the need to support both English language proficiency and academic achievement. With the new Every Student Succeeds Act, the needs of ELs will be further addressed through the strengthening of accountability provisions. Acquisition of language is a key issue when considering how to best meet the needs of ELs. In the academic classroom, ELs are learning the English language and academic content simultaneously, which may cause problems for teachers who do not have the tools both to assist students in accessing the curriculum and to meet their language acquisition and other needs. Literacy development is a problem for ELs who enter the educational system in later grades, especially for those who enter at the high school level.

Meeting the instructional needs of ELs is a critical focus for educators. There are approaches to working with ELs including SIOP, ESOL classes, and dual and bilingual programs. It is critical that teachers modify instruction for ELs to address specific language needs.

Over the past eight years, RSD has promoted collaboration among ESOL and non-ESOL teachers using the SIOP model. During this time, English proficiency for ELs

has been slow to improve. RSD currently has ESOL classes at the secondary level where ELs attend for 45 minutes per day. These classes are silos for ELs with little to no connection between those classes and what is occurring in academic classrooms.

Although, professional development is provided for teachers on the WIDA standards and the connection to academic content, it is often a one-stop shop for content area teachers with very little follow up. Building teacher capacity through professional development and creating a culture of collaboration should be a top priority as the number of ELs grow in classrooms throughout RSD, the state, and the country.

Understanding the academic, linguistic, and cultural needs of ELs is important to the achievement of this diverse population of students. Additionally, creating a vision for how best to meet the needs of these students while supporting the training needs of teachers is equally important.

This study investigates Non-ESOL teachers' knowledge of the language and cultural backgrounds of the ELs and their implementation of practices which have a direct impact on meeting the linguistic, academic, and cultural needs of secondary ELs.

Section 2: Study Design

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to investigate non-ESOL secondary education teachers' knowledge of the language and cultural backgrounds of students identified as ELs; and the teachers' implementation of practices which have a direct impact on meeting the linguistic, academic, and cultural needs of secondary ELs. Additionally, this study examined teacher perceptions regarding professional development as well as administrative and other support to build their capacity to instruct ELs. This study, conducted in a small rural school district in Maryland, focused on the high school with the highest enrollment of secondary ELs in the district. The following three research questions guided the investigation:

- 1.) To what extent do secondary teachers report having knowledge of educating ELs in content, language acquisition, and cultural needs?
- 2.) What instructional practices do teachers report they use to meet the needs of secondary ELs?
- 3.) What do teachers report to be important to their professional development needs to further build their capacity to meet the academic, linguistic, and cultural needs of secondary ELs?

Design

The overall design of the study was descriptive. According to Moffatt (2015), descriptive research often analyzes existing relationships; prevailing practices, beliefs, views, or attitudes; and ongoing processes or developing trends. Descriptive research fundamentally describes situations. The process of descriptive research design involves

collecting and tabulating data. Additionally, it is an attempt to obtain facts about the current state of things in order to assign meaning to and provide useful data for further research.

This study utilized an online web-based questionnaire to obtain information from secondary teachers in one high school in a small rural school district in Maryland. The choice of the study design was based on several of the characteristics of quantitative research as explained by Babbie (2010) including

- clearly defined research questions to which objective answers are sought,
- data gathered using structured research instruments, and
- results reported in the form of numbers and statistics.

Participants

To address the research questions, 79 teachers from the high school which enrolls the most secondary ELs in the small rural school district were invited to complete the survey. At the time of the study the high school had approximately 1500 students with 42% of them considered economically disadvantaged and 11% identified for Special Education services. EL enrollment was less than 5% at 47 students. These students included 36 active ELs, students who test below English proficient on the state's annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessment, ACCESS for ELs 2.0; four whose parents refused ESOL services; and seven who have recently exited out of ESOL services, but are still being monitored for a few years post-exiting per ESSA regulations. Given that local education agencies in Maryland now need to monitor those students for up to four years post-exiting rather than the two years of monitoring required earlier, these seven students are considered ELs for the purposes of this study. For all of these

learners, it is crucial that those teachers who lack Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) education have the necessary knowledge and tools to address the linguistic needs of their ELs.

The teachers surveyed included teachers from many content areas: English language arts, math, science, social studies, the arts, foreign languages, physical education, and ROTC. The participant group also included co-teachers, defined as teachers who go into content area classrooms to support students with Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs), but also provide support for other at-risk students who do not have IEPs. Responses from this varied group of teachers will help school and district administrators to understand the teachers' knowledge and needs as they all work to support the learning needs of ELs.

Methods and Procedures

A confidential online survey was constructed and administered to the teachers. The conceptual framework for the research questions and survey-questionnaire included four categories: teacher knowledge, teacher practices, administrative supports, and professional development needs. A description of the survey instrument is given in the following section, along with a description of the procedures used to collect the data, the method of analysis, and the process of ensuring protection of the human subjects selected for the study.

Human subjects review. Each participant's consent was obtained through a consent form found on the first page of the survey. The consent form provided the purpose and informed the individual that his or her participation was completely voluntary and that all of the responses were confidential (see Appendix A).

Instrument. To answer the research questions, I adapted a survey conducted by Hernandez (2009). Hernandez used the survey to investigate the usage level of English as a second language strategy and research-based practice in the instruction of ELs. Additionally, Hernandez sought to gain insight into the perceptions of educators about teaching practices and beliefs in regard to the instruction of ELs and into the educators' professional development needs to meet the academic, linguistic, and cultural needs of ELs.

To address the three research questions of this study, I adapted the survey in the following manner. The entire section to be completed by administrators in Hernandez's (2009) original survey was removed since the primary focus of the current study was on teacher knowledge and practices. Questions were deleted that would not lead to information to further answer the three research questions, such as questions regarding specific instructional practices because these might be interpreted differently from teacher to teacher. The adapted survey-questionnaire contained variables aligned to the research questions and intended to measure the knowledge and practices of teachers of secondary ELs. Additional demographic variables were included in the survey-questionnaire to gather data concerning total years of school experience in any role, total years of experience as a teacher in high school in the district, total years of experience as a teacher in high school or any role before coming to the district, total number of ELs taught, and subject area taught. Survey items were entered into Qualtrics, an online survey tool. The survey-questionnaire included one open-ended question, requests for demographic information, and Likert-scale questions (see Appendix B).

Data collection. To gather sufficient and useful data, it is important to get early buy-in from participants (Babbie, 2010). This means explicitly explaining to survey participants the purpose of the research. The first step was to contact the school's principal by phone early in the spring semester to introduce the project, state the purpose of the research, and verify his e-mail address. After I received consent from the principal, I sent an initial e-mail to teachers using their email addresses obtained from the school's Master Schedule List. This first email explained the purpose of the research, outlined timelines, and provided a link to the survey. Participants were asked to complete the survey within two weeks. After the first deadline for responses had passed, I sent a second e-mail with the link to the survey as a reminder to those who had not yet completed the survey. A third attempt to collect data from all non-respondents was sent two weeks after the second attempt.

Analysis. The responses to the survey-questionnaire were compiled through Qualtrics. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages for responses on each question, were used to analyze the data. This technique was appropriate as it addresses ordinal or ranked data, such as demographic information, as well as responses to the Likert scale questions pertaining to practices, perception of the learning environment, and professional development perceptions.

Section 3: Results and Conclusions

The study investigated Non-ESOL secondary education teachers' knowledge of the language and cultural backgrounds of English learners and the teacher's implementation of practices which have a direct impact on meeting the linguistic, academic, and cultural needs of secondary ELs. Additionally, this study examined teachers' perceptions regarding professional development as well as administrative and other supports to build teacher capacity to instruct ELs. Research was guided by three research questions. An online web-based survey was used to collect information from secondary teachers to address each research question. This section presents results, conclusions, and recommendations

Results of the Survey

Return rate and background. A total of 38 usable surveys was obtained from the 79 teachers who were sent the survey, a return rate of 48%. Among the teachers who responded, 15% ($n = 6$) have been teaching 1-3 years, 13% ($n = 5$) have been teaching 4-6 years, 21% ($n = 8$) have been teaching 7-10 years, and 50% ($n = 19$) have been teaching for 10 years or more. Participants teach a variety of academic content areas including English language arts, math, science, social studies, and foreign languages (see Table 5).

Table 5

Participant Teaching Experience

Years of teaching experience	Total number of participants	Number of participants disaggregated by content area taught						
		English	Math	Science	Social Studies	Foreign Langs.	The Arts	Other
1-3 yrs.	6	0	2	0	1	0	1	2
4-6 yrs.	5	1	0	0	1	1	0	2
7-10 yrs.	8	2	1	2	0	0	2	1
10+ yrs.	19	2	3	4	1	1	1	7

When respondents were asked about experience teaching ELs, 62% ($n=26$), reported teaching 10-20 ELs over the course of their time working in the district. For the current academic year, 47% ($n=18$) of teachers reported teaching 1-5 ELs, 34% ($n=13$) reported teaching 5-10 ELs, and 30% ($n=12$) reported teaching 1-10 ELs.

Perceptions of working with ELs. Of the 38 teachers who responded to the online survey, 59% ($n=23$) felt confident working with students from diverse backgrounds with limited English proficiency while 38% ($n=15$) did not feel confident. Regarding their preparation for working with students of limited English proficiency, a majority of respondents, 62% ($n=24$), considered themselves to be prepared; 35% ($n=14$), however, did not. Among respondents, 63% ($n=21$) of teachers noted they were knowledgeable of developmentally appropriate ESOL and research-based strategies as opposed to the 36% ($n=12$) who reported not feeling knowledgeable. Responses for familiarity with second language acquisition were evenly split with 19 saying they were familiar and 19 saying they were not familiar. More teachers, 49%, reported feeling comfortable with choosing materials and activities that promote second language acquisition than those who were not comfortable, 38% ($n=15$). Over half of the teachers, 67% ($n=26$), reported having experience teaching ELs through academic content. In contrast, 31% ($n=12$) of the teachers reported that they did not have experience teaching ELs.

Teaching ELs. Questions from this section of the survey looked at teaching practices. A clear majority of respondents, 83% ($n=32$), said they understood the importance of native language on second language learning while 14% ($n=6$) responded they did not know of its importance. With respect to their knowledge about teaching

practices that are culturally supportive and relevant to ELs, 72% ($n=24$) of the teachers responded favorably to having knowledge of culturally supportive and relevant practices; 27% ($n=9$) of teachers responded they did not have knowledge of culturally supportive and relevant teaching practices. More than half of the teachers, 88% ($n=34$), responded they understood the influence of cultural differences on language learning; 10% ($n=4$) of respondents did not have knowledge of how cultural differences influence language learning.

In spite of the number of responses above that stated the majority of respondents had knowledge of practices for working with ELs, 62% ($n=24$) responded that they were not familiar with the concepts of Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) versus Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) and how they both influence language learning, though 36% ($n=14$) said they were familiar with the concepts. When asked about experience with differentiated instruction and how it influences language learning, 94% ($n=35$) reported having experience while 5% ($n=3$) reported not having the experience.

Regarding experience modifying curriculum, assignments, and assessments for ELs, 87% ($n=32$) responded favorably that they had experience while 12% ($n=5$) responded unfavorably. When teachers were asked if they considered cultural differences in the instruction of academic content, 83% ($n=31$) said they did; a small portion, 15% ($n=6$), said they did not. In response to a question asking about their consideration of academic vocabulary needs in the instruction of content, 83% ($n=31$) of the teachers responded they did consider academic vocabulary issues and 15% ($n=6$) responded they did not. Another question asked whether or not teachers felt district leaders,

administrators, and educators recognized that educating ELs is the responsibility of the entire school staff. To that question 58% ($n=22$) responded they did; 39% ($n=15$) responded they did not.

Professional development. Responses received from the online survey regarding job-embedded professional development to meet the needs of ELs showed that 58% ($n=22$) of teachers felt professional development was not job-embedded to give them the skills needed to promote a culture of collaboration while 40% ($n=15$) responded favorably that it was. More than half, 53% ($n=20$), felt that professional development was data driven; 45% ($n=17$) felt it was not. When asked if they had been offered professional development to help them meet the academic, linguistic, and cultural needs of ELs, 53% ($n=20$) of teachers responded that they had been offered such professional development while 45% ($n=17$) responded they had not. The final question of the survey asked, “*What professional development needs would be most beneficial to you, your school, and the district in improving educational outcomes for ELs?*” In response, 56% ($n=21$) of the respondents indicated that training in the area of academic language and literacy development would be most beneficial to improving educational outcomes for ELs and 13% ($n=5$) chose training related to oral language development as most beneficial. It is worth noting that these responses directly relate to the research findings regarding BICS and CALP.

The open-ended option allowed teachers to respond with their own suggestions for professional development to improve educational outcomes. Among participants, 29% ($n=11$) chose this option. The suggestions included resources for ELs, strategies for supporting older ELs or SLIFEs, courses to support teachers speaking Spanish,

development of basic expectations for ELs to reach their potential in a new language, practical tools, technology, small group instruction, and a better system of communication and support between ESOL teacher and academic teachers.

Findings Related to Research Questions

Research question #1: *To what extent do secondary teachers report having knowledge of educating ELs in content, language acquisition, and cultural needs?*

The research question was intended to obtain information about teachers' knowledge of educating ELs in academic content, language acquisition, and cultural needs. When participants were asked about culturally relevant teaching and their understanding of cultural differences, the large number of highly favorable responses showed that the teachers consider cultural differences when planning instruction for ELs. The high positive response rate is directly aligned to the majority of teachers who had been teaching for 10 or more years, perhaps because they have had more opportunities for professional development about ELs than newer teachers have had.

It was surprising to see the percentage of respondents who felt they were prepared to work with students from diverse backgrounds with limited English proficiency. Among the teachers who responded positively about their level of confidence, 50% of them had been teaching for 10 or more years and had taught at least 5-10 ELs since coming to the district. The researcher's perception of confidence was much lower going into this study due to reports that had been submitted to administration by teachers who stated they struggled to support secondary ELs in their academic classes with learning academic content.

One group of participants did report less confidence. Science teachers with 10 or more years of teaching experience did not feel confident or prepared to work with students from diverse backgrounds. Additionally, those science teachers responded that they were not familiar with second language acquisition and were not comfortable choosing materials and activities that promote second language acquisition.

Research shows that one of the most complex challenges facing many secondary teachers in their efforts to educate students is their ability to meet the needs of adolescent ELs in content area classrooms such as English language arts, math, science, and social studies (Kim & Garcia, 2014). RSD data show secondary ELs in the district struggle in academic content classes that are required for graduation. As the number of ELs has increased in the district, there has been added focus on how to support teachers and ELs. When ELs arrive in rural areas such as the district in this study, they often do so in small numbers which pose another challenge for educators (Flynn & Hill, 2005).

There is a growing consensus in literature that the instructional needs of ELs in non-ESOL classrooms are different from the needs of native English speakers, and attempts to meet these differing needs should be based on knowledge of second language acquisition (Russell, 2012). Survey responses to knowledge of second language acquisition were evenly divided. The split may be related to teaching or working in the school district. Additionally, there is the question of whether or not the teachers' understanding is aligned to their work with ELs in the secondary classroom or to their personal experience with second language acquisition through learning another language. Further probing would be needed to fully understand teachers' knowledge of second language acquisition.

Research question #2: *What instructional practices do teachers report they use to meet the needs of secondary ELs?*

Research question two was intended to obtain information about teachers' instructional practices when working with ELs. A large number of teachers (62%) reported they were not familiar with BICS versus CALP. These responses contradicted previous responses about knowledge of second language acquisition. Science, math, and social studies teachers reported the least familiarity with the process of second language acquisition or BICS and CALP. BICS and CALP are prevalent in second language acquisition research, especially the research of Jim Cummins (2008). The evolution of BICS and CALP according to Cummins describes the addition of discrete language skills as a component of language proficiency.

Differentiation was another area found to be surprising as over half of the survey respondents felt they understood how differentiation influenced language learning. One challenge facing teachers of ELs is teaching mixed ability classes. Generally teachers express the need to learn more about differentiating instruction, selecting successful grouping strategies, creating well-structured cooperative learning activities, and integrating meaningful content for older learners who struggle with first and second language literacy skills (DelliCarpini, 2006). Further, a large number of teachers reported they have experience modifying curriculum, assignments, and assessments in the classroom to support ELs. A small portion 12% ($n=5$) of the teachers report they have no experience with modification. This may be due in part to the fact that some of the teachers have been teaching for only 1-3 years. Additionally, a small percentage of teachers 15% ($n=6$) responded they do not consider cultural differences when planning

and implementing instruction. The same portion of respondents also did not consider academic vocabulary needs in the instruction of content. These low responses are in direct alignment with teachers who have been teaching in the district for 1-3 years. These responses raise concerns because creating a learning environment to take ELs to a higher level of performance requires changes in instruction that target comprehension and interest as well as adaptations to classroom assessments to accommodate the linguistic and cultural needs of ELs until they are able to fully participate in classroom assessment without adaptation (Pappamihel & Mihai, 2006).

English teachers had the highest positive response rates across the board for questions related to understanding how to meet the instructional needs of ELs. English teachers responded they were familiar with second language acquisition, BICS and CALP, and best instructional practices to support ELs in the secondary classroom. This is most likely directly related to the participation by English teachers in professional development experiences to support the literacy needs of all students.

Teachers' overall perceptions of instructional supports in the school to help meet the needs of ELs were almost evenly split. Of the respondents who do not believe educating ELs is the responsibility of the entire staff, further probing is required to understand the reasons for this perception. Honigsfeld and Dove (2010) emphasize the importance of establishing a culture across the school for all teachers to work collaboratively to help ELs succeed and the significant role administrators play in creating this culture.

Research question #3: *What do teachers report to be important to their professional development needs to further build their capacity to meet the academic, linguistic, and cultural needs of secondary ELs?*

The third research question was intended to obtain information from teachers about their professional development needs to help them create effective instruction for ELs. The topics specifically suggested in the survey questions, cultural needs, oral language, academic language, and literacy development, reflect the areas of understanding that Samson and Collins (2012) assert are necessary for all teachers working with ELs.

Data collected to inform research question three was informative. Over half of respondents feel professional development is not job-embedded to give them skills to promote a culture of collaboration. Additionally, teachers feel professional development is not data driven. Nearly half of respondents reported they are not offered professional development to support the academic, linguistic, and cultural needs of ELs. Further research is needed to find specifically what professional development is taking place and what data points are currently being used to inform both professional development and instruction. Opportunities and encouragement for ongoing, collaborative interaction between ESOL teachers and content teachers to plan curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and to engage in relevant professional development can lead to improved achievement for ELs (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2010).

The data gathered from the open-ended question are an important starting point for further dialogue on how to support students and teachers of ELs. For example, respondents were interested in learning more about “resources for ELs, strategies for

supporting older ELs or SLIFEs, basic expectation for ELs to reach their potential in a new language, technology, small group instruction, and a better system of communication and support between ESOL teacher and academic teachers.” Teachers’ responses were reflective of the needs of ELs and of the teachers' own needs as educators expected to meet the needs of ELs as required by the new Every Student Succeeds Act. In a collaborative school culture for ELs, a collective vision is developed, philosophical beliefs and values are shared, and a common purpose is articulated (Russell, 2012).

Conclusions

The study’s findings show a great number of secondary teachers in Rural School District feel prepared when working with ELs with limited English proficiency. Teachers report they take into account the cultural differences of ELs when planning instruction and modifying curriculum and assessments to meet learning needs. In addition, teachers’ knowledge of second language acquisition was evenly split, which is a good starting point for the district to further explore ways to help students and teachers. Even though participants reported confidence in having knowledge of educating ELs, language acquisition, and cultural needs, it is important to note that they do not feel supported with job-embedded professional development to help them with the instruction of ELs in their classrooms.

Over half of the teachers responded to knowing how second languages are learned. However, Reeves (2006) observed in his study that teachers hold misconceptions about how second languages are learned and lack the attitudes necessary to facilitate student achievement. Further study is needed to determine if the perceptions of the RSD teachers reflect their actual knowledge.

The majority of participants responded that they were not familiar with BICS or CALP, terms coined by Cummins in 1979. Understanding these concepts is an important part of understanding how to help ELs with language development. Teachers often equate knowledge of BICS with academic language use in classroom contexts. BICS according to Haynes (2007) are language skills needed in social situations and the day-to-day language needed to interact socially with other people. CALP, the language skills needed in academic situations, is more than understanding vocabulary and learning academic facts for a test. CALP also requires students to sharpen their cognitive abilities and learn new concepts (Haynes, 2007). Providing professional development on the concepts of BICS and CALP and their importance in the language development of ELs might be one way RSD could increase support for teachers and students.

Participants' feelings of inadequacy in the instruction of ELs are consistent with the research of Gomez and Diarrassouba (2014) who affirm that often teachers feel frustrated when they do not know how to help their students. To build teacher capacity and promote a culture of collaboration, it is important that there is a feeling of teamwork among teachers. Petit (2011) points out that high school ESOL students were viewed as the responsibility of the ESOL program and teacher. A majority of participants of this study responded favorably that educating ELs is the responsibility of the entire staff. However, 39% of respondents did not see the education of ELs as the responsibility of the entire staff. Considering the coursework demands for ELs in high schools today, it seems unrealistic to expect these students to solely rely on their ESOL teachers for support. It is vital that administrators tap into the resources and expertise of ESOL

teachers and Teacher Leaders to provide the support classroom teachers require for teaching ELs.

When teachers are given opportunities for job-embedded learning to meet the needs of their students, there is proven growth in student achievement. Job-embedded experiences will support secondary teachers of ELs by giving them resources and practical tools needed to support learning. If all parties can begin to visualize teachers with specialized expertise as collaborating partners rather than individuals with sole responsibility for second language learners, improvements in the educational achievement of secondary ELs will follow (Russell, 2012). A collaborative culture can lead to improved academic outcomes for ELs because these environments encourage the ongoing interaction between ESOL teachers and content teachers. ELs benefit when they see the interconnectedness of materials and skills presented in different classes. However, DelliCarpini (2008) argues that collaboration does not occur naturally in most secondary schools. Collaboration must be encouraged. With the implementation of the Common Core State Standards which require students to demonstrate mastery in language usage and writing skills and to meet grade-specific standards, it is extremely important for teachers to collaborate and share best practices, lessons, and assessments to meet the needs of ELs.

Implications

The enrollment of ELs in RSD increased from 189 in 2010 to 228 in 2015. This increase is occurring across the grades. Secondary schools in RSD are facing many challenges with respect to educating ELs who come with many common problems including lack of oral language skills and lack of the literacy development needed to be

successful in secondary classrooms. Since the implementation of new standards in 2012, ELs in RSD have yet to meet the state target for learner progression in learning English. The lack of English proficiency hinders students' ability to be successful in English-only classrooms requiring strong English skills for reading, writing, speaking and listening across all content areas. Consequently, ELs are a large portion of the students who do not graduate from high school. In 2014 the U.S. national graduation rate for all students was 82%. For ELs, the rate was 62% (Calderón, 2008; Ujifusa, 2015). With ELs graduating at lower rates, these students face a dismal future without a solid educational foundation. The economic impact is considerable both to the individual and to society at large (Amos, 2013; Flores, Batalova, & Fix, 2012).

As the number of ELs in the nation's schools continues to rise, educators must look more closely at how to support the learning needs of ELs in secondary content classrooms. With the Every Student Succeeds Act, there is pressure on local education agencies to ensure ELs become English proficient. That it takes ELs time to acquire English language proficiency is a given, especially if students are coming to schools as SLIFEs, so educators must look at variables over which they have control. One such variable is the ability and opportunity for all educators, including ESOL Supervisors, ESOL teachers, content teachers, and administrators, to collaborate about the instructional needs of ELs, and to make instructional decisions to promote student growth and achievement.

Establishing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) in RSD for Non-ESOL and ESOL teachers would promote collaboration to meet the needs of ELs. The results of this study indicate that many teachers are unfamiliar with second language acquisition,

BICS and CALP. PLCs, meeting at least quarterly as a content specific or vertical team, should help to support teachers in this area. Possible activities for PLC groups could include sharing in a professional book study; planning, conducting, and discussing findings from action research on second language acquisition, BICS and CALP; unpacking standards to plan instruction for ELs; reviewing student work; collaboratively scoring assessments to inform instruction; and analyzing relevant data.

The results of this study also suggest the recommendation that RSD look into offering continuing credit professional development courses to give teachers another resource for supporting ELs and to help build teacher knowledge and instructional capacity. These courses might include, but are not limited to, EL Reading: Teaching Strategies for Grades 6-12, EL Language Assessment and Related Issues in the 6-12 Classroom, Developing Listening Comprehension in ELs, and Content-based Instructional Strategies for ELs. These courses could be offered face-to-face in the district or online to provide teachers with flexibility to support their schedules.

The major purpose of this study was to identify how to improve the educational outcomes for secondary ELs in academic classrooms. While there may be some lack of knowledge of best practices and competencies for teachers, results from the survey show that in RSD, job-embedded professional development coupled with the use of data to inform instruction would benefit ELs and secondary teachers. As a school and school system, it is extremely important to develop and promote a culture of collaboration between ESOL and Non-ESOL teachers. As a step to ensure that the needs of both teachers and ELs are met, RSD should convene an EL Task Force focusing specifically on strategies for meeting the instructional needs of ELs in the secondary classroom,

appropriate professional development opportunities for teachers, and the exploration of other ways to effectively support students and teachers.

Limitations of the Study

Although the study has reached its purpose, there were some unavoidable limitations. First, because of the district being a low-incidence district for ELs, the high school with the largest enrollment of ELs was chosen as the site for the study. To generalize the results for larger groups, however, the study should have involved more participants, such as teachers from the two middle schools that feed students into the high school. Second, the study was constrained by the small number of ELs in the one high school and in the district. The benefit of this is that the study can be tailored to other small districts. This study shines a spotlight on the growing number of ELs in small school districts that do not have the resources through Title III funds to provide much needed professional development or to hire additional ESOL teachers to support the educational needs of ELs.

Future Research Implications

For districts that have a low-incidence of ELs, this study could prove informative as they seek ways to support the learning of ELs. Expanding the study by conducting qualitative interviews of Non-ESOL teachers might be a way to further examine teacher knowledge and needs when working with secondary ELs. Potential questions to guide future research might include:

1. How does a district with a low enrollment of ELs provide teachers at the secondary level who teach LTEL and SLIFE with instructional supports that equip them to provide ELs with equitable access to curriculum?

2. How does a district with a low enrollment of ELs utilize Professional Learning Communities to support teachers and ELs at the secondary level?
3. What do administrators with a low enrollment of ELs need to consider when supporting Non-ESOL teachers as they work with ELs at the secondary level?

Policy Implications

As small numbers of ELs continue to arrive in rural school districts, it will be beneficial for state and local education agencies to look beyond the minimal requirements of ESSA. Educators need to initiate and participate in discussions focusing on ways to increase teacher competence for teaching ELs. The competencies needed would be in direct alignment with the competencies needed by teachers to increase literacy among all students. One potential way to encourage teachers to develop their competence would be to offer continuing education credits for certification renewal to teachers who take classes that support improved understanding of and instruction for ELs.

APPENDIX A

Participant Consent Form

Project Title	Examining Non-ESOL Teacher Knowledge and Practices for Educating Secondary English Learners
Purpose of the Study	This study will examine non-ESOL (English as a Second Language) secondary education teachers' knowledge of working with English learners (ELs) and their implementation of classroom practices as they relate to meeting ELs' linguistic, academic, and cultural needs. Additionally, this study will examine teacher perceptions regarding professional development and administrative and other supports to build their capacity to instruct ELs. This is part of the doctoral dissertation for Contina Quick-McQueen under the direction of Dr. Margaret McLaughlin and Dr. Drew Fagan.
Procedures	The research involves participating in a web-based survey questionnaire that will ask teachers questions about their knowledge and practices as well as perceptions of supports and professional development needed to support the instruction of ELs. To maintain confidentiality, all participants will be provided an introductory email to explicitly explain the purpose of the study, which will also include a confidentiality statement expressing that all feedback will be confidential. Qualtrics will assign each participant a code, and all survey responses will be linked to that particular code; in this way, no survey will be connected back to any particular person. Furthermore, all data will be reported in the aggregate so that no identifying information will be shown. The system will be referred to as "a small rural school district in the Mid-Atlantic area." The survey will take approximately 10 minutes.
Potential Risks and Discomforts	There are minimal risks to your participation. Your responses will be confidential. Only I will know your identity and your responses will be coded.
Potential Benefits	There are no direct benefits from participation in this research. However, possible benefits include providing the school district with insight into best practices to support the academic, linguistic, and cultural needs of ELs. We hope that, in the future, other people might benefit from this study through improved understanding of how to meet the needs of ELs.

Confidentiality	<p>Any potential loss of confidentiality will be minimized through the use of Qualtrics, an on-line software program. The program has a log-on feature and firewall to prevent any type of data breach. Each participant will have a unique log-on Qualtrics ID. I am the only person that will be able to link your responses to your name. I have established a separate survey link for your responses. Your name will be coded so your responses will remain anonymous. Every effort will be taken to prevent breach of confidentiality. To maintain confidentiality, all participants will be provided an introductory email to explicitly explain the purpose of the study, which will also include a confidentiality statement expressing that all feedback will be confidential. Qualtrics will assign each participant a code, and all survey responses will be linked to that particular code; in this way, no survey will be connected back to any particular person.</p> <p>Furthermore, all data will be reported in the aggregate so that no identifying information will be shown. The system will be referred to as “a small rural school district in the Mid-Atlantic area.” Data from Qualtrics will be downloaded and secured on a separate flash drive and only the researcher will have access to the files. All data will be kept confidential and destroyed after the researcher has conducted a thorough analysis or six months after the survey window closes whichever comes first. If I write a report or article about this research project, your identity will be protected to the maximum extent possible. Your information may be shared with representatives of the University of Maryland, College Park or governmental authorities if you or someone else is in danger or if I am required to do so by law.</p>
Compensation	<p>You could receive a \$100.00 Visa gift card if you complete the questionnaire within two weeks and if your coded identity is randomly selected to receive compensation. If you are selected. I will contact you directly to provide you with the incentive. You will be responsible for any taxes assessed on the compensation.</p>
Right to Withdraw and Questions	<p>Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. If you decide to participate in this research, you may stop participating at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you stop participating at any time, you will not be penalized; however, you will not be entered into the drawing for the gift card.</p>

	<p>If you decide to stop taking part in the study at any point, please close your internet browser. If you decide to stop taking part in the study, if you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or if you need to report an injury related to the research, please contact the investigator: Contina Quick-McQueen @ 240-431-1937 or cquickmc@umd.edu</p>
Participant Rights	<p>If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or wish to report a research-related injury, please contact:</p> <p>University of Maryland College Park Institutional Review Board Office 1204 Marie Mount Hall College Park, Maryland, 20742 Email: irb@umd.edu Telephone: 301-405-0678</p> <p>This research has been reviewed according to the University of Maryland, College Park IRB procedure for research involving human subjects.</p>
Statement of Consent	<p>By agreeing to participate, you are indicating that you are at least 18 years of age; you have read this consent form or have had it read to you; your questions have been answered to your satisfaction; and you have voluntarily agree to participate in this research study. You may print/download a copy of this consent form.</p> <p>If you agree to participate, please indicate below.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>As a part of the questionnaire, you will be asked to provide an electronic signature.</p>

APPENDIX B

Participant Survey-Questionnaire

**Examining Non-ESOL Teacher Knowledge and Practices
to Meet Needs of Secondary ELs**

Q1 I understand this survey-questionnaire is confidential.

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)

Q2 I teach.....

- ☐ Click to write Choice 1 (1) _____

Q3 I have been teaching for the following number of years?

- ☐ 1-3 years (1)
- ☐ 4-6 years (2)
- ☐ 7-10 years (3)
- ☐ 10 or more years (4)

Q4 I have been a high school teacher in Rural School District for the following number of
years.

- ☐ 1-3 years (1)
- ☐ 4-6 years (2)
- ☐ 7-10 years (3)
- ☐ 10 or more years (4)

Q5 I have the following number of years teaching high school or in another role before coming to high school.

- ☐ 1-3 years (1)
- ☐ 4-6 years (2)
- ☐ 7-10 years (3)
- ☐ 10 or more years (4)

Q6 I feel confident working with students from diverse backgrounds with limited English proficiency?

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)
- ☐ Disagree (3)
- ☐ Strongly disagree (4)

Q7 I feel prepared to work with students from diverse backgrounds with limited English proficiency?

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)
- ☐ Disagree (3)
- ☐ Strongly disagree (4)

Q8 I am familiar with second language acquisition (SLA).

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)
- ☐ Disagree (3)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree (4)

Q9 I am comfortable choosing materials and activities that promote second language acquisition.

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)
- ☐ Disagree (3)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree (4)

Q10 I have experience teaching English learners through content.

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)
- ☐ Disagree (3)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree (4)

Q11 I understand native language importance in second language learning.

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)
- ☐ Disagree (3)

☐ Strongly Disagree (4)

Q12 I am aware of how cultural differences influence language learning.

☐ Strongly Agree (1)

☐ Agree (2)

☐ Disagree (3)

☐ Strongly Disagree (4)

Q13 I am familiar with the concept of Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS)

vs. Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency Skills (CALPS) and how they
influence language learning.

☐ Strongly Agree (1)

☐ Agree (2)

☐ Disagree (3)

☐ Strongly disagree (4)

Q14 I have experience with the concept of differentiated instruction and how it influences

language learning.

☐ Strongly Agree (1)

☐ Agree (2)

☐ Disagree (3)

☐ Strongly disagree (4)

Q15 I have experience modifying curriculum, assignments, and assessments for ELs in my classroom.

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)
- ☐ Disagree (3)
- ☐ Strongly disagree (4)

Q16 I consider cultural differences in the instruction of content.

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)
- ☐ Disagree (3)
- ☐ Strongly disagree (4)

Q17 I consider academic vocabulary needs in the instruction of content.

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)
- ☐ Disagree (3)
- ☐ Strongly disagree (4)

Q18 I feel school leaders, administrators, and educators recognize that educating ELs is the responsibility of the entire school staff.

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)

- ☐ Disagree (3)
- ☐ Strongly disagree (4)

Q19 I feel professional development to meet the needs of ELs is job-embedded providing me with the knowledge and skills to collaborate about English as a Second Language research-based practices.

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)
- ☐ Disagree (3)
- ☐ Strongly disagree (4)

Q20 I feel professional development is data driven so that it will have a lasting impact on the academic achievement of ELs.

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)
- ☐ Disagree (3)
- ☐ Strongly disagree (4)

Q21 I am offered professional development aimed at meeting the academic, linguistic, and cultural needs of ELs.

- ☐ Strongly Agree (1)
- ☐ Agree (2)
- ☐ Disagree (3)

- ☐ Strongly disagree (4)

Q22 What professional development needs would be most beneficial to you, your school,
and the district in improving educational outcomes for ELs?

- ☐ Oral language development (1)
- ☐ Academic language and literacy development (2)
- ☐ Other, please explain. (3) _____

GLOSSARY

Acronym	Meaning	Explanation
ACCESS	Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English from State to State	Official test from the WIDA consortium administered annually to English learners in grades K-12
AMAO I	Annual Measurable Achievement Objective One	Measurement of the number or percentage of English learners making progress in learning English during the school year
AMAO II	Annual Measurable Achievement Objective Two	Measurement of the number or percentage of English learners who reach proficiency in English by the end of the school year
ARRA	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	Federal economic stimulus package signed into law in 2009 that includes funding provisions directly related to the education of English language learners
AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress	Measurement to determine whether schools or school systems meet the requirements on federally mandated state assessments
BICS	Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills	Language skills needed in social situations; everyday language needed to interact socially with other people
CALP	Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency	Language term coined by Jim Cummins which refers to formal academic learning
COMAR	Code of Maryland Regulations	Official compilation of all regulations issued by agencies of the State of Maryland
EL	English Learner	Students who are unable to communicate fluently or learn effectively in English and require modified instruction in both the English language and their academic course content
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages	Program inside of PK-12 setting that is designed for English learners who seek proficiency in social and academic language

ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965	Legislation representing a major new commitment by the federal government to “quality and equality” in education
ESSA	Every Student Succeeds Act	Federal legislation passed in 2015 that governs K-12 public education policy in the United States
IEP	Individualized Education Program	Document developed for each public school child who needs special education describing specific needs and strategies to address those needs
LAS	Language Assessment Scale	Spanish language proficiency assessment that measures the speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension skills of K-12 students
LTEL	Long-term English Learner	Formal educational classification given to students who have been enrolled in American schools for more than six years, who are not progressing toward English proficiency, and who are struggling academically due to limited English skills
MSDE	Maryland State Department of Education	State education agency for Maryland
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress	Largest national continuing assessment of what America’s students know and can do in various subject areas
NCLB	No Child Left Behind	U.S. Act of Congress that reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act including Title I provisions applying to disadvantaged students
PARCC	The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career	Consortium of states, the District of Columbia, and the Bureau of Indian Education that creates and deploys K-12 standardized assessments in mathematics and English language arts based on the Common Core State Standards

PLC	Professional Learning Community	Group of educators who meets regularly, shares expertise, and works collaboratively to improve teaching skills and the performance of students
RSD	Rural School District	Pseudonym for the school district in the study, used to protect anonymity
SI	Sheltered Instruction	Approach to teaching English learners which integrates language and content instruction
SIOP	Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol	Research-based and validated instructional model that has proven effective in addressing the academic needs of English learners throughout the United States
SLIC	Second Language Instructional Competence	Theory of language in school; refers to the development of second language proficiency by monolingual and bilingual speakers
SLIFE	Students with Limited and/or Interrupted Formal Education	Umbrella term used to describe a diverse subset of the English language learner population who share several unifying characteristics
TESOL	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages	General name for the field of teaching English learners
WIDA	World-class Instructional Design and Assessment	Multi-state consortium that provides instructional standards for English learners as well as assessments to measure their progress on those standards

REFERENCES

- Amos, J. (2013). The English learner dropout dilemma. Retrieved from <http://all4ed.org/articles/the-english-learner-dropout-dilemma-new-report-examines-consequences-causes-and-solutions-to-high-dropout-rate-among-english-language-learners/>
- Ariel, G. R. S., Hooker, S., & Batalova, J. (2015). States and districts with the highest number and share of English language learners. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/states-and-districts-highest-number-and-share-english-language-learners>
- Babbie, E. R. (2010). *The practice of social research* (12th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Beldon, S., Snow, G., Manno, Y., & Short, D. (2015). *SLIFE: Students with limited or interrupted formal education*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, 1–14.
- Brown, J. E., & Doolittle, J. (2008). A cultural, linguistic, and ecological framework for response to intervention with English language learners. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 40(5), 66–72.
- Bunch, C. G., Kibler, A., & Pimentel, S. (2013). *Realizing opportunities for English learners in the Common Core English Language Arts and Disciplinary Literacy Standards*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Calderón, M. (2008). Expediting language, literacy and learning for adolescent ELLs. *The STARlight*, issue 6.

- Calderon, T. C., & Zemora E. (2014). Factors affecting the implementation of sheltered instruction observation protocols for English language learners. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 31(3), 20-32.
- Carrier, K. A. (2005). Key issues for teaching English language learners in academic classrooms. *Middle School Journal*, 37(2), 4-9.
- Center for American Progress. (2012). Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English language learners: Applying research to policy and practice for teacher effectiveness. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535608.pdf>
- Center for Public Education. (2016). How many English language learners are in our school(s)? Retrieved from <http://www.data-first.org/data/how-many-english-language-learners-are-in-our-schools/>
- Center for Public Education. (2007). Preparing English language learners for academic success. Retrieved from <http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/Main-Menu/Instruction/What-research-says-about-English-language-learners-At-a-glance/Preparing-English-language-learners-for-academic-success.html>
- Cloud, N., Lakin, J., & Leininger, E. (2011). Learner-centered teaching: The core of effective practices for adolescent English language learners. *TESOL Journal*, 2(2), 132-152.
- Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 120.
- Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226699482_BICS_and_Calp_Empirical_and_theoretical_status_of_the_distinction

- Daniel, S., M., & Conlin, L. (2015). Shifting attention back to students within the sheltered instruction observation protocol. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(1), 169-184.
- Dawson, S. M. (2014). Pull-out or push-in service delivery model: Conducive to students or teachers? Retrieved from http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1297&context=education_ETD_masters
- DelliCarpini, M.(2006). Scaffolding and differentiating instruction in mixed ability ESL classes using a round robin activity. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 7(3). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/DelliCarpini-RoundRobin.html>
- DelliCarpini, M. (2008, August). Teacher collaboration for ESL/EFL academic success. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 14(8). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/DelliCarpini-TeacherCollaboration.html>
- Dirnberger, L. M. (2010). *ELL instructional concerns of a low incidence school district: A case study*(Master's capstone). Retrieved from <https://www.hamline.edu/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=2147514383>
- Dworin, J. (2011). Listening to graduates of a K-12 bilingual program: Language ideologies and literacy practices of former bilingual students. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 5, 104-126. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ106273.pdf>
- Echevarría, J., Richards-Tutor, C., Chinn, V., & Rattleff, P. (2011). Did they get it? The role of fidelity in teaching English learners. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 54(6), 425–434.

- Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2006). School reform and standards-based education: A model for English-language learners. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(4), 195–211.
- Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. (2011). Issues A-Z: English-language learners. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/english-language-learners/>
- Faltis, C., Aria, M. B., & Ramirez-Marin, F. (2010). Identifying relevant competencies for secondary teachers of English learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 33(3), 307-328.
- Flores, S., M., Batalova, J., & Fix, M. (2012). *The educational trajectories of English language learners in Texas*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy institute.
- Flynn, K., & Hill, J. (2005). *English language learners: A growing population*. Retrieved from http://www.inetmigrant.org/resources/2013/educational/policyBrief_ELL.pdf
- Gandara, P. (2015). *The implications of deeper learning for adolescent immigrants and English language learners*. Retrieved from <http://www.jff.org/sites/default/files/publications/materials/The-Implications-of-DL-for-Adolescent%20Immigrants-and-ELLS-110415a.pdf>
- Gomez, M., & Diarrassouba, N. (2014). What do teachers need to support English learners? *English Language Teaching*, 7(5), 89-99.
- Hagan, E. C. (2010, Spring). Response to intervention: Implications for Spanish-speaking English language learners. *Perspectives on Language and Literacy*, 36 (2).
- Hashwani, M. S. (2008). Students' attitudes, motivation and anxiety towards English language learning. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, 2(2).

- Haynes, J. (2007). *Getting started with English language learners: How educators can meet the challenge*. Retrieved from http://ngl.cengage.com/assets/pro00000000094_pd/pdf/sample-getting_started_with_ELLs.pdf
- Haynes, J. (2014). Six strategies for teaching ELLs across the content areas. Retrieved from <http://blog.tesol.org/six-strategies-for-teaching-ells-across-the-content-areas/>
- Hernandez, M. (2009). *Perceptions of Educators' Use of English as a Second Language Strategies and Research-based Practices with English Language Learners in Northeast Tennessee* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1834>
- Hill, J., & Flynn, K. (2004). *English Language Learner Resource Guide: A Guide for Rural Districts with a Low Incidence of ELLS*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2010). *Collaboration and co-teaching: strategies for English learners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Huelsman, M. (2015). The debt divide: The racial and class bias behind the "new normal" of student borrowing. Retrieved from <http://www.demos.org/publication/debt-divide-racial-and-class-bias-behind-new-normal-student-borrowing>
- Kim, W. G., & Garcia, S. B. (2014). Long-term English language learners' perceptions of their language and academic learning experience. *Remedial and Special Education*, 35(5), 313-324. Retrieved from www.rse.sagepub.com
- Klein, A. (2015). ESEA rewrite and waiver issue: When should ELLs count for accountability? Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-12/2015/07/nclb_rewrite_and_waiver_issue_.html

- Klinger, K. J., Boardman, G. A., Eppolito, E. A., & Schonewise, E. A. (2012). Supporting adolescent English language learners' reading in the content areas. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 10(1), 35-64.
- Koelsch, N. (2006). *Improving literacy outcomes for English language learners in high school: Considerations for states and districts in developing a coherent policy framework*. Washington, DC: National High School Center.
- Lee, O. (2004). Integrating content areas with English language development for English-language learners. Retrieved from http://www.glencoe.com/glencoe_research/Math/icawp.pdf
- Lapayese, Y., Huchting, K., & Grimalt, O. (2014, March 7). Gender and bilingual education: An exploratory study on the academic achievement of Latina and Latino English learners. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 152-160.
- Lindholm-Leary, K., & Hernandez, A. (2011). Achievement and language proficiency of Latino students in dual language programmes: native and English speakers, fluent English speakers, fluent English/previous ELLs, and current ELLs. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(6), 531-545.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2012). Success and challenges in dual language education. *Theory into Practice*, 51, 256-262.
- Lopez, F. (2010). Identity and motivation among Hispanic English language learners in disparate educational contexts. *Education Policy Archives*, 18 (16). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/717/843>

- Martinez-Wenzl, M. T.(2014). *¿Listo para el colegio? Examining college readiness among Latino newcomer immigrants* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles).Retrieved fromhttp://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/programs/title_III/elp_s_a.html
- Maryland Report Card. (2015). 2015 NAEP Performance for the State of Maryland. Retrieved from <http://www.mdreportcard.org/NaepResults.aspx?PV=61:4:99:AAAA:1:N:6:1:1:2:1:1:1:1:3>
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2015a). Final report of the study of increasing and declining enrollment in Maryland public schools. Retrieved from <http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/adequacystudy/docs/MDEnrollmentReportFinal-071815.pdf>
- Maryland State Department of Education.(2015b). Press release: Maryland high school graduation rate hits record high. Retrieved from http://marylandpublicschools.org/press/01_27_2015.html
- MacSwan, J.,& Rolstad, K.(2003). Linguistic diversity, schooling, and social class: Rethinking our conception of language proficiency in language minority education. Retrieved from <http://www.terpconnect.umd.edu/~macswan/MacSwan-Rolstad2003.pdf>
- Meltzer, J., & Hamann, E. T. (2005). Meeting the literacy development needs of adolescent English language learners through content-area learning. Part Two: Focus on classroom teaching and learning strategies. *Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education*. Providence, RI: The Education Alliance at Brown University.

- Moffatt, S. (2015, November-December). Contextualizing scientific research methodologies. *IOSR Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 5(6), 52-57.
Retrieved from <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jrme/papers/Vol-5%20Issue-6/Version-1/GO5615257.pdf>
- Molle, D. (2013, Winter). The pitfalls of focusing on instructional strategies in professional development for teachers of English learners. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 40(1), 101-121.
- Moskovsky, C., Alrabai, F., Paolini, S., & Ratcheva, S. (2013). The effects of teachers' motivational strategies on learners' motivation: A controlled investigation of second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 63(1), 34-62.
- Murphey, D. (2014). The academic achievement of English language learners: Data for the U.S. and each of the states. Retrieved from <http://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/2014-62AcademicAchievementEnglish.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). English language learners. In *The Condition of Education 2015* (NCES 2015-144). Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015144.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). The nation's report card. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2009/2010458.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). Number and percentage of public school students participating in programs for English language learners, by state: Selected years, 2002-03 through 2012-13. In *Digest of Education Statistics*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_204.20.asp

- National Council of La Raza. (2014). State performance standards. Retrieved from <http://www.sreb.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/maryland2014sps.pdf>
- National Council of Teachers of English. (2008). Research policy brief: English language learners. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/PolicyResearch/ELLResearchBrief.pdf>
- NEA Education Policy and Practice Department. (2008). English language learners face unique challenges. Retrieved from [http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/ELL_Policy_Brief_Fall_08_\(2\).pdf](http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/ELL_Policy_Brief_Fall_08_(2).pdf)
- National High School Center. (2006). Improving literacy outcomes for English language learners in high school: Considerations for states and districts in developing a coherent policy framework. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED501077.pdf>
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Public Law 107-110, enacted by the 107th U.S. Congress. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf>
- Pappamihel, E., & Mihai, F. (2006). Assessing English language learners' content knowledge in middle school classrooms. *Middle School Journal*, 34-43. Retrieved from http://www.umbc.edu/stept/Modules/Science/module5/resources/Pappamihel_Assessing_ELLs_content_knowledge_in_middle_school_classrooms.pdf
- Petit, S. K. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about English language learners in the mainstream classroom: A review of the literature. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 5(2), 123-147.

- Pompa, D. (2015). New education legislation includes important policies for English learners, potential pitfalls for their advocates. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/news/new-education-legislation-includes-important-policies-english-learners-potential-pitfalls-their>
- Rance-Roney, J. (2009). Best practices for adolescent ELLs. *Educational Leadership*, 66(7), 32-37.
- Rivera, M., Francis, D. J., Lesaux, N., Keiffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006). Researched-based recommendations for instruction and academic interventions. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/lep-partnership/interventions.pdf>
- Reeves, J. R. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Journal of Education Research*, 99(3), 131-139.
- Robertson, K., & LaFond, S. (2009). How to support ELL students with interrupted formal education (SIFEs). Retrieved from <http://www.colorincolorado.org/article/how-support-ell-students-interrupted-formal-education-sifes>
- Rolstad, K. (2015). Second language instructional competence. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1057101>
- Ruiz-de-Velasco, J., Fix, M., & Chewell, B. C. (2000). Overlooked and Underserved: Immigrant Students in U.S. Secondary Schools. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

- Russell, F. A. (2012). A culture of collaboration: Meeting the instructional needs of adolescent English language learners. *TESOL Journal*, 3(3), 445-465.
- Samson, J. F., & Collins, B. F. (2012). Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English language learners: Applying research to policy and practice for teacher effectiveness. Retrieved from <http://www.AMERICANPROGRESS.org>
- Sargrad, S. (2016). Hope for English-language learners: The Every Student Succeeds Act finally prioritizes the progress of English-language learning students. Retrieved from <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/knowledge-bank/articles/2016-01-13/every-student-succeeds-act-brings-new-hope-for-english-language-learners>
- Scott, D. (2012, December 6). Graduation data shows states struggle with English learners. Retrieved from <http://www.governing.com/blogs/view/gov-graduation-data-shows-states-struggle-with-English-learners.html#Data>
- Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners—A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Short, D. J., Cloud, N., Morris, P., & Motta, J. (2012). Cross-district collaboration: Curriculum and professional development. *TESOL Journal*, 3(3), 402-421.
- Short, D. J., Fidelman, C. G., & Louguit, M. (2012). Developing academic language in English language learners through sheltered instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(2), 334-358.

- Slama, R. B. (2012). A longitudinal analysis of academic English proficiency outcomes for adolescent English language learners in the United States. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104 (2) 265-285.
- Stewart, M. A., Araujo, J., Knezek, L. A., & Revelle, C. (2015). Tapping into English language learners' lived experiences through relevant literature. *California Reader*, 48(4), 13-19.
- Tuchman, O. (2010). Effective programs for English language learners with interrupted formal education. Indianapolis, IN: Bridging Refugee and Youth Children's Services.
- Ujifusa, A. (2015). National graduation rate increases to all-time high of 82 percent. Retrieved from <http://blogs.edweek/campaign>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2010). Meeting the needs of English learners and other diverse learners. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/english-learners-diverse-learners.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice. (2015). Dear colleague letter: English learner students and limited English proficient parents. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-el-201501.pdf>
- Vialpando, J., Yedlin, J., Linse, C., Harrington, M., & Cannon, G. (2005). *Educating English language learners: Implementing instructional practices*. Washington, DC: National Council of La Raza.
- Wallace, S. (2004). Effective instructional strategies for English language learners in mainstream classrooms. Retrieved from <http://education.jhu.edu/PD/newhorizons/strategies/topics/English%20Language%20Learners/Articles/Effective>

%20Instruction%20Strategies%20for%20English%20Language%20Learners
%20in%20Mainstream%20Classrooms/

Walqui, A. (2000). Contextual factors in second language acquisition. Retrieved from
www.eric.ed.gov

Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual
framework. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(2),
159-180.

Wesley, P. (2009, Summer). The language learning motivation of early adolescent French
immersion graduates. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(2), 270-286.

Wesley, P. (2010). Language learning motivation in early adolescents: Using mixed
methods research to explore contradiction. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*,
4(4), 295-312.

Weyer, M. (2016). Dual and English language learners. Retrieved from
<http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/english-dual-language-learners.aspx>

WIDA. (2012). *The 2012 amplification of the English language development standards:
Kindergarten - Grade 12*. Madison, WI: author.

Zinshteyn, M. (2014). In U.S., students struggling with English outnumber kids born
abroad. Retrieved from [http://www.ewa.org/blog-latino-ed-beat/us-students
-struggling-english-outnumber-kids-born-abroad](http://www.ewa.org/blog-latino-ed-beat/us-students-struggling-english-outnumber-kids-born-abroad)