2019

Effective Instruction for English Language Learners

Kelly Picard Brown
Walden University

Walden University

College of Education

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Kelly Picard

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Michael Brunn, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Crissie Jameson, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Bonita Wilcox, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University

2019

Abstract

Effective Instruction for English Language Learners

by

Kelly Picard

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

November 2019

Abstract

The problem addressed in this study is that English Language Learners (ELLs) in a California school district are not meeting the targeted yearly grade level expectations or making the same progress as non-ELL students. Meeting this goal will help close the achievement gap between ELLs and their native-English speaking peers. The purpose of the qualitative study was to explore the local problem and identify how teachers provided academic instruction to support ELLs with academic instruction and investigate perceived causes of the inadequate progress in learning English and the academic content. The research was guided by Vygotsky's theory of development and the social/cognitive interactions with Ladson-Billings' approach to cultural relevance. These theories support how teachers and students maintain an active cognitive and social learning approach. The qualitative study investigated teachers' instructional practices for ELLs through classroom observations and interviews. Purposeful sampling identified 12 potential participants who met the criteria of providing ELL instruction. Four ELL teachers participated through observations and interviews. The data analysis examined, identified, and interpreted themes. Data saturation was reached as no new themes emerged. The following 4 themes resulted: (a) classroom environment, (b) curriculum content, (c) academic language, and (d) differentiation. A 3-Day PD was designed to guide future ELL pedagogy and strategic activity to promote social change by providing educators opportunities to practice research based ELL instructional approaches to teaching. The end goal is for improved academic and social achievements for ELL students.

Effective Instruction for English Language Learners

by

Kelly Picard

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

November 2019

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Section 1: The Problem

Introduction

According to a 2016 California school district, their mission strives to promote academic excellence, equity, and access for the District's 326,893 English learners. The District has developed a variety of instructional programs to meet the needs for these students. English language learners (ELLs) are not only responsible for learning the content in the Common Core State Standards, but they must also learn these standards as second language learners.

Wolf, Yuan, Blood, and Huang (2014) stated that the challenge faced by ELLs is that they must acquire the English language while also learning academic content. Teachers of ELLs are still required to teach the Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards, but also must adjust the curriculum to meet needs of these students to ensure that these standards are met (Murphy & Haller, 2015).

ELLs need opportunities to practice the use of academic language by working collaboratively with other students of various English language development (ELD) levels so that they can increase their levels of proficiency. All students can benefit from participating in conversations that give them chances to use the vocabulary they are familiar with and the academic language of the content area they are learning. Fisher and Frey (2014) stated that 50% of instructional time for ELLs should include student collaboration through conversations with others.

The use of perfect pairs of picture books can provide ELL students with support in learning academic language through the combining of content area narrative and expository texts (Hansen et al., 2015). When instructing a group of students during ELD, teachers will use the California ELD standards to guide their instruction. The teacher may have just one level of ELL students in a class or varying levels of ELL students. According to Linquanti, Hakuta, and Policy Analysis for California Education (2012), "State legislation (AB 124) requires the state to revise its English Language Development (ELD) standards to better reflect the language demands found in new English Language Arts standards" (p. 2). Either way, it is essential that the teacher differentiate instruction to meet the needs of the various ELD levels. English language learners expect to excel provided the additional academic support and explicit direct instruction, which targets language acquisition. In addition, oral language skills are strong predictors of reading comprehension among native English speakers and English learners (Babayiğit, 2015).

The instructional component of teaching ELLs is important because it offers these students exposure to presentation, engagement, and academic conversation during a content lesson. Specifically designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE) is one set of strategies that teachers can use to teach academic content. Teachers outside of an ELD instructional block support academic content knowledge with SDAIE strategies. Students need multiple opportunities to practice academic language and conversation. ELL

students need direct teacher interaction as well as small group collaboration for academic conversation to be effective (Brooks & Thurston, 2010).

In this California School District, ELLs need academic language support to reach their greatest potential. The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) state that ELLs hold to the same standards as native English speakers. ELL students need resources to improve language skills. These students are trying to master rigorous academic content and processes as delineated in the CCSS/CCCSS, they are also learning and trying to master rigorous academic language as delineated in the ELD Standards. Gottlieb and Ernst-Slavit (2014) clarify that academic language must have specific linguistic features all of which are associated with academic discipline that includes discourse, grammatical features, and vocabulary across different language domains or modalities (listening, speaking, reading, writing) with specific content areas (language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies/history). Therefore, "it is imperative that teachers know how to teach English language learners, and other students, content and academic English, concurrently and systematically" (Vogt & Echevarria, 2015, p.49).

The Local Problem

The goal is to identify how ELL teachers provide academic instruction so students can make progress in learning English and the academic content. The local problem is to recognize what ELL teachers need to support their students as they are not making adequate yearly progress. The results from the 2015 National Assessment of Educational

Progress (NAEP) in Reading and Mathematics for Grades 4 and 8 show ELL students are still not making the expected growth when comparing subgroups. The term *student subgroup* is predominantly associated with a specific set of federally defined student subgroups for which public-education data are collected and reported by schools, districts, and state education agencies in accordance with requirements outlined in the 2002 No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). This previous law required states to publish annual public reports on the educational performance of students across several distinct subgroup classifications outlined in Section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency (Great Schools Partnership, 2015). According to the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2013), ELLs make up over 9% of the student population in the United States as of the 2011-2012 school year. The estimation is that 4.1 million students require a language support system to help them achieve academically.

In Grade 4, from 2003 to 2015, all subgroups (economically disadvantaged. Students and students from major racial and ethnic groups) showed substantial increases with the exception of English learners, who did not make expected growth but declined by 15 points. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is the only assessment that measures what U.S. students know and can do in various subjects across

the nation, states, and in some urban districts. This number is based on the expected growth measurement for ELL student progress from the NAEP assessments. Teachers, principals, parents, policymakers, and researchers all use NAEP results to assess progress and develop ways to improve education in the United States. At the study site, the Grade 8 subgroups showed significant gains from 2003 to 2015, with the exception of ELLs, which declined by 5 points. NAEP provides a common measurement of student progress across states and selected urban districts throughout the country. Not only are ELLs performing below grade level in language-related instruction, but they also show notable gaps in core subject areas due to these high language demands (Alt, Arizmendi, Beal, & Hurtado, 2013).

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) is now the main federal law for K–12 general education. It covers all students in public schools. When it passed in 2015, ESSA replaced NCLB. The two laws are different, but they have some things in common.

ESSA and subsequent legislation demand that students are successful. The NCLB Act of 2001, signed into law by President Bush on January 8, 2002, required accountability for schools. This legislation required that all students share opportunities, taught by qualified teachers, and attend quality schools. One concern regarding the education of ELLs includes the fact that less than 3% of educators have a specialization for teaching ELLs, and only 38% of teachers report having coursework regarding this

population of students (Taie & Goldring, 2017). Initially the NCLB Act was developed to provide a means for students to make significant achievements in their education, and as a way to make state educational departments and their schools accountable to the public for such progress (U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

As part of that NCLB (2001), Title III took to implementation to help limited English proficiency (LEP) students and recent immigrant arrivals. The objective is for LEP students to learn English and become proficient enough in the language to be successful in their academic work alongside their first language (L1) cohort. The federal government provides funds to state education agencies (SEAs) as well as to the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) for assistance in meeting the requirements of the Act.

NCLB makes no special provisions for students learning English. The law's accountability requirements and the use of standardized tests to measure AYP presents difficulties for the emergent ELLs. When such tests intend to measure academic content learning, they in part become language proficiency tests for the emerging ELLs (Menken, 2008, 2010). The past decade the U.S. Department of Education has worked to provide supports for students labeled as "long-term English learners." Students fall under this criteria if they do not reclassify as English proficient after 7 years. Although the label long-term English learner is often not clearly defined, it is widely used among schools, districts, and states (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, & Medicine, 2017). Information to all school districts on how to identify ELL students is provide for those

who need it. In 2015, the U.S. Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division, and the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights provided reminders to all states about recommendations, advising school districts to implement accurate and timely procedures when identifying possible ELL students (U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division & U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, 2015). The label ELL is applied to any student who is participating in a public school's program of language assistance with the expectation of meeting the same content and academic achievement standards all students are required to meet (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2016), and the term ESOL is applied to a program of language assistance and instruction designed for ELLs.

All ELL students are entitled to EL programs with and resources to ensure the programs implemented, which includes highly qualified teachers, support staff, and appropriate instructional materials. Jimenez-Silva and Olson (2012) reported that only three states require that all pre-service and in-service teachers train in ELL education in order to meet their licensure. In addition, research has shown the links between the quality of instruction and student achievement (Baecher, Farnsworth, & Ediger, 2014; Saxe, Gearhart, & Seltzer, 1999). School districts must have qualified ELL teachers to implement programs, and must have access to supplemental training when necessary (U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division & U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, 2015).

At the school district where I conducted this project, ELD instruction consists of 60 uninterrupted minutes daily for ELLs at ELD Levels 1-3 and a minimum of 45 uninterrupted minutes daily for students at ELD Levels 4-5. These changes align with the district's policy as set forth in the 2012 English Learner Master Plan. The 60 minutes of daily mandated ELD instruction at this school site is not providing enough language development support for the ELD students. The California Department of Education [CDE] 2014 ELA/ELD Framework defines a protected amount of time provided during school days (CDE, 2014). This daily instruction is a minimum of 30 minutes to a maximum of 60 minutes, based on the need of the local school site. In addition to the designated ELD instruction, students continue to receive Integrated ELD throughout the school day and across all subjects by teachers who have ELL students in their class. California's ELLs need instructional support in developing proficiency in English language and literacy as they engage in learning academic content based on the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) (CDE Dataquest 2014).

ELLs must have full access to high-quality English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies content, as well as other subjects, at the same time that they are progressing through the ELD-level continuum. (CDE, 2018). There are many possible factors contributing to students not having equitable access to ELD instruction, among those the emphasis on the quality of instruction that supports student learning. Nationally, more ELLs are enrolled in schools than ever before (Menken, 2008; 2010). For most

students it can take 5 to 7 years of language instruction and practice in order to be able to achieve proficiently academically (Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000). The quality of both mainstream teachers and certified English as a Second Language teacher is important for student success (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008).

The rigor of the CCSS affects ELLs expected to understand the content as second language learners but in the same timeframe as English only (EO) students. The limitation is proficiency for both conversational and academic English for ELLs. Teachers must be aware of ongoing struggles ELL students face and provide strategies to improve their level of performance.

Definition of the Problem

In this study, I sought to identify how teachers provide academic instruction to support ELLs at the study site so that the students can make progress in learning English and the academic content. California has the most ELLs in the country whose primary language is not English. In the fall of 2018 there were 1,195,988 English learners constituting 19.3 percent of the total enrollment in California public schools (CDE,2018). The CDE (2018) states the majority of English learners (70.2 percent) are enrolled in the elementary grades, kindergarten through grade six. The rest (29.8 percent) are enrolled in the secondary grades, seven through twelve, and in the ungraded category. The assessment of content knowledge is in part based on a student's language proficiency,

which makes it particularly challenging for educators and policy makers to develop a proper course of study for the ELLs (Review of Educational Research,2009).

Rationale

Evidence of the Problem at the Local Level

ELLs need additional academic support from well-trained teachers in order to increase their overall proficiency levels. Schools that are receiving additional funds for Title III must provide students with daily ELD instruction as well as Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), across content (Peregoy & Boyle, 2008). The California ELD standards provide the link to support ELLs. These standards are specific in meeting the needs to support language development in academic content.

The states having the largest numbers of ELLs (e.g., California, New York, Texas) have developed not only standards, but also their own English Language Proficient (ELP) assessment instruments (e.g., California English Language Development Test [CELDT], New York State English as Second Language Achievement Test [NYSESLAT], Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System [TELPAS]). These types of test were designed to assess the language proficiency of ELLs at all stages of their learning. The CCSS require states to develop LEP standards and assessment instruments aligned with the mandated practices of the CCSS and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). These standards and assessment instruments are enduring measures that will aid in organizing ELL instruction for educators and for the ELL

students they serve. With over 1.4 million current, another 800,000 former, reclassified ELLs, and over 300,000 initially English-fluent linguistic minority students in the state (California Department of Education, 2012a), this combined group constitutes over 41% of the state's K-12 public education population.

In a standards-based curriculum, ELLs face academic and cognitive requirements. These students must simultaneously acquire English language proficiency and academic content. The academic language is a necessary component of learning the core subjects. Today, 1 in 10 students is an ELL; by 2025 it is predicted that ELLs will make up 25% of the student population (National Education Association). The CCSS are what students are expected to achieve, but ELLs must also acquire the use of English in the classroom to achieve. This brings a need for ELD instruction. According to Wolf, Yuan, and Huang (2014), "There is the need for resource materials to help ELLs meet these challenging standards" (p.35). The EO resources alone are insufficient to provide such support to ELLs. As stated by Olsen (2010) without explicit English language development, most ELLS stay idle at the intermediate level of English proficiency and become long-term English Learners. As stated by the CDE (2014) California's ELLs need instructional support in developing proficiency in English language and literacy as they engage in learning academic content based on these new, rigorous standards. However,

Students who acquire basic language skills through collaboration, writing, and reading can take these new skills and apply them outside of the ELD instructional block.

When a student progresses through various levels of proficiency, the student will begin to expand her or his level of knowledge and use it as part of daily communication with others (Roa, 2012). For English learners, it is important to provide multiple opportunities across many weeks of instruction to ensure mastery of the grammatical features of language (Baker et al., 2014). The CCSS presume that all students have native English proficiency. The goal for ELD instruction is for students to acquire the language, use the language functions, and eventually transition to full engagement and no longer require ELD instruction (Roa, 2012). ELLs can participate fully in rigorous lessons and achieve high academic standards (Echevarria, 2012; Frey, Fisher, & Nelson, 2013).

ESSA requires that schools receiving Title III funds are monitoring ELLs' proficiency with the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs; Roa, 2012). ELL students are provided with strategies to attain English proficiency. However, these students need additional support to reach their greatest potential. National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (2011) reported that the achievement gap between ELLs and English proficient students continues. The number of enrolled ELLs in prekindergarten through 12th grade has grown by 51% ,and the total student enrollment was just over 7% (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011). The ongoing concern continues regarding how to best support ELLs in the classroom. Over time, there have been more and more ELL students attending public schools in the United States. The percentage of public school students in the United States who were ELLs was

higher in fall 2016 (9.6 percent, or 4.9 million students) than in fall 2000 (8.1 percent, or 3.8 million students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019).

In California, most ELL/LEP students in middle and high schools were not taking the core content classes to graduate at the expected rate (Berman et al., 1992; Olson, 2010). These students were not in academic content area classes, but rather in classes specifically focused on language acquisition. According to Trickett et al. (2012), the rigor of CCSS affects ELLs as they are acquiring a second language while their expectations were to become proficient regardless of being English Language Learners. Students needed time to reach proficiency levels while attaining appropriate linguistic support. Teachers needed quality skills, training, or professional development to teach ELL students.

This study showed how teachers provided academic instruction to support ELLs at the study site so that the students make progress in learning English and the academic content. The research supports the idea that teachers need to provide academic instructions that support ELLs (see van Lier & Walqui, 2012). The major research findings in the literature indicated that ELLs do not have a lot of success in the content areas compared to native English language speaking peers (van Lier & Walqui, 2012). The CCSS set expectations that pose additional challenges for ELLs. As Davis, Sinclair, and Gschwend, (2015) reported, ELLs faced challenges with the implementation of

CCSS. The priority was to acknowledge how teachers support ELLs all while providing academic content.

The ELL student population continues to increase at many school sites across the United States (NCES, 2014). The school could use this evidence to support ongoing professional development, professional learning communities, and common core teacher training to establish the most effective instructional support to meet the needs of ELLs. The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding about ELL instruction for ELLs in the participating school district.

Definition of Terms

Annual Measurement Achievement Objectives (AMAO): AMAOs are the targets set in the Title III of NCLB for assessing proficiency in English. AMAO targets are set at the state level (Vialpando, Yedlin, Linse, Harington, & Cannon, 2005).

Common Core State Standards (CCSS): CCSS are high quality academic expectations that outlines the knowledge all students should have learned at the end of each grade level to ensure that they are on track for success later in college and career (McDonnell & Weatherford, 2013).

English language development (ELD): ELD is defined as an instruction that is "designed to help them (English Learners, or ELs) learn and acquire English to a level of proficiency (e.g., advanced) that maximizes their capacity to engage successfully in academic studies taught in English," (CDE, 2010, p. 23)

English language learner (ELL): ELL refers to a student whose primary language is not English and who is learning English as an additional language (Echeverria et al., 2004).

English as a second language program (ESL): ESL is a term used to refer to programs for students who learns English as a second language (Harris & Hodges, 1995; McLaughlin & Vogt, 1996).

Limited English proficient (LEP): LEP is the term used by the government for individuals who have a different primary language than English (Hutchinson & Hadjioannou, 2011).

No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB): NCLB will refer to the law passed in 2002 during the Bush administration which defined the parameters for school funds, curriculum, teachers' preparation, student achievements, courses taught, standardized tests and other relevant educational topics (Ketzoir, 2004).

Significance of the Study

Professional Literature for ELL Instruction

The study is significant because it maximizes opportunity to show how teachers provide ELL instruction, currently engage students, and the possible causes for the instructional inadequacies during ELD instruction. Through the examination of teacher interviews and observation of instruction, data was collected which then yielded the findings to support further action to support teachers. Examining the common concerns

of teachers also helped to establish and determine the greatest teacher needs to support ELLs.

California has the largest number of ELLs in the country. More than 20% of California's students in kindergarten through grade12 identified as designated ELLs with over 60 language groups represented (CDE, 2014). It was estimated in the last several years, that California enrolled roughly 22% of the nation's ELLs (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017) and more than 55% of the state's total enrollments as language minority students. ELL students needed multiple opportunities to interact with small groups and one-to-one instruction with teachers and actively engage in content area lessons (Brooks & Thurston, 2010). According to Jimenez-Castellanos & Topper 2012, "More than 11 million school-age children between the ages of 5 and 17 spoke a language other than English at home in 2009" (p.179).

The need of ELLs in a rigorous Pre K-3 program was necessary. As stated by Marietta & Bookover (2011) students who began school at an early age, (Pre K), set the stage for a positive educational experience and future success. This implementation was limited to few school districts with such coherent PreK-3 sites.

The CCSS would have an effect on schools that have large ELL populations. Based on the current statistics from the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA), one in six school-age children are speaking a primary language that is not English when at home (NCES, 2005). The prediction was that by 2025, one out

of every four students will be classified as an ELL in the U.S. public schools (Diáz-Rico & Weed, 2010). As stated by Short, Boynson & Coltrane (2003) due to the changes in the demographics, the public and the governments have now focused on the academic performance of ELLs from Kindergarten until Grade 12. Previous research studies have shown that a coherent and sequenced set of learning experiences, beginning with Pre K and continuing through third grade, was the foundation for students' educational success (Marietta, & Brookover, 2011). Yet, few districts have developed high quality and aligned PreK-3 systems for ELL students. For example, 57 % of adolescent learners now classified as limited English proficient and born within U.S. borders; they are second-or third-generation residents (Badalona, Fix, & Murray, 2007). These students achieved oral proficiency but lagged behind in their ability to use English for literacy. In addition, the lag in content learning for reasons that could be only partly related to second-language status—for example, mobility and switching between language programs (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007).

Guiding Research Question

The purpose of this study was to observe how teachers provide academic instruction to support ELLs at the study site. The main research question: How do teachers at the large school district provide instruction for English language learners?

The following are the subquestions I developed to understand the methods teachers used to support ELLs and provide academic instruction.

1. What methods of teaching do teachers employ in teaching ELL students?
2. How do teachers vary their approach in teaching ELL students?
3. What were the driving factors that determine how teachers' best support ELL students in their classroom?

The study took place in Southern California. In the school district, about 171,000 of the district's 655,000 students were English learners. In addition, there were 25,000 reclassified as Fluent-English-Proficient. The study site was an urban K-5 elementary school setting with approximately 840 students during the 2013-2014 school year. Of the 840 students, 402 students were English Learners. From the 402 ELL students, 42 or 10.4% reclassified as English Learners in Grades two through five. These students needed opportunities to practice academic conversations, model, and learn strategies and skills to develop their academic conversations, acquire language, and develop writing.

Review of the Literature

Past literature has indicated that ELLs do not have a lot of success in content areas compared to native English language speakers. As Olson (2010) stated, "An English language learner who is still an ELL seven or more years after entering U.S. schools has reached a point at which concern is warranted (p. 31). The number of ELLs in the public school system continued to increase at rates that surpassed total student enrollment (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction, Educational Programs, 2011). Li (2013) showed that ELL populations were

rising more drastically than general school populations. Schools need to provide ongoing language support tools for their linguistically diverse student populations so that they can reduce the achievement gap with ELL students. As a result, it was important that teachers be equipped to provide instructional support for these learners.

The influx of ELLs in the school system was concerning as their success continued to prove inadequate when compared to English proficient students (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011). Schools with a well-targeted ELL program and high quality services are likely to have stronger outcomes and reclassification when compared to low quality school EL programs (Umansky, 2016).

ELLs have failed to make the same gains as the English proficient students, which have caused many concerns for educators. As the ELL population continues to increase, their overall scores in reading and science have been consistently lower. More particularly, “ELLs achieved 219 scale score points on average, compared to 266 scale score points for English proficient students” (NCES, 2011a, p. 25). Moreover, in science, “ELLs achieved 103 scale score points, compared with 153 scale score points for English proficient students” (NCES, 2011b, p. 25).

In this section, I present the literature and concepts related to the quality of ELL instruction, and identify how teachers provided effective academic instruction that supports ELLs. The literature review focused on the objectives of the study and on the descriptions and implementation of what effective curriculum stems from. This section

begins with a discussion of the conceptual framework that defines and grounds the study. I then offer other discussions about the teaching methodologies for ELLs, some problems with standardized instruction for ELLs, and ideas to increase ELL language proficiency. I conclude with a brief summary of the points addressed.

Research for this literature review began with the use of the Walden Library and several education databases. I searched the following multidisciplinary databases: ERIC, Education Research Complete, Thoreau, Academic Search Complete, and Google Scholar. Key words or phrases applied to the search included *professional development for English language development (ELD), English language learners (ELLs),* and *explicit teaching elements of English.*

Conceptual Framework

Effective education for ELL students rests ultimately in the quality of instruction and the capacity of educators to continue improving their craft and foster the robust educational settings that ELLs need to succeed (Farbman, 2015). Concepts and various models of learning for educational research and practice provide evidence of how people learn and what conditions can most effectively alter their learning. For example, the overall performance of an ELL student is based on the school district's implementation of specifically designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE). This is a teaching approach wherein teachers use specifically designed lessons (targeted to various academic content) and educate students who are still learning English about the English

language (Nguyen, Benken, Hakim-Butt, & Zwiep, 2013). In Nguyen et al.'s (2013) study, the SDAIE was prepared so students could access the English language academic content supported by meticulously planned instruction that strived to provide comprehension, content, connections, and interaction. SDAIE scaffolds lessons and was designed for teaching students in English so that they acquired skills in both the subject material and increasing abilities to use English.

The conceptual framework of socio-cultural constructivism was the most appropriate for organizing and supporting this research. The main researchers I referenced were Ladson-Billings (1995) and Vygotsky (1978). The ideas and concepts used by Ladson-Billings and Vygotsky aligned with how teachers needed to revise and restructure teaching methods and materials when using SDAIE and other sheltered methods in a school district in Southern California. For example, Ladson-Billings (1995) believed culturally relevant teaching to be that where students have academic success, continue to develop cultural awareness, and were aware of their critical consciousness. Teachers could now align 21st century global citizenship as an ongoing key component of 21st century learning.

Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory frames learning as a social process. The major theme is that social interaction plays a fundamental role in the development of cognition. Vygotsky supported using social interaction to support the cognitive development. Yin (2009) noted that researchers' use of several different methods of data

collection provides foundations for the findings and insights. The use of scaffolds, collaborative learning, modeling, and social interactions are all components used to support ELLs.

In recent years, research addressing teaching strategies to support ELL students has grown because more teachers are in need of strategies and skills to serve the ELL student population. For example, Herrell and Jordan (2003) stated that techniques that provided both modeling and feedback related to language in speech and writing could support the progress of ELLs. According to Diaz-Rico and Weed (2002), and Ovando, Collier, and Combs (2003), teachers use scaffolds (contextual support, simple language, modeling, graphic organizers, cooperative groups) to help ELLs make significant gains in learning academic English and content. The objective for ELL teachers is to enhance learning outcomes by providing instruction.

The support teachers provide in the classroom to enhance ELLs learning is vital for ongoing success in learning academic English. ELL students are working to learn new content, based on grade level specific standards; while trying to understand the English language. It is important to recognize the needs of these students to provide the most beneficial strategies. Staehr, Fenner, and Snyder (2017) noted that when implementing scaffolds, it is recommended to do so based not only on ELLs English language proficiency level, but also on individual ELL strengths and needs specific to the lesson taught.

In Staehr et al.'s study, once ELL students gained proficiency the scaffolds that were once in place could be removed or modified. The teachers made decisions on how to adjust scaffolds and strategies based on individual student success. ELLs were responsible for acquiring a new language and attaining standards-based grades in all subject areas. Several authors (Jung & Guskey, 2010; Tomlinson, Moon, & Imbeau, 2015) recommended three grades for differentiated classrooms based on a student's product (mastery of content), process (effort, motivation, and participation), and progress (improvement over time).

The ELD framework allows teachers to use a guide to grade students based on their level of English language and expectations during ELD instruction. ELD standards are the set of skills a student should have to express ideas effectively in English (including abilities to read, write, and speak). In California schools, these standards are the CA ELD Standards. Teachers use this framework to align lessons to support students during ELD instruction.

Critical Review of the Literature

To be most affective during ELL instruction teachers must plan lessons that ELLs can participate in. Students who have basic literacy skills in their primary language will benefit most in this setting (CDE, 2009). As noted by the CDE (2009) it must provide ELLs with the tools (graphic organizers, charts, peer support, scaffolds) and only remove these supports as students' skills develop. This provides ELLs with a scaffold to build a

robust academic connection to content. However, the rigor also depends on the connections, content, comprehensibility, and the vocabulary used in the classroom. The engagement of the lessons will affect how the student interprets the academic content.

Authors Goldenberg & Coleman(2010) stated "Coherent school-wide goals, ongoing assessment of student learning, strong leadership, and ongoing professional development linked to goals and assessments contribute to creating a school-wide culture of higher achievement and higher expectations for ELLs" (p. 60). Educators should understand that targeting the narrower aspects of school management and that dismissing the greater school wide context is perilous (Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010). It is widely known that SDAIE emphasizes developing knowledge in content areas and that the learning of the English language is a sought after goal (Genzuk, 2011). Further, SDAIE strives for expansion and enrichment of grade level subject matter.

In order to align with objectives, school leaders from lead teachers to superintendents should organize conversations and make time for planning within each subject area. This way a teacher can provide students with equitable access to all content. As stated by Herrell and Jordan (2008) students need opportunities to interact and given the opportunity to communicate to enhance their syntactic processing.

According to van Lier and Walqui (2012), to make sure ELLs would be able to meet the new standards, language should be taught not in isolation with real life but instead in a lively way that learners can apply what they learned outside of school

(Valdés & Castellón, 2011). There is a need to understand language as a form of action developed through meaningful support for students that include engaging lessons in daily curriculum (van Lier & Walqui, 2012). In addition, Walqui and Heritage (2012) proposed that English teachers should consider the students' prior knowledge and experiences outside the classroom. Teachers must take this knowledge and experiences and expand them or relate them to the discussions in the classroom. Duke, Pearson, Strachan, and Billman (2011) added that readers or students' prior knowledge could play a critical role to develop an accurate representation of the text base, which students can relate to and learn. The immigration in the United States continues to increase resulting in a higher number of students that have had an interruption in their education. Lee (2012) stated in urban areas, "about 10% of all ELLs are students that show evidence of interrupted formal education" (p. 66). ELLs immigrating from areas with inadequate educational experiences or those with limited educational opportunities are joining similar students (DeCapua Sc Marshall, 2015). The language challenges and engagement in subject matter are important and necessary to address.

For ELLs, it is also vital to link instruction with the students' prior knowledge because it is through this method the learners will be more likely to understand the specific language they are trying to attain. They have an easier time engaging in the English language taught to them, if they relate and are familiar with the topics tackled during class hours. The social expectation for the class of English language learners not

only use their existing and prior knowledge to understand new words or concepts; but also by their perceptions and beliefs with regard to the role of schooling in their lives.

For example, the former strategy focuses on using various pictures, forms, and questions to provide a better understanding of material. However, to improve the ability of everyone to gain greater insights, allowing various speakers to engage with the class who can speak in the native language of the students and English brings realism (Walqui & Heritage, 2012). This helps create a sense of excitement for the material presented. The reason why is because they are taking an approach that is different from other techniques that are being utilized. Once this occurs, it means that the students remember the different concepts presented (Walqui & Heritage, 2012). This creates a sense of importance, allowing everyone to see how these ideas used in the real world through providing another way of understanding the material. With this kind of philosophy embraced, it allows students opportunities to gain a greater understanding of the ideas that presented.

Over the course of time, this will prepare everyone for the various issues they are facing in the real world. This accomplishment occurs through using various techniques to bridge the difference between language and culture with that of English (Walqui & Heritage, 2012). Warm up exercises, pre-teaching techniques, controlled practices, semi-controlled practices, and personalization provide strategies to meet their needs. These elements are important because they show how this basic philosophy provides numerous formats for understanding the material presented (Walqui & Heritage, 2012). While these

techniques support ELLs, the Inquiry based learning practices align with instructional strategies considered effective for ELL students (Echevarria et al., 2011; Goldenberg, 2013).

At the same time, different techniques to improve the overall amounts of learning comprehension include taking into account the student's native language and culture, and ensuring that they are using English in the proper context. These factors are significant because they are helping teachers to understand how the lesson plan can be effective.

Inquiry based learning and instruction is thought to maximize meaningful learning opportunities for ELL students by taking some the heavy linguistic demands away that are associated with traditional forms of textbook and lecture-based learning (Fang, 2006; Lewis, Lee, Santau, & Cone, 2010). Teachers are taking specific techniques and then augmenting them with a variety of issues that will have a positive impact on the student (Walqui & Heritage, 2012). This is because the educator is using these elements to be able to relate to the student and help them to associate these concepts with those in English. Once this occurs, it means that teachers know how to effectively deal with a host of issues that affect individuals. At this point, the teacher is able to reach out to ELLs in a way that will make certain they are able to grasp these ideas. This is significant because it illustrates how this type of lesson plan is effective by taking these concepts and building upon them. This creates a foundation for understanding the various ideas presented.

According to Walqui and Heritage (2012), however, this does not mean teaching ELLs be done by only restricting the lessons to topics that are already familiar to the learners. In contrast, these prior knowledge and experiences can be helpful for developing the conditions under which gaining new knowledge and learning new concepts can take place. These conditions would also make learning and language development happen in a more productive way (Walqui & Heritage, 2012).

According to Valdés & Castellón (2011), with enough support, ELLs can engage in various languages of the discipline that demanded by the Common Core State Standards, even if their English would still be imperfect. That said, the researchers recommended that to meet the new standards, the focus of instruction offered to ELLs should deviate from the goal of making them acquire a "native-like" or "standard" level of English (Valdés & Castellón, 2011). The researchers claimed that even though English language learners will be able to carry out the wide range of practices that the Standards call for, the English they would use might still have features that differentiate them from the English of their native or monolingual English-speaking friends and classmates (Valdés & Castellón, 2011).

A big challenge that most English language learners face is the difficulty in aligning their understanding of the new concepts with their culture (Hodge & Benko, 2014). Most ELLs have to deal with issues in relation to differences between English and their native language. For the educator, this can be particularly challenging, so they must

engage in strategies that will reach out to these individuals. Hodge & Benko (2014) stated teachers have to address the basic survival instincts of the student and then augment them with various tools. This is a part of an effort to ensure that they are able to master the language itself. Once this occurs, the educator is able to help the student master the language and adapt to the various cultural challenges that they are facing.

To fully understand how to achieve this objective requires designing effective lesson plans, unique to these students, understanding the rationale for the approaches/methodology that are utilized, discussing the supporting materials that can be used during the process, and conducting an analysis of the lesson plan itself. These elements will provide the greatest insights as to how educators can effectively reach out to these individuals. At this point, they will be able to help students to overcome the various challenges that they are facing (Hodge & Benko, 2014).

Teaching Methodologies for ELLs

While behavioral methods continue to support pedagogies emphasizing the reinforcement of language behaviors, the focus has shifted towards helping students monitor their own behavior and providing instruction to add new behaviors to students' repertoires (Stille & Cummins, 2013). The diverse student population in this country, including the ELL population, creates opportunities for teachers to use many teaching styles. The current research supports the use of specific academic strategies for ELLs to develop students' language. Dutro and Moran (2001), Lyster (2007), and Zwiers (2008)

continue to encourage additional research in this area. ELLs have dual learning needs: they need to acquire English to have fuller access to school and society, while also learning academic content alongside their non-EL peers. The dual needs create the tension within schools to provide the time to address academic instruction, and resources. California and federal law require that schools provide ELs with targeted services to meet both English language and content learning goals (Umansky, Reardon, Hakuta, et al., 2015). A recent study conducted by Elfers and Stritikus (2014) revealed that there is a need to find the link between leadership practices and the achievement of English learners. This recent shift in both focuses on a learning-centered leadership that is imperative for the success of English learners.

From their perspectives, educators are strongly encouraged to become more knowledgeable about strategies for teaching academic language and for implementing those more effective practices in their classrooms. Academic content language made comprehensible with supports such as visuals, modeling, peer assistance and native and social language support (Gonzalez, 2016). ELD lessons and SDAIE strategies need to be engaging and clear so that students can practice applying these skills and language functions when they are engaged in academic conversations, reading, and writing. These SDAIE strategies align with teaching outside of their ELD instructional block. These strategies will help support students with their ELD. When using sheltered instruction

teachers plan for ELLs to practice the English language by engaging in listening, speaking, reading and writing activities (Kareva & Echevarria, 2013).

Hakuta of Stanford University supports a national effort to develop CCSS-aligned methods and materials that provide needed support for educators working with ELLs. In a recent interview, Hakuta (as cited in Migdol, 2011) suggested that English proficiency in oral and written language provide the connection ELLs need to access the CCSS. Instruction for ELLs must be a priority from the moment a student walks into school, along with rich academic content. Content-area instruction can also provide opportunities for ELLs to practice academic language, but the focus during content instruction should be content (Migdol, 2011). In spite of a growing U.S. literature regarding the education of ELLs, and an increase in studies surrounding vocabulary intervention; there is a dearth of research that examined the effects of instruction English language development (Saunders, Goldenberg, & Marcelletti, 2013).

English language proficiency is foundational to the language learner's academic success. An ELL proficiency level clearly affects her/his ability to learn academic content in English, to demonstrate academic knowledge and skills, and to do so on assessments written exclusively in English. The label ELL applies to a student who takes part in a public school's ELL program (with the expectation of meeting the same content and academic achievement standards) all students are required to meet (U.S. Department of

Education [USDOE], 2016) and the term ESOL is applied to a program of language assistance and instruction designed for ELLs.

This is basic to ELLs in federal law (Section 9101(25) (D) of ESEA) (Linquanti, Hakuta, & Policy Analysis for California Education, 2012). Implementing effective strategies support language development throughout the academic content areas. Students must receive daily instruction on academic conversations and language functions. Designated ELD instruction as defined in the CDE 2014 ELA/ELD Framework consists of a minimum of 30 minutes every day (CDE, 2014). Instruction should include explicit teaching in English, and specific skills and strategies to learn the language. California statute requires every teacher who provides instructional services to an ELL must have authorization to provide specialized instruction for those learners (Ctc.ca.gov, 2018). As stated by Haneda and Wells (2012) many immigrant children are ELLs and, for those who arrive in the late elementary and middle school years, mastering the curricular content while at the same time learning the language of instruction is very poignant. Thus, the challenge is how to provide students with the skillset to use academic language effectively in an out of the classroom.

The instruction of second languages in general is hindered by a big gap between what is achieved in primary education and what is expected in secondary or college education, as well as what is expected in the job market and the professional sphere in general (Bell et al., 2014). The result, as the literature review here clearly demonstrates,

is a continuous call for improvements both in terms of pedagogy at the formative levels and in terms of support for the transition to subsequent levels of education (Bell et al., 2014). With the current CCSS putting more demands on ELLs, there is a higher need to develop more methods to improve current ELL instruction.

Reyes and Garcia (2014) believed that addressing the needs of all English learners is challenging because many principals and teachers lack the skills needed to provide effective instruction for English learners. This lack of knowledge in teaching ELLs has been evident for decades (Reyes & Garcia, 2014).

According to Bell et al. (2014), there is a need to improve recognition of the challenges unique to ELL students and to find ways of assisting in the transition to subsequent levels in the educational system. The traditional methods also have to be refined to prepare ELL students for the educational and occupational challenges ahead. Many of these relate to the modernist position that there is a need for the adoption of newer and more relevant texts, the development of more perceptive teaching materials, ways of taking the classroom outside of traditional laboratory parameters, and modes for the assimilation of improving teaching technologies (Bell et al., 2014).

Howatt and Widdowson (2004) elucidated some of the reasons for the difficulty in changing approaches in ELL instruction. Namely, the history reflects on a wide variance of opinions, all asserting the same notion: linguistic education has the power to employ both as a cultural weapon and as an instrument for social advancement. Limited

attention was given to addressing the linguistic needs of English learners (DiCerbo, Anstrom, Baker, & Rivera, 2014). Political, economic, and ideological implications all emanate from ways of using language. To this end, Howatt and Widdowson (2004) asserted that traditionalist views on language education have attributed an importance to the "role of 'correct grammar' in a socially responsible system of education" (p. 123).

This implied a certain sociological imperialism where the use of the English language is concerned, such that its incorrect usage used as a marker of socioeconomic and cultural status. This inherently created a considerable sociological obstacle overcome by those working with the scope of the English-based education system for advancement while simultaneously attempting to grasp the language.

This view can be quite controversial. According to the researchers, even though there is a particular value in finding ways to bring more egalitarian philosophies into play where ELL education is concerned, there is a pointed prejudice in creating and purporting an educational system that is so inherently stacked against newcomers without making accommodations for their specialized and effectively stewarded assistance. Access to core content is required by federal law concerning the education of ELL students Law and regulation regarding the education of ELLs tie around ELLs' rights to support learning English and to provide access to grade level core content. Yet ensuring students' rights to equitable and full access to core content proved challenging (Robinson-Cimpian, Thompson, & Umansky, 2016). Establishing a more sensitive mode of encouraging the

adoption of grammatically acceptable but also culturally relevant uses of language is of critical importance in helping to reduce the opportunity gaps for ELL students. According to Echevarria, Frey, & Fisher (2015) "Teachers that understand culturally diverse classrooms will incorporate students' values and experiences, thus providing students with a sense of partnership and engagement" (p. 24). The role of teachers as an equitable partnership with ELL students is necessary.

Stated by Howatt & Widdowson (2004) there is an even greater matter to help prepare students because of the linguistic deficiencies "not only does this attitude have a harder cutting edge than the modern desire for a cooperative condominium of dialects but it is also more realist in its assessment of the workings of power." (p.123). Teachers have a hand in providing fairness and equality for all their students.

Indeed, it seems a greater unfairness to ELL students be coddled by the educational system and to be made as exceptions to language-usage principles in the interests of political correctness when the ultimate consequence will be a significantly diminished ability to compete in the American economy upon exiting this educational system (Howatt & Widdowson, 2004). Teachers teaching specific content need to be prepared when working with English Language Learners. They need to implement and plan research-based practices so that students are getting the most effective instruction (Echevarria et al., 2011).

This underscores a core imperative of the literature review and consequently proposed research, which makes as its primary concern an emphasis on improving the level of preparation used to ready ELL students for continued advancement in the educational and professional systems that are the primary determinants of long-term socioeconomic status (Howatt & Widdowson, 2004).

On this point, the text by Wardhaugh (1967) identified one of the early challenges facing educators in the field, who in the 1960s struggled with competing ideas on how best to bridge the gap between practical and conceptual use of basic rule drilling. According to Wardhaugh, educational practitioners have debated the merits of language both as a system of habits and as a linguistic enterprise with more nuanced applicative elements at play. Wardhaugh states, it has become increasingly evident that there is a distinct value in actually integrating the two approaches, suggesting that this problem of conceptual orientation is actually best resolved through balance rather than pedagogical dispute. Wardhaugh indicated, that language for a native speaker is much more that a system of habits. Wardhaugh (1967) stated “this required more than practice drills and stimulus-response in the classroom” (p.21). However, Wardhaugh warns that it has long been a habit in this field to assert the instruction of language as being largely arbitrary and that instruction on how to use the target language should be steeped in habit-formation above all else. It was also indicated that there was a problematic need in the

field to reverse expectations about the capacity of this approach to instruct in practicable and usable linguistic ability.

According to Wardhaugh (1967) the author takes exception with traditionalist ideas that argues “the single paramount fact about language learning is that it concerns, not problem solving, but the formation and performance of habits” (p. 21). The linguistic theorist rejected this principle as failing to acknowledge many of the more abstract contextual factors relating to the applicable usage of language. Particularly, it overlooks the impact levied by culture, by regional dialect, by accent, by generational difference, by distinctions between formal, informal, and slang usage, and other even less tangible effectors that cannot be introduced simply using habit-forming drills or other techniques that rely singularly on rote practice.

Kanno and Varghese (2010) contributed research that does endorse this more integrative approach, which characterizes also as modernist in its interest in egalitarianism. Contrary to the softer standards implicated in the modernist ideology described by Howatt and Widdowson (2004), Kanno and Varghese assert that a conceptual broadening of what is implied by an ELL program is required. The research indicated that a critical problem in grammar school and primary education approaches to instructing English was failure to address the extremely broad spectrum of difficulties faced by students; attempting not only to navigate the educational system and learn a new

language, but also to navigate a broader culture with a wide variance of challenging and unfamiliar customs.

To this point, Kanno and Varghese (2010) asserted reference to Bourdieu's cultural reproduction theory (1973), which their article reports is responsible for the alternate socioeconomic trajectories of those with the capacity to acclimate and those lacking the necessary education, support or resources. Accordingly, the article by Kanno and Varghese (2010) contributed that the argument that ELL students are limited in both English proficiency and socioeconomics. These factors influence their graduation rates, college potential, and access to college funds (Kanno & Varghese, 2010).

This difficulty compounded by the challenges that are incumbent upon educational institutions attempting to retain ELL populations. As the study by Booth (2009) contributed to the research, there are particular difficulties in socioeconomic adjustment that will generally compound the challenges not simply of learning but even of remaining enrolled in schools. Thus, those student not provided with the proper preparation where ELL education is concerned, are far more likely than members of the native English speaking population to be too greatly imposed upon by the combination of academic difficulties and personal life responsibilities. On this point, Booth reported that institutions such as community colleges in particular have struggled to balance the priorities of rigorous and meaningful education and the demand to retain immigrant students. Accordingly, the article by Booth (2009) showed that "Retention is a problem in

all higher education settings, but is especially important for community colleges because of their “open door” policy” (p.1). Community colleges have the highest number of new immigrants in proportion to other colleges Most of these immigrants are from low-income families, with more than half that are employed full-time (Boswell, 2004), this results in challenging odds for retention. There is a direct relationship between the lack of adequate preparation for ELL students and their confrontation of greater proportions of difficulty in learning the language, especially for college and beyond (Flood, 2003). Flood offered a handbook that connects the many different strands of English education that stretch across pedagogical approaches and levels of educational attainment. According to Flood, there has persisted something of a failure on the part of English curricula to adjust to broader influxes of ELL students and that the result is an unfair casting of immigrant students within the educational system as being either inferior or less academically capable. English departments are beginning to reflect new advancements in policy to understand how and why minorities are not able to meet the demands of these applications (Flood, 2003).

Improving Language Proficiency of ELLs

In order to increase an ELL's language proficiency, teachers should monitor their teaching strategies so that the students can practice basic phonics and master the meaning of vocabulary and oral proficiency first. These basic skills help with reading fluency, believed to impact reading comprehension (Quirk & Beem, 2012).

Educators need the best resources to succeed. ELLs have not developed the cognitive awareness necessary to assess their understanding as they read and to recognize when their comprehension has broken down (Orsoco & Abdulrahim, 2017).

The best teachers are those who have taken the initiative and are informed educators. They continue to update on the latest techniques, strategies, and research (Quirk & Beem, 2012). Teachers teaching specific content need to be prepared when working with English learners. As stated by Echevarria et al (2011) "teachers need to implement and plan research-based practices so that students are getting the most effective instruction" (p.337).

Teachers need to provide ways of effectively engaging their students to develop skills specific to grade level standards and expectations. ELLs need multiple opportunities to practice academic and conversational language in English. Quirk and Beem's (2012) study suggested ELLs who have automaticity in reading does not mean they are able to comprehend the reading. Designated ELD provides students with explicit teaching and practice techniques to understand academic language derived from ELA content (Vogt & Echevarria, 2015, p. 26). Extensive vocabulary practice, use of context clues, and identifying text features can help students better understand reading passages.

As Van Lier and Walqui (2012) stated language forms and functions with various levels of differentiation for skills and strategies will provide students more successful opportunities to succeed thus improve in learning a language. Many of the language and

literacy tasks that students are expected to perform are often assumed to be part of their existing repertoire of skills, when in actuality, these skills need to be taught and practiced (Echevarria & Short, 2010).

If students lack opportunities to practice, they will not build on the language to practice effective communication. For example, reading comprehension takes a complex skillset. Students need to use context, text features, and sentence structure to gain meaning and understanding. As these demanding skills are taught, ELL students are also acquiring the language (Pang, 2013). Key findings show the impact and influence school districts have on the success of ELLs. The U.S. Department of Education (2010) stated in 2009, for example, 43% of ELL students scored below the basic level on the grade 4 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) mathematics assessment compared with 16% of non–ELL students. The school districts' implementation of training their ELL teachers affects the outcome and success of ELL students.

Multiple approaches and methods focused on language are an important part of a teacher's resources. According to Capps et al. (2005) "76% of elementary school ELLs and 56% of secondary school ELLs are native-born, and more than half of the ELLs in public secondary schools are second-or third-generation U.S. citizens" (p. 36). About 4.85 million students enrolled in public schools were not yet fully proficient in English in the 2012-2013 school year, representing nearly 10% of the total public-school student enrollment (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). If school districts do not

provide teachers with the skills, strategies, and content to teach ELL students in grades K-12, the students will continue to fall behind (Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012).

Teachers must have knowledge, training, and effective curriculum to support the needs of ELLs. There are many leadership styles, theories, and research that used to support different modalities and processes involved in creating ideal learning environments (Pang, 2013). Therefore, leadership must provide the schools with adequate sources of materials to teach students so students can succeed with all content. Qualitative studies have revealed that the academic language demands of state assessment items hinders ELLs' abilities to answer the items correctly (Miller, 2018).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (also known as the No Child Left Behind Act) requires all students to work at the highest level of expectation. Part A of the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act of Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 is designed to help ensure that all students achieve or meet the same academic standards in each state.

The ELL population will continue to increase, therefore mandating many public schools to implement curriculum for ELLs. Capps et al. (2005) stated from the 1997-1998 school year; until the 2008-2009 school year, "the number of English-language learners enrolled in public schools increased from 3.5 million to 5.3 million, or by 51%" (p. 15). "Contrary to common assumptions, most ELLs are native-born U.S. citizens, not immigrants." (p. 36). The need for every teacher to be qualified to teach ELL students is

here. The EL population is growing and, as a result, more districts, schools, and U.S. teachers will be instructing this population (OELA, 2015a; U.S. Department of Education (USDoE), 2006; USDoE, 2013)

School districts need action plans to create meaningful, professional development for teachers to begin implementation of an effective academic language program that supports ELLs (Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012). As stated by Forehand (2014) "it is important for teachers to have the skills to modify curriculum and align lessons to teach these students so that they can be successful" (p.76). According to Achieve the Core (2014), the CCSS focused on specific skillsets within a content area. The content areas still require high expectations for ELLs. English language learners will continue to struggle with learning academic language.

The opening phase. During this part of the class, the teacher will ask a number of different questions of the student. The basic idea is to review the material that was covered and begin introducing new ideas to utilize. This will allow everyone to begin focusing on scaffolds from previous sessions (Farrell, 2008).

Evidence of this as seen by looking no further than comments from the Education Department's office for civil rights issued a letter updating how districts should approach ELLs. Districts must use instructional practices and programs backed by scientific evidence and effective in helping students speak, listen, read, and write English and meet challenging state content standards (Sparks, 2016).

This is significant because it is showing how this approach can be effective at addressing the needs of the student by providing a brief review and then building from it. Once this occurs, teachers build on previous concepts to have an impact upon the way the students understand new ideas introduced.

Simulation. This is when the teacher will pose a single or a series of different questions that will challenge the students' thinking. In general, this takes place by having everyone ask a series of different questions used to help stimulate higher levels of thinking. Another approach is to introduce different ideas through a series of different photos, forms, and worksheets. The basic strategy behind this kind of approach is to encourage everyone to start thinking on a much deeper level (which will help to build learning comprehension) (Farrell, 2008).

Instructional. During this part of the lesson plan, the teacher encourages the students to become involved in learning the new concepts through working with other students and practicing real world situations. The basic idea with this approach has students working with each other to collaborate; and learn the skill by using it on their own; in individual groups. Once this occurs, it means that they are able to receive repeated exposure to the new concepts presented. At the same time, it is giving them real world experience in working with these various ideas (Farrell 2008).

Evidence of this as seen with observations from Tellez and Waxman (2006), who said, "Teachers conceptualize the format of content with students, individuals, homes,

and community lives. This gives them a better understanding of the language with the new concepts that are being introduced" (Tellez & Waxman, 2006, p. 81). This part of the strategy will help to improve learning comprehension by providing everyone with another avenue for learning about these ideas. This supports the need to give them a chance to practice using these concepts to help increase their ability to comprehend the material. Once this occurs, it means that everyone will be able to apply these ideas on a regular basis.

Closure. This is when the teacher summarizes the different materials presented. They will then focus on asking students a series of different questions. This helps to spark their ability to think critically about the ideas presented during the class (Farrell, 2008).

This is significant because it shows how this technique used increases learning comprehension by challenging all students. Once this class dismisses, they think about concepts, how to improve abilities, and to understand the language. This is the point they can take these ideas and build upon them during the next session.

Follow up. This is when the teacher will give the students practice using these ideas on their own. In general, this kind of approach ensures that they have the ability to retain the information presented in class by giving them the chance to reinforce these ideas through self-study. This means that the underlying amounts of learning comprehension increases after they have the ability to answer a number of different questions and apply these ideas

on their own. Once this takes place, it means that the teacher ensures the students' exposed to the concepts presented in class (Farrell, 2008).

When you put different elements together, they show how the approach addresses some of the most common challenges facing English language learners, as there are a number of different formats for building from and introducing new ideas.

According to Haynes & Zacarian, (2010) ELL teachers need to create environments where students' background knowledge, experiences, and culture are seen as resources.

From this section, it shows teachers need to provide students with many strategies and skills to provide student growth. If the outcomes for ELLs is to improve, the way teachers teach and implement instruction is critical to serving the growing ELL population. ELLs who are lagging behind in their educational progress require urgent attention (Samson & Collins, 2012). Teachers provide the strategies and skills for students to establish a foundation to build on language and conversation.

SIOP Model. One popular method for improving ELLs' achievement level are the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria, Richards-Tutor, Canges, & Francis, 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short, Fidelman, & Louguit, 2012). Under this model, there are eight components composed of 30 features that when used together, is expected to lead to higher English literacy levels. Each of the lesson plans to teach English includes the eight

components of "lesson participation, building backgrounds, comprehensible input, strategies', interaction, practice & application, lesson delivery, and review and assessments" (Wooten, Bateman, & Crouch, 2014, p. 319). Each of these eight parts briefly described below.

Lesson participation. The first step in creating any kind of lesson plan was to design specific elements that could be included in the course that would help to improve learning comprehension. This was accomplished by examining specific factors used on a daily basis. At the same time, educators created a strategy that promoted the long-term objectives of helping the student to assimilate and master the concepts. Over the course of time, this allows educators to address the cultural and communication differences between English and their students' native language. The results indicated that this structure could improve the effectiveness of the teacher's ability to reach out to each student in a format that they could relate too (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012.

Building backgrounds. Before creating any kind of lesson plan, educators must understand that they need to be flexible in the approach that they are using. Flexibility starts by looking at the specific needs of the students and then augmenting certain techniques with them to improve learning comprehension (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012). Most of the time, this will mean that educators must understand the different cultural traditions of the

students and that they need to have flexibility to adjust to the changes that are taking place. With this kind of philosophy embraced, it will ensure the students are able to maximize their understanding of the material and the concepts presented (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012).

Comprehensive output. The appropriate lesson plan should be based on constant repetition and using various tools to help maximize the amounts of learning comprehension. This will use a number of different elements to fully understand how this is impacting the students, which include warm up exercises, pre-teaching techniques, controlled practices, semi-controlled practices, and personalization (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012). The below strategies illustrate how teachers can utilize these different elements.

Warm up exercises. This will take place in the first 3 to 5 minutes of every class.

Students will brainstorm about their vocabulary assignment from their homework on the board. The basic idea with this approach is to ensure that there is a way of building upon what they learned from the previous session. This establishes a foundation to prepare students for more advanced concepts while retaining what they have already learned.

Pre-teaching techniques. This is when educators are going to be introducing students to new words in the English language. The way that this is completed is by providing them with a pre-vocabulary discussion of the ideas and their underlying meanings (Todorova &

Mills, 2012). Some tools used to help improve learning comprehension include the use of a flip chart from the student's book. At the same time, they illustrate how concepts utilized in the real world through a concept check works. A concept check is used to help students gain meaning and understanding. The teacher checks to make sure the students use the language, grammar, or vocabulary taught. The questions used check for clarity and understanding. This will take place for about 5 to 10 minutes with tremendous amounts of student and teacher interaction (Todorova & Mills, 2012).

Controlled practices. During this part of the class, students practice using different concepts through seeing various photos on the flip chart. At the same time, there are various questions asked of the students to help improve their learning comprehension (Todorova & Mills, 2012).

Semi-controlled. This part of the lesson plan will take approximately 25 minutes to complete. It will involve the student and the teacher interacting with each other to improve learning comprehension. A beneficial lesson would have hands-on materials, activities for students to apply content, or activities that integrate language skills. For example, the student will work on page 3 in their books. They will then write answers to the questions for the photos at the bottom of the page. After they finish, each person proceeds and answers the questions on pages: 4, 5, 6 and 7. At which point, educators and students will discuss and correct the answers together (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012).

Personalization. In this part of the lesson plan, the focus is on having the students interact with each other. This will involve the students going around the classroom, then answering the various forms, photos, and worksheets from their books. This will occur for 20 minutes, with there being an emphasis on improving learning comprehension as much as possible (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012).

When these different elements are together, they highlight how to provide students with a number of different exposures to the material. At the same time, it ensures everyone relates to the various ideas presented in their own unique way. This is significant because it shows how this kind of approach improves the student's understanding of the various concepts presented. This is a key to reach out to students on a regular basis.

Strategies. To help to achieve the different objectives used in the outlined lesson plan requires that teachers must be able to utilize a number of different tactics. Some of the most notable include taking into account the students' native language and culture, and ensuring that they are using English in the proper context. If used in conjunction with one another, these elements improve the ability of the student to learn more effectively. As an educator, it is vital to reach out to them in a format that increases their overall understanding of key concepts and their ability to deal with a host of issues that they face in the real world. In the way they maximize their understanding of the material (which

will help making adjustments easier) (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria, et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012).

Interaction. Understanding the language happens when the educator relates to students in such a way that he or she is able to reach out to them in a format that makes sense. This means that the teacher must begin with the words that the students understand from their native language. The way that this is accomplished is through using the proper meaning, form, pronunciation, and use of the words in everyday situations. Literature demonstrates these elements as important for reaching out to each student in formats that they can relate. Once this occurs, is when they can help to improve their ability to use various words from English in a way that will make certain they are able to succeed. This is the point when educators can help address these differences by reaching out to them in formats they can understand (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012).

Part of interaction is to understand students' culture. When educators relate to the student's environment and values, they have been able to improve the overall amount of learning comprehension that is taking place. The way that this is occurring is through the educator knowing various cultural norms and phrases that are common for this individual. This will help to create a bridge between the ideas presented and their ability to understand a wide variety of concepts (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012). Once this occurs, it means that the

students can be able to make the connection with English. This results in the formation of a relatable foundation, as well as understandings of new ideas (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012).

Practice and application. The use of English in the proper context when the teacher builds upon the different techniques discussed earlier to increase the overall amounts of learning comprehension. The way that this takes place is by ensuring that everyone understands how the various ideas and phrases used in social as well as more formal setting occur (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012). Educators will need to make certain that everyone is following the proper use of the language, they understand the different meanings of the words, there is a firm grasp of the pronunciation of the various words, and they are applying these different words/phrases at the most appropriate times. This is significant as it highlights the proper use of the various concepts helps everyone to bridge the new ideas presented with their culture. Once students reached this level, they were able to increase learning comprehension, and issues then addressed with struggling students (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012).

Review and assessments. When educators step back and look at the different techniques, it is clear what provides a foundation to help improve the effectiveness of the lesson plan. This is because educators are using an approach that ensures they effectively understand the concept presented by taking into account students' language and culture. This

technique has made education more effective, by relating to each student on a level that they would be able to understand (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2011; Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Short et al., 2012).

From these, it is clear that the lesson plan can be effective at helping English language learners to improve their overall amounts of learning comprehension. Strategies that focus on students' language, cultural traditions, and the proper use of English in the right context are more likely to be successful. At the same time, giving the student repeated exposure to the various ideas presented is also helpful. This demonstrate how to build on prior knowledge and introduce new ideas. As such, the students take previous thoughts and use them to improve their understanding of the language.

A good example of this is with comments from Fathman (2006) who said, "Students often need explicit linking of their previous work to the activity at hand. Then discuss the objectives, content, and language; that way you can be able to more easily assess the student's learning because educators are clear about the direction of it" (Fatham 2006, p. 103). It is important to note that teaching English language learners is a knowledge-building process for the teacher as well. This is because they must be able to understand different cultural concepts and the language of each student (Santos, Darling-Hammond, & Cheuk, 2012). This means that all teachers must be constantly studying the cultural and social norms of the student. They must then tie in various phrases in English together through knowing and applying the native language of the individual, which can

be difficult when there are students of multiple backgrounds and languages. However, when this approach happens, it ensured that everyone understands the different concepts presented (Santos et al., 2012). At the same time, they must be able to have a certain amount of flexibility to adapt the lesson plans of the class to their needs. The educator must ensure that everyone understands the different concepts (Samson & Collins, 2012). Yet they must do so in a way that will keep it fresh and exciting.

Review of Methodology in Previous Literature

The review of methodology looked at previous studies that evaluated the best strategies to teach English to ELLs. For instance, Blackwell (2013) used a qualitative approach to identify the effective strategies and best practices used to improve vocabulary and language development of ELLs, which was a timely study because non-English speaking students had already reached at least 3.5 million at the time. The researchers carried out the qualitative approach in three urban public elementary schools in southeastern part of the country.

Through interviews and observations, the researchers found several useful themes. Based on the interviews and observation, the researcher determined teachers must utilize evidence-based strategies or strategies already proven to work well with ELL students. The researchers also found that teachers should use Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) strategies because these strategies made the lessons much easier to learn. Lastly, the researchers found that it was important that teachers would

have ability in teaching diverse students, culturally, and linguistically. The qualitative approach has proven to be effective in gathering in-depth findings.

Bennett and Hart (2014) also used a qualitative approach. In particular, the researchers conducted an exploratory study with the intention of contributing to the knowledge base on how to improve teachers' strategies for teaching ELLs. They gathered the secondary pre-service teachers' perceptions of disciplinary literacy practices, and what strategies supported instruction. They found that applying structural inquiry into disciplinary communities improved the teachers' comprehension of what defines disciplinary literacy. Unfortunately, the findings did not show that this improved knowledge of the teachers was easily applicable into classroom instruction.

Bunch (2013) also used a qualitative study to look at what teachers should use as strategies to improve learning of ELLs under the new era of standards. Bunch argued that efforts to make the teachers of ELLs be more prepared to meet language and literacy expectations demanded for by CCSS should not discount the importance of developing pedagogical language knowledge. Using the qualitative approach of literature review analysis, Bunch established that the focus of teaching English should deviate from past practices, where the emphasis was on form and function. Instead, instructors should offer opportunities for students to develop language and literacy skills within the core curricular content, expand their understandings, and embrace the activities that teachers are responsible for and excited to teach. Through literature synthesis, the researcher was

able to establish that the best way to meet CCSS demands was to push teachers to view and understand language as action (van Lier & Walqui, 2012).

DeLozier (2014) designed a qualitative study as well. In particular, the researcher used the qualitative hermeneutical phenomenological study to inquire about the perception of elementary teachers with regard to instructional strategies, methods, and models used to enhance learning within the core curriculum for ELLs. The researcher distributed questionnaires and conducted interviews and found that, overall, there were multiple challenges, frustrations, and critical success factors (DeLozier, 2014). The researcher urged educational institutions to provide professional development for them to learn specifically how to engage in instructional practices that would work for other kids (DeLozier, 2014).

Implications

The anticipated findings focus on the teachers' need for ongoing collaboration to provide the needed support for ELL students. The recommendation is for teachers to continue with professional development and/or professional learning communities to share best practices to support ELLs. By looking closely at what teachers thought to have the most impact on their teaching practice, the strength and weakness of the current teaching practice were identified. In moving forward, teachers' recognize the value of collaborative planning. Teachers of ELLS can be more prepared and ready to meet the needs of their ELL students in the future. The research could help distinguish what

current teaching strategies and instruction supports academic language needs for the ELL student population. Teachers may continue to monitor student progress and identify learning profiles in the classroom, as students learn best when instruction matches their learning styles. Implications for social change include teacher preparedness to better prepare ELL students to be successful in their academic language resulting in more enhanced student success with their academic language.

Summary

The objective was to explore ELL instruction and identify how it instruction was provided. To do this, teachers provided students daily objectives and strategies, students then used these strategies (academic language functions) to complete assigned tasks. In addition, teachers provided students with a variety tools to guide them with the assigned tasks. These teachers continue to try to meet the needs of these learners but do not have all the skills, instructional strategies, and teaching tools needed to provide the best opportunity. One issue is the lack of time to collaborate. The teachers agreed weekly barriers were not having the allocated time to prepare. The lessons take time to prepare to support the academic needs of the ELL students.

The literature established that ELLs need additional academic support to increase their overall proficiency levels. As teachers work to plan lessons, they need to identify which strategies will work best for their students. The experiences of the teachers shared the importance of taking time to plan lessons in order to carry them out successfully.

The literature review highlighted the importance for ELL students to advance language proficiency levels and reach the bridging stage, at which point they would be proficient in English. ELLs must attain the same standards as their peers but through a second language. Acquiring English proficiency through specific linguistic resources takes time. Teachers must have the training and professional development to teach, learn and practice these focused and meaningful lessons.

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to gain an understanding about instruction for ELLs in the participating school. This study demonstrated how ELLs learn and how teachers' best supported their academic needs. The future will have an impact on research activities. At times teachers were unclear or confused about the resources needed to best support their students. It was imperative teachers realized it is not just about equal access and providing all the strategies to students but rather allowing students choices to choose a strategy that works best for the individual.

Teachers must provide ELL instruction approaches that focus on language and content integration. Findings of the current study could be of help in supporting ongoing professional development, professional learning communities, and common core teacher training to establish the most effective instructional support for ELL teachers.

The next section will discuss the methodology taken to attain the purpose of the study, wherein the design, the sample and participants, the data collection and analysis procedures, the limitations, and the ethical considerations.

Section 2: The Methodology

Research Design and Approach

The study presented how teachers provided academic instruction to support ELLs at the study site so that the students can continue to progress in acquiring English and the academic content. I collected data to gain more insight as to how the teachers actualized the curriculum. Several components must be the focal point if the needs of these ELL students in the California school district are met: planning time, explicit teaching, and practice time. The objective of the study was to provide evidence of how teachers prepared the ELL student population within this California school setting. This study provided evidence of instructional methodologies in a focused curriculum, for the targeted ELL population. The study participants shared how they implemented specific strategies targeting ELLs and current teaching strategies and instruction that supported academic language.

I used a case study method because it enabled me to develop an understanding of individuals who participated in the study. Creswell (2012) stated that researchers use the case study to develop an in-depth understanding and identify the activities of the group. I used a case study because it is descriptive and exploratory. It is useful for studying research problems in which there is limited interaction with study participants, but such participants are knowledgeable of the organizational issue in question (see Maxwell & Beattie, 2004). To analyze open-ended responses in this study, I recognized overlapping

themes in the open-ended data. I did not choose phenomenology because the purpose was not to focus on one's personal sensory experience or phenomenon. I did not choose grounded theory because it would have been appropriate only if the goal was to generate a theory from the findings (Corbin & Strauss, 2014). Likewise, an ethnographic approach would have worked best if I was assessing a cultural phenomenon based on the perceptions of the participants, which was not the case for my study (see Corbin & Strauss, 2014). Instead, I aimed at formulating a particular problem and clarifying concepts through input from knowledgeable individuals rather than develop conclusive evidence, as is the foundational approach of an exploratory study (Etchegaray, 2013).

This study took place in a natural setting in the attempt to provide participants an opportunity to express their thoughts, ideas, and teaching methodology with ELL instruction. The qualitative data consisted of information gathered from classroom observations and interviews thus providing an in-depth study of how teachers used teaching methodologies to provide ELL instruction to their students. Observations allowed me to gain more insight into how various approaches in teaching ELL students affected or had an impact on student learning and instruction.

The significance of this research was to recognize what effective and non-effective teaching strategies and lesson planning supported ELLs. With this, I was able to create a specific PD opportunity that provides instructional modes and collaborative practices to improve the success rate for ELLs in academic content during ELD

instruction. Observations allowed me to gain more insight into how various approaches in teaching ELL students had an affect or impact on student learning and instruction.

I collected narrative data (non-numerical data) over several weeks in a classroom setting within a specific context. The observations, interviews, and interview/behavioral protocols (Appendices B, C, D) were used to guide the collection. I categorized and interpreted the data. I used observations as evidence in the classrooms, as teachers worked with students. These observations focused on teacher engagement with ELL students and the instructional strategies employed within the ELL classroom. The observations were documented along with the teachers' interview responses. Furthermore, these observations were one of the driving forces I used to design the professional development at the local site. The information reported stemmed from the terms, themes, and definitions derived from the data. As stated by Creswell (2009) it is important to delve into the specifics of research design that pertain to the relationship and appropriate correlation between observational definitions, the units of analysis, and the research questions. The selected participants were of a purposeful sampling and specific to the research (see Patton, 2005). The selected participants were part of the ongoing phenomenon of interest in this study. To ensure adequate information, only ELL certified teachers received an invitation to participate.

The chosen participants were among the 18 ELL teachers who met the selection criteria at the study site. Of the 18 teachers, I invited four teachers from Grades 1 through

5 to participate in the study. Teachers communicated with me through school email and private conversations regarding specific meeting times and scheduled observations. The inclusion criteria were only the grade levels they taught and that they must be ELL certified teachers. The chosen participants were categorized based on years of service. This number provided for a deeper inquiry per individual.

The observations, interviews, and interview/ behavior protocols provided the data. I collected and reported the detailed accounts. The participants received a summary of their responses by email. They had the opportunity to discuss their responses and reply as they were able to view their responses in print. This gave me an opportunity to address disputes or concerns about any of the findings.

I completed the interviews during their non-contractual time, outside of the school setting. For the classroom observations, I asked permission from the principal and consent from the teachers. I then scheduled my classroom observations. Teachers were observed during the mandated ELD instructional block. The observations showed what teachers did during their designated ELL instruction. In addition, the observations showed how students responded to the instruction. The purpose of these observations was to obtain data regarding the instructional strategies employed for ELL students and to observe teacher engagement with ELL students. This gave more insight and evidence as to how the scripted lessons benefitted students during ELD instruction.

The consent form outlined my expectations for participants as well as how the observation process would take place. I kept a cataloging system and also collected the data to be transcribed and coded. I used Excel for simple tracking of the interviewed and observations. This collected data resulted in four themes to be presented. The following themes emerged: classroom environment, curriculum content, academic language, and differentiation**.**

The SDAIE scaffold lessons provide support to students in learning English. The students acquire skills in both the subject material and increasing abilities to use English (Nguyen et al., 2013). It was important to understand that this research study was not designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction; rather, I was interested in the following overarching research question: How do teachers provide instruction for ELLs? The research question was used to identify and recognize what teachers were doing during their lessons to teach ELL students.

Research is sufficient when data feels saturated (Merriam, 2009). Once the data and emergent findings are repeated without any new information arising, saturation is evident. I provided documentation for concerns and uncertainties during the study and referred to them when examining the data. During observations I wrote what was being said by the teacher as well as what students were doing to support a summary of the interview and/or observation. I designed the observation protocol (Appendix C) using social constructionism to ascertain how the teachers were implementing the SIOP model

of lesson strategies. Methodological triangulation was valuable for qualitative researchers to establish the credibility and confirmability of the research study's findings (Lincoln & Guba, 2013). By utilizing multiple data collection methods, I was able to verify the findings across all sources of data, in this case using observations and interviews.

Although I was a colleague to the interviewees, it did not impair or interfere with the data collection. I observed the lessons presented by the teachers. I ensured that my colleagues understood my role as a researcher and that my prejudices and biases were always in check.

To help reduce biases and to check the accuracy of the research, I employed validation procedures such as member checking, triangulation, and auditing (Creswell, 2012). Recording the data during the observation rather than waiting until after the observations helped in preventing misinformation or errors. I wrote what was taking place in the moment. Member checking involved submitting a summary of the interview(s) to each participant to ask if the summary was a fair rendition of the conversation(s). Merriam (2009) noted that a member check involves asking the participant if the interpretation of statements is accurate. Triangulation is a research method that involves more than one source to compare and analyze the data collected from different sources (Merriam, 2009). In essence, the audit examines both the process and product of the inquiry to determine its trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1982, 1985).

Ethical Considerations

Participants received an informed consent agreement to be signed and returned to me (copy to participants as well). Consent included the following as mandated by IRB: the statements that the study involved research, description of any benefits to subject, and a description of any risks or discomforts to the subject. A statement described the confidentiality of records disclosing the subject was maintained, minimal risks, if any, of the research, as well as a statement to participate on a voluntary basis (Appendix I).

The data was confidential and participants were aware of their involvement in the study and private as to maintain and the names of the participants. A pseudonym was given to participants as necessary. All materials were stored in a file on my personal computer. The participants had consent forms that stated their role and the process involved within the research study. The participants were informed of the code of ethics and my role within the research study. The information derived from the analysis was used to improve and enhance student learning and teacher efficacy.

Data Collection and Analysis

There were two sources of data: interviews and classroom observations. The study utilized a narrative of the interviews based on the experiences of interviewees. Observations were used to gain more insight in understanding how various approaches in teaching ELL students affected student learning and instructional outcomes. The data collected from interviews and observations were analyzed and digitally recorded

(Merriam, 2009, p.221). The following are the findings obtained from the interviews and observations. Data from four teachers were collected, transcribed, coded, themed, and then analyzed to determine what was implemented during ELL instruction. The findings presented, addressed the research sub-questions. The research sub-questions (SQ) aligned to the interview questions (IQ). A table format was used to present the data as part of the data analysis.

The following are the sub-questions that sought to understand the methods teachers used to support ELLs and provide effective academic instruction

SQ 1. What methods of teaching do teachers employ in teaching ELL students?

SQ 2. How do teachers vary their approach in teaching ELL students?

SQ 3. What are the driving factors that determine how teachers' best support ELL student in their classroom?

The following four themes emerged from the data analysis: (a) classroom environment, (b) curriculum content, (c) academic language, and (d) differentiation.

Interviews

Teacher interviews provided details and illuminated personal experiences for this qualitative study. The interviews took place outside of the participants' working hours and environments, for example, at a nearby coffee shop. The interviews lasted approximately thirty minutes. The transcribing of note taking and observations accurately presented the data. I took notes as the interviewee answered each question. The use of the

interview questions helped to understand the methods teachers used to support ELL instruction. The 10 questions used during the teacher interviews aligned to the research questions. After the receiving answers for the interview questions, I took a moment to review the notes, making sure I had enough information needed before moving on to the next question. This pattern continued until all questions were answered. I labeled the interview data for each participant with a number to keep individual information private. The responses for the interview questions sought to gain insight on ELL instruction. The interview guide consisted of the following 10 questions:

1. How would you describe an effective teacher of ELL students? What methods of teaching do you employ when teaching ELL students? (RQ1)
2. In what ways do you vary your approaches in teaching ELL students? (RQ2)
3. What are the driving factors that determine the approaches you use for ELLs? (RQ3)
4. How similar or different are the materials you use with your ELLs compared with the English Only (EO) teachers? (RQ1)
5. In what ways do you change the instructional materials to accommodate your ELLs? (RQ2)
6. How well aligned are your current teaching materials with the CCSS required materials? (RQ3)

7. How similar or different are the time blocks you use with your ELLs compared with EO teachers? (RQ2)
8. How would you change the time block(s) if you could? RQ3)
9. What portion of your common planning time would you estimate can be used for teachers to collaborate on teaching techniques to support ELLs? (RQ1)
10. How often do you plan together with other teachers for ELLs? (RQ2)

After the completion of the interviews, I organized and analyzed the data using codes (key words). The codes aligned with the data and then reduced to major themes stemming from the research questions. The coding process allowed patterns to become more noticeable. As stated by Creswell (2012) many patterns seen in data are revised and labeled. This data reflected any commonalities across grade levels.

Observations

Data collection via pre-arranged classroom observations with each participant provided the least amount of interference and distraction, occurring in the classrooms (Merriam, 2009). An additional observation protocol tool provided a format to follow for that part of the research. During the observations, I listened to what the teachers were saying. I wrote notes on what teaching tools the teacher was using for the range of ELLs in the classroom, and noted how the students responded to the teacher. During

observations, students and teachers were at various parts of their daily lesson. The teachers would use various strategies (visual cues, teaching tools, anchor charts, sentence stems) based on the needs of the students they were working with. Once the observations were complete, I summarized what was observed and noted if any of the four themes (classroom environment, curriculum content, academic language, differentiation) were used during the observation.

In analyzing the observation notes, I used mapping. Mapping involves describing the behavior one observes and the physical work environment (Schensul, Schensul, & LeCompte, 1999).

Validity

The observations and open-ended interviews with teachers provided triangulation, to help ensure validity. In addition, examining unusual or contradictory results known as outliers provided additional analysis. These discrepant cases were highlighted and noted. To do so, I rigorously assessed both the supporting and discrepant data. Next, I determined whether these responses affected the conclusion I arrived at. One must be aware of all of the pressures to ignore data that do not fit with the conclusions (Maxwell, 2012). I did not just ignore data that did not fit my conclusion. The case study method is not one without limitations. According to Yin (2013), case study research studies are often criticized as lacking in rigor, prone to bias, and lacking in generalizability. The current study was also affected by these limitations, but I used methods such as member

checking and triangulation, and was equally aware of my own biases to reduce any effects on the findings. In addition, a copy of the transcripts from each interview were provided to the respective participant to confirm the accuracy.

Conclusion

The intent of the study was to find out how teachers provide ELL instruction. The school could use this evidence to support ongoing professional development, professional learning communities, and common core to establish the most effective instructional support to meet the needs of English Language Learners. The goal was to give teachers support to provide high-quality instruction in any setting and with any cohort of students. One of the ways to do this was to identify those strategies that would enable teachers to address the needs of non-native English speakers. I collected narrative data (non-numerical data) over several weeks in an ELL classroom setting. The data included observations and documentation of classroom environments and teacher interactions and then analyzed to identify similar correlations or vast differences.

The observations, descriptive data collected from field notes, and open-ended interviews with teachers provided triangulation, to help ensure validity. The code of ethics should be consistent throughout the data collection (Creswell, 2012). I used a structured, organized method to manage the interview and survey data.

The data addressed what teachers did to provide instruction for ELLs. The school may use the findings to support ongoing professional development, professional learning

communities, and common core teacher training to establish the most effective instructional support to meet the needs of English Language Learners.

Data Analysis Results

The purpose of this study was to identify how teachers provide academic instruction to support ELLs. Interviews and observations were the basis of this study. I used an interview protocol with ten interview questions, plus one closure question, and conducted 12 classroom observations with four participants. I recruited four participants, who were ELL teachers from Grades 1-3. Each teacher had a range of ELLs consisting of ELD Levels 1-3 in her classroom. The average student to teacher ratio was 22:1. The teachers were all certified ELL teachers within one elementary school with a high ELL population. I chose these teachers to observe because they were ELL teachers at this school site.

The school district from which I collected and analyzed this data has a research approval process. The district received my proposal, and then presented it to a committee. The accepted request by the school district led to the confirmation of Walden's IRB approval. Next, I made contact with a school within a large school district, with a high ELL student population. With the approval of the principal, I received a list of ELL teachers to begin the initial request for participation via email. My relationship with the participants was limited to professional association. Three of the participants were previous colleagues with whom I worked when I was a teacher in that state; I have since

moved to another state. To contact possible participants of ELL teachers in Grades 1-4, I sent an initial email. I was able to confirm four participants out of 10 initial invitations to participate. The next step was to make face-to-face contact via Skype to explain my role in this process. I explained to these teachers that I would not use their names and thus a letter figure represented their names (i.e., Teacher A – D) in my findings. I answered any questions that the potential participants had regarding her role in this process. Once I obtained informed consent from each willing participant, I began the interviews and observations.

The first phase of the research began with the interviews. During the interview process, all teachers shared a list of the same questions from the Interview Protocol (Appendix H). The interviews happened via Skype and took place outside of the teachers' working school hours. I asked teachers questions and as they answered, I jotted the responses, which were later summarized and presented. I did not record the interviews, instead I wrote down participants responses. The interviews lasted approximately 20 – 30 minutes, meaning approximately two to three minutes were spent on each interview question. In the end, all of the study participants were women. Two male teachers did not consent to participation in this research study. The selected participants chosen through purposeful sampling for the research (Patton, 2005); of the 10 invitations sent, those who participated were the ones who consented to do so.

As the interviews were taking place, I wrote key phrases as the side notes that I might want to identify as repeating patterns/topics, in addition to what the teachers shared. Data collection consisted of interviews and multiple observations of the teachers. After the interview process, the participants had an opportunity to review the written record of their interview responses. The review and analysis of the participants' data addressed any concern for outliers. I determined one discrepancy within this study as noted from the interview questions. Once I analyzed all the responses, I generated the findings for the research study. All participants were given an opportunity to view the analysis of the findings from the interviews and were asked to reply with any comments or concerns within a week. None of the participants replied with any concerns about the process or observations. Therefore, I determined the data was accurate, allowing me to move forward. After the initial interviews, the teacher observations started; accomplished via Skype. It was a live Skype feed where I had full view of the classroom. I took extensive notes during the observations to detail teacher/student interactions. My notes transferred to the Observation Protocol as a tool to organize and analyze the data.

The observations provided the data to understand the methods teachers used to support ELLs and how teachers were providing academic instruction for ELL students. These observations also provided a picture of the methods teachers used and how teachers varied their approaches to their students. As stated by Braun & Clark (2013) observations and interviews can be used as instruments for collecting data. Each

participant mentioned English language development (ELD) lesson plans during their interviews. During the observations, I did not attempt to verify the use of these lesson plans since the goal of the observations was to record the methods used to support ELLs and how teachers provided academic instruction to ELL students.

The interview process helped to gain insight as to what teachers perceive as the best support ELL instruction. I created a spreadsheet for tracking and analyzing the data. Analysis and review of the answers from the interview questions signaled any common themes (key words) used by the participants. The discovery of any similarities or differences occurred through coding. Coding for reoccurring themes was necessary to provide detailed findings when reviewing data (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, 2010). The organization of data included several themes from both interviews and observations. These were contained in spreadsheets. A thorough analysis of the spreadsheets identified the findings.

The data analysis began after the observations were completed. I found common themes shared by the teachers during the observations, based on the participants' actions during instruction. I was able to reread the copious notes taken from the observations to determine the themes. The coded observations identified any themes among the participants. This collected data resulted in four themes to be presented. The following themes emerged: classroom environment, curriculum content, academic language, and differentiation. A spreadsheet with themes analyzed and highlighted any patterns or

recurring themes. Yin (2014) stated that computer software helps in identifying themes, however; the researcher is the one who establishes these patterns or themes with the data collected and analyzed.

Evidence of Data, Discrepant Cases, and Findings

The use of data further explored organized themes, creating an opportunity to analyze descriptive patterns of the participants. The data analysis continued through triangulation of the interviews, the observations, and member checking to ensure validity. The interviews and multiple observations of the teachers ensured credibility. After the interview process, the participants gained an opportunity to review the written records of their individual responses to confirm the accuracy of those responses. The process of having participants review their responses is often called a member check. After participants confirmed the accuracy of their responses, I began the data analysis process. The first step was to familiarize myself with the data by reading and rereading the interview responses that I wrote during the live observations and interviews. During this process, I began to take preliminary notes of prevalent topics and patterns among the interview responses. Table 1 outlined these preliminary notes.

Table 1 Preliminary Topics

Preliminary Topics

Prevalent topics and patterns	
Being organized is important for ELL instruction	Planning ahead
Student competency influences teaching	Small group work
Assess student's level of skill	Student needs
Scaffolds and modeling for students	English skills
Aligned lesson plans with curriculum expectations	Different curriculum

After I completed this process, I began coding the data by identifying meaningful segments of data and labeling them with summative labels. I examined each interview response line-by-line to identify the most meaningful portions of data that represented participants' thoughts, feelings, and opinions regarding the phenomenon. While every participant noted several consistent aspects of their experiences as ELL teachers, participants mentioned different aspects. I noted these discrepancies and reported them in the final report of the findings because they provided depth and detail to the findings. Table 2 outlined an example of the coding process.

Table 2 Example

Example of Coding Process

Raw Data	Code
"I think there is a lot of new material for students and teachers and some of the lessons can take much longer that you initially plan for." (IQ8)	Time management of lesson plans
"During a 60 minute planning time we might be designated 30 minutes to plan but something else is needed to be addressed and then we lose that planning time." (IQ9)	Obstacles to appropriate use of planning time
"Instruction depends somewhat on students' levels of knowledge. Less scaffolds and modeling with a higher exception for students who are near the bridging level when compared to an emerging student." (IQ5) Note: Interview Questions (IQ) is used throughout this document.	Student competency influences instruction

Once I finalized the coding of all the interview data, I began to organize and cluster codes together with similar sentiments. During this time, I was able to coordinate and include discrepancies in the data with the similar responses. By doing so, I ensured within the reporting of the findings I could highlight similarities while using the discrepancies to substantiate the need for further research in this specific field. After clustering codes together, I provided a summative label that served as the initial thematic title for the cluster. I took these thematic titles and reviewed them against the data to ensure they accurately represented participants' narratives. If thematic titles did not

represent participants' narratives, I reassessed them and began the process of review again. I continued this process until the initial themes represented the data.

Once I verified their accurate representation, I examined the participant observations for support or discrepancies against the thematic findings. I reviewed my personal field notes that indicated instructional strategies, teacher engagement, and ELL student engagement along with behavioral patterns. These notes verified instructional strategies that participants indicated during their interviews including, but not limited to, the use of small group work for ELL students and alignment with curriculum standards through active teaching practices like modeling.

As I noted, there were small discrepancies within the data regarding their specific strategies, but overall these discrepancies supported the themes. Because of this, I included these small discrepancies into the final reporting of the data because they added depth and detail to participants' experiences as teachers of ELL students. Nonetheless, overall participants felt the need to improve on prioritizing the importance of staying punctual. The teachers all felt the use of instructional materials was dependent on the needs of the students.

The narrative and observational data were consistent with one another and further supported by the observations supporting the thematic findings. The lessons used by teachers were differentiated based on students' ELD levels. As I explored through

observing, I noticed the participants all shared a commonality, using a structured lesson plan to present each lesson.

Teachers used a daily template lesson that provided them with modeling techniques to demonstrate how students should actively engage with the language components within the lessons. Through the observations, I was able to determine that the teachers were consistent with the interview questions. Each teacher worked to satisfy the needs of the students in the classroom. The ongoing best practices used were evident as teachers provided students with opportunities to engage in language and descriptive dialogue. The following four themes emerged from the data analysis: (a) classroom environment, (b) curriculum content, (c) academic language, and (d) differentiation.

The following are the sub-questions that sought to understand the methods teachers used to support ELLs and provide effective academic instruction:

1. What methods of teaching do teachers employ in teaching ELL students?
2. How do teachers vary their approach in teaching ELL students?
3 What are the driving factors that determine how teachers' best support ELL student in their classroom?

The three sub-questions showed how teachers provided academic instruction to support ELLs at the study site so students can make progress in learning English and academic content. With the three questions addressed, these results followed.

Results for Research Question 1

RQ 1: What methods of teaching do teachers employ in teaching ELL students?

Participant responses to interview questions one, four, and nine addressed the first research question. In this section, I present summative tables of each interview question and discussions of these results. I also present the themes that I generate during data analysis, based on aggregated data from interviews and observations, which addressed the research question.

Table 3 RQ1 **R**esults

Interview Question 1: Results

	IQ 1. How would you describe an effective teacher of ELL students? What methods of teaching do you employ when teaching ELL students?
Teacher A	"Being prepared by planning lessons ahead of time. Student opportunities to use language in small groups so that students can be heard in small group academic conversations."
Teacher B	"Organization and getting all materials ahead of time, small groups and differentiation to gain an understanding of what students' needs are when it comes to language and speaking effectively."
Teacher C	"Having lesson plans to use and be able to plan out lessons to prepare what you will be teaching."
Teacher D	"Having lesson plans and organization helps to address the needs of our students. The students need daily language practice."

Interview Results for RQ 1

During the interview process, each of the four teachers shared the methods used during their ELD instructional block. All teachers felt that an important aspect of being prepared and effective as an ELL teacher was to plan and have materials ready to engage their scholars.

Teacher A responded by sharing how she felt the time for planning and preparedness are important. Being prepared provided her some idea of what to expect and plan for the lesson. She was able to plan for the small group instruction and prep students to engage in academic conversations. During the interview, Teacher A stated by planning lessons and providing students with opportunities to engage in language and academic conversations prepared students to be successful.

Teacher B's response was similar as she shared her concerns were with being organized and aware of what the lesson entailed. She felt the students would be most successful if they were given time to learn during small group instruction. She continued to share the value of small group instruction and its implementation as part of the lesson. Accommodations must be in place or readily available based on student differentiation, as it pertains to the lesson or daily language skill practice for that day.

The response for Teacher C was similar to the other responses as she suggested lesson plans and long range planning were effective ways to provide opportunities for success. The lesson plans that aligned with the content and academic language were beneficial to teacher and student. The teacher was able to identify what the lesson was, the standards, strategies, and skills needed to present the lesson. At that point, the teacher could provide supplemental resources as needed based on the current needs of her students. Long-range plans provided teachers with a view of what was to come; this helps teachers gage what standards to cover, teach, and a time-frame is then established for teaching those standards.

Teacher D was concerned with having lesson plans ready and organized to support the needs of her students. She also felt that daily language practice was an effective approach in providing students with more opportunities to succeed with academic content and language development. The preparation of lesson plans was an important step. This allowed teachers a chance to view the lesson prior to teaching it and decide what other tools may be needed to support the learners. The preparedness was timely and effective tool when working with students on a daily basis.

Teachers employed a variety of methods and strategies for teaching ELL students Teachers felt being prepared by reading and planning for lesson ahead of time would help them better understand what was missing from these scripted lesson formats, and what information could be changed to better accommodate their level of learners. For example,

Teacher A noted the importance of "Being prepared by planning lessons ahead of time." Teacher C and D echoed this focus: "Having lesson plans to use and be able to plan out lessons to prepare what you will be teaching" (Teacher B) and "Having lesson plans and organization helps to address the needs of our students" (Teacher D). Teacher C spoke specifically to the importance of organization: "Organization and getting all materials ahead of time." Table 3 presented participant responses.

Observation Results 1s *for RQ 1*

Theme 1. Classroom Environment

Theme 1 addressed the first research question. Across all 12 of the observations conducted, each of the teachers fostered a positive learning environment through instruction and classroom environment. In Observation one of three, Teacher A, began her lessons with whole groups to ensure understanding and foster collaboration among the students. Teacher A asked questions to gain understanding before beginning the lesson. She participated in exercises to assess the students' level of knowledge. The observations revealed the print rich classroom thus providing students with many scaffolds and materials to support learning. Student expectations, norms, sentence stems, objective, student friendly language were all evident forms of student supports. Teacher B shared similar anchor charts, ELD posters, and sentence stems throughout the classroom. She used similar strategies to Teacher A in order to foster a positive classroom environment where every student felt comfortable and able to learn. She

participated in a student-teacher model to demonstrate what students will do during the lessons.

Teacher C also fostered a positive classroom environment for her students. She spent ample time answering individual questions and helping students while they were working independently on their models. She told students to use the charts and materials posted in the classroom to support their writing and speaking as needed.

Teacher D fostered a positive classroom environment through group participation. For example, when reviewing the poster of the lesson content for the first observation, Teacher D had the students read the poster together: "This is a choral reading, everyone is reading together." She provided areas within the classroom for students to work with partners, small groups, or teacher led discussions.

Each class had students that moved around the classroom gathering materials without disrupting other students working. It was evident teachers had procedures and expectations in place. The students knew what materials to use for specific interactions. Implementation and practice of these skills was evident across classrooms.

Observation Results 2 &3

Theme 2. Academic Language

The second theme, Academic Language found during observations and noted while investigating RQ1. As I continued with the observations, I noted a commonality.

The lessons provided by the teachers' modeled techniques to demonstrate how students should possibly engage with the language components within these lessons. I saw teachers modeling and reviewing vocabulary as part of the daily instruction. Since lessons were shared across grade levels based on ELD levels, much of the same information aligned in each classroom. The use of many scaffolds (anchor charts, visuals, sentence stems, visual texts, academic conversation prompts, response starters, table tents, and student norms) were visible throughout the observations.

Classroom teachers reviewed the conversation norms posters as a whole group during observations. Choral readings, when everyone reads together, was evident in all classes. The teachers always asked students why they should review norms prior to beginning with the language of the skill component. Students stated reviewing the poster gave them the information of to do when it came time to listen to conversations. The teachers practiced and explained the use of a model and non-model example. In addition, teachers shared to be effective communicators, students must practice skills and vocabulary to build academic conversations. The whole group discussions fostered the use of academic language. This practice continued to ensure that students grasped the concepts presented according to the curriculum.

Teacher A prompted conversations using academic language. She specifically outlined the type of language that the students were to use during the activities (e.g., adjectives). The teacher spent time reviewing the definition of an adjective and then

prompted students to find adjectives within the visual texts. The students identified adjectives and shared examples of adjectives used in the reading.

The classroom was print rich with anchor charts, sentence stems, and daily objectives. It was evident planning time had been used to prepare lessons. Teacher A told students to use sentence frames to prompt them during the partner A and B discussion. The students were excited to begin the academic language activity. Two students sat at the front of the classroom in chairs. They had the conversation chart posted on the board and the visual text to refer back to. Teacher and students read the prompt, "What do you notice in the visual text? Cite details to CLARIFY your ideas." The students immediately began to provide feedback to one another using key words and sentence stems. The partners provided model and non-model examples during the lesson. The engaging activity provided the evidence that planning, review, and practice of skills was in place.

Those students needed time to engage in academic conversation to build on language skills. The students reviewed how to model conversations and partner talks. In one lesson, the students spent time sharing ideas about the visual text. When the students were not able to provide the necessary information for the visual text, the teachers asked more questions and had students dig deeper into the visual text. Digging deeper was what the teacher stated when she wanted students to look for more key words or comprehension within the visual text. The students used illustrations and words on the page to add more detail to the statement they made about the visual text. The teacher

prompted students by providing her own clarification of the text. The teacher stepped in and used the words “I noticed the ground is brown.” That provided an opportunity for students to continue practicing with the skill, Clarify.

After observations with Teacher B, I determined there was a strong connection with modeling in the classroom. The teacher spent much time modeling all components of lessons. She fostered the use of academic language by visually displaying it on the poster as well as encouraged students to use it in conversation and activities. Teacher B had students model and explain their learning. She took her time, not moving to the next part of a lesson until she felt the students understood the objective of the lesson. When students did not verbalize the skill set, the teacher modeled and referred to the poster for conversation norms. The teacher modeled and provided examples before she continued or moved to the next part of the lesson. She would ask students to repeat or restate what they said. When all students understood, the teacher moved to the next part of the lesson.

Teacher C explained the objectives of the lessons and modeled for the students. The students moved quickly through the lessons. The students provided evidence from the text, added details, revised their writing. Students worked with partners as the teacher walked and annotated and prompted students. Teacher C used discussions guided by the concepts displayed on a poster to foster the use of academic language. These students moved faster and seemed to grasp content at a much a quicker pace when compared to the other classes. She reiterated key words and handed out sample scripts to the students

before prompting student discussions. She noted that, "The students [were] asked to highlight or circle the information and then write what skill [was] being used." The students showed engagement and excitement to add details and revise a script during the last observation. Students worked in small groups, looked at a script, and discussed how to add details to clarify. The students understood the use of adjectives made things clearer. When students added adjectives to describe a script it brought the script to life. The students gained an understanding of the vocabulary and academic language because they talked and shared information about the script and academic conversations.

Similarly, Teacher D used an exercise to help students identify academic language. She told me that, "…the teacher asked the students to go back to their seats and look for 5 key vocabulary words from the story that the illustrations may have helped students clarify what the words meant." Teacher D demonstrated model and non-model before the lesson. The teacher also restated what the objective of the lesson was, and restated the skill of the day along with the importance of think time. Teacher D spent a lot of time modeling and questioning. The modeling and discussion prior to the lesson provided students the scaffold they needed to begin their independent part of the lesson. When the students began the partner activities, they found anchor charts and posters as additional resources if needed.

The teacher reminded students to use think time and the language of the skill for FORTIFY. A student volunteer read a model script to practice asking questions and

answering using the language skills. The teacher asked students how to support ideas. Students answered by adding detail. When the teacher modeled, she pointed out the importance to use engaging questions. The teachers asked students if they could tell the difference between a model and non-model example of questions for the language of the skill FORTIFY.

The students understood the lesson as they identified differences between model and non-model script. Students responded by saying no prompting or questioning is used for non-model, in addition the information seems boring because no details were provided. The teacher told students they would play a game using create, clarify, and fortify cards. She explained the different skill cards used to ask different types of questions about the visual text to play the game. Students referred back to the constructive conversation skills poster if they needed help asking questions or using the language of the skill. The review of expectations and scaffold gave students the confidence to begin their activities. The tools that the teacher provided prior to the independent practice gave students the confidence to collaborate. Teachers employed a variety of methods and strategies for teaching ELL students

Table 4 RQ1 Results

Interview Question 4: Results

	IQ 4. How similar or different are the materials you use with your ELLs compared with the English Only (EO) teachers?

Teacher A	"We use a completely different curriculum."
Teacher B	"ELD teachers have their own set of standards and curriculum that we are mandated to use."
Teacher C	"ELL teachers focus on language and being able to model language forms and targeted conversations."
Teacher D	"EO teachers use the state standards without a set curriculum or specific assessments that are not at all similar to what the ELD teachers' use."

Interview Results for RQ 1

The ELD curriculum used during the mandated ELD instruction was completely different from what EO students used for their daily mandated instructional block. Each ELL teacher noted that the materials used by ELL and EO teachers were very different. For example, Teacher A noted broadly, "We [ELL and EO teachers] use a completely different curriculum." Teacher B further noted this saying, "ELD teachers have their own set of standards and curriculum that we are mandated to use." Teacher D also noted "ELD teachers focus on language and being able to model language and being able to model language forms and targeted conversations." Teacher C offered a specific example of the curriculum differences by including, "ELL teachers focus on language and being able to model language forms and targeted conversations." Table 4 presented participant responses to interview question four.

Table 5 RQ1 Results

Interview Question 9: Results

	IQ 9. What portion of your common planning time would you estimate is used for teachers to collaborate on teaching techniques to support ELLs?
Teacher A	"Other things always come up during planning time that can take away from effective planning, collaboration time is lost."
Teacher B	"During a 60 minute planning time we might be designated 30 minutes to plan but something else is needed to be addressed and then we lose that planning time."
Teacher C	"The time is set aside or given for you to plan but often teachers are late or other information has to be dealt with before we can collaborate and then the time ends up being ten minutes for teacher collaboration."
Teacher D	"The designated time is not always used affectively for collaboration to support ELL instruction."

Interview Results for RQ1

Teachers responded in similar fashion on this question. The top concern was the amount of time taken away due to unforeseen situations. Teachers were prepared to shift and make changes on the fly without the loss of planning time. Teachers not being punctual seemed to play for concern on estimated time on collaboration. Teachers ran late because she had to address an issue. For example, Teacher A mentioned how

collaboration time was lost, “Other things always come up during planning time that can take away from effective planning, collaboration time is lost.” Teacher B echoed similar issues with loss of planning time, “During sixty- minute planning time we might be designated 30 minutes to plan but something else is needed to be addressed and we lose that planning time.” Teacher C noted that planning time was often lost due to other teachers’ inability to be on time, “The time is set aside or given for you to plan but often teachers are late or other information has to be dealt with before we can collaborate and then the time ends up being ten minutes for teacher collaboration.” Teacher D summed up the challenges expressed by the previous teachers, “The delegated time is not always used effectively for collaboration to support ELL instruction.” Established norms were a great way to keep teachers on task and consistent. During the time of the interviews, participants did not mention whether or not they had advocated for additional planning time to administrators. Because of this, it was difficult to determine if any current actions were in place to address this concern. Moving forward teachers would like to emphasize planning time was a priority and necessity to be most effective. Table 5 highlighted participant responses to interview question nine.

Results for Research Question 2

RQ 2. How do teachers vary their approach in teaching ELL students?

In this section, I presented the results of the interview and observational data analysis. I presented this in table formats, thus aggregating the interview data and

providing a description of the findings based on these data. I also presented Theme 3, based on data from interviews and observations, addressing research question 2.

Table 6 RQ2 Results

Interview Question 2: Results

	IQ 2. In what ways do you vary your approaches in teaching ELL students?
Teacher A	"ELD levels will affect your approach to teaching. For example, you need to consider ELL levels and what works best for small groups or one-to-one."
Teacher B	"Sometimes variance depends on the students ELD levels you have to wait to see the ELD level of students that come to your classroom. The range of learners varies in each class."
Teacher C	"You have to consider the needs of student and how they will learn best in your classroom. Some students enjoy working in whole group or with a partner. Other students like working in a small group. You need to observe your students to see what will work best for them."
Teacher D	"What students' need support with can depend on ELD levels. There are some students who do not speak English; their needs will be different than a child who is advanced as a speaker and much more fluent in English."

Interview Results for RQ2

The teachers stated the biggest variance depended on the instructional needs of their students. The grade level, curriculum, and ability level of students was a huge component of what teachers must use to teach. The class make-up had the highest impact on how to plan. Teachers agreed a variance in ELD levels affected their approach when

teaching. For example, Teacher A said, “ELD levels affect your approach to your teaching. For example, you need to consider ELL levels and what works best for small groups or one on one.” In addition, Teacher B stated, “Sometimes variance depends on the students ELD levels. You have to wait to see the ELD level of students that come to your classroom.” Teacher C also noted, “You have to consider the needs of students and how they will learn best in your classroom. You need to observe the students to see what will work the best for them.” Finally, “What students need support with can depend on ELD levels,” stated by Teacher D. Table 6 summarized participants’ findings.

Table 7 RQ 2 Results

Interview Question 5: Results

	IQ5. In what ways do you change the instructional materials to accommodate your ELLs?
Teacher A	“The higher level, the less scaffolds and modeling you need to do for these students.”
Teacher B	“The accommodations depend on the ELL student levels.”
Teacher C	“What students know helps you align your instruction to accommodate their needs.”
Teacher D	“Instruction depends somewhat on students’ levels of knowledge. Less scaffolds and modeling with a higher exception for students who are near the bridging level when compared to an emerging student.”

Interview Results for RQ2

The focus on instruction was to build on language support and comprehension while working on listening, speaking, reading, and writing. For example, Teacher A said, "The higher the level the less scaffolds and modeling you need to do for these students." Teachers monitored and assessed to identify the academic deficits or successes. Teacher B's and C's responses aligned with this concept: "The accommodations depend on the ELL student levels," and "What students know helps you align your instruction to accommodate their needs" (Teacher C). The observation protocol used by ELD teachers during instruction provided the assessment tool used to differentiate the instructional materials. Teacher D offered the highest level of detail regarding accommodating instruction: "Instruction depends somewhat on students' levels of knowledge. Less scaffolds and modeling with a higher exception for students who are near the bridging level when compared to an emerging student." Table 7 highlighted participant responses to interview question five.

Table 8 RQ 2 Results

Interview Question 7: Results

	IQ 7. How similar or different are the time blocks you use with your ELLs compared with EO teachers?
Teacher A	"We spend the same amount of time teaching the ELL students as EO teachers do, but I do not plan with them so I don't know the specifics of what is in their lessons."

Teacher B	"The EO teachers focus on building academic language but I don't know which standards they address during their instructional block."
Teacher C	"What and how you teach ELL students and EO students was different."
Teacher D	"I teach ELL students so I have not looked at what the EO teachers do or how they structure their lesson plans for their students, I just know there is more wiggle room to teach different lessons. The ELL lesson plans are very structured and explicitly lay out how to teach our ELD blocks."

Interview Results for RQ2

The teachers did not have much knowledge about the EO instructional block. The four teachers stated the block time was the same amount as the ELD classes; however, the instruction was different. For example, Teacher C said, "What and how you teach ELL students and EO students [differs]." Teacher B noted, "The EO teachers focus on building academic language but I don't know which standards they address during their instructional work." Teacher A echoed this idea, "We spend the same amount of time teaching the ELL students as EO teachers do but I do not plan with them so I don't know the specifics of what is in their lessons." Teacher D offered a bit more detail regarding differences in how ELL and EO teachers used their time blocks: "I teach ELL students so I have not looked at what the EO teachers do or how they structure their lesson plans for their students. I just know there is more wiggle room to teach different lessons. The ELD lesson plans are very structured and explicitly lay out how to teach our ELD blocks." The lesson format was a scripted plan that provided all teachers with the basic starting point.

Teacher D continued to share that teachers were able to modify as needed dependent of the learners in the classroom.

There were many scaffolds, posters, and support materials provided by the district. The curriculum had numerous materials to support all levels of learners. A specific language program provided the foundation for this ELD program. This program itself is the base for the lessons. The teachers modified lessons and content based on the skill level of the students. The objective was to teach the lesson in the allocated time of 45 minutes. Within the timeframe, teachers are to provide the supports or enhance the lessons so that students at varying levels are learning the content.

Observation Results RQ4

Theme 4. Differentiation

During the observations, I observed and judged the teacher within the classroom. Despite the observation, it may be possible the teacher used a common lesson format; however, this was unknown to me. The differences in learning styles and student knowledge affected the completion of lessons within an hour of instruction and implementation of lessons. Table 8 outlined the responses to interview question seven.

Results for Research Question 3

RQ 3. What are the driving factors that determine how teachers' best support ELL student in their classroom?

In this section, the research sub-question, RQ3, aligned to the interview questions ten, three, six, and eight. The IQs are in table format as part of the data analysis, and found in tables nine, ten, eleven, and twelve. Theme 3 and 4 are also included based on the data from interviews and observations.

Table 9 RQ 3 Results
Interview Question 10: Results

	IQ 10. How often do you plan together with other teachers for ELLs?
Teacher A	"We are scheduled to plan weekly however the timing or planning does not always take place, outside factors." Teacher B: Teacher C: Teacher D:
Teacher B	"There are times during our professional development (1 time a month at least) that time is set aside to plan with other ELL teachers."
Teacher C	"The school does a good job in allocating time to plan with colleagues, weekly grade level plans and some of the PD time (after school) allocated for ELD instruction."
Teacher D	"There are designated meetings during PD 1-2 times a month, and during grade level weekly planning."

Interview Results for RQ3

Teachers agreed that the school did a good job allocating the scheduled planning time for ELL teachers during PD times, ELD meetings, and grade-level planning. Although teachers agreed the time allocated for planning, it seemed the agenda was set but not always followed through. This left a gap in the amount of planning actually done

within the set amount of time provided for teacher planning. For example, Teachers B, C, and D noted the designated times were set aside. Teacher B noted the time set aside during professional development, "There were times during our Professional Development, 1 time a month as least, that time is set aside to plan with other ELL teachers, we need to make sure this time is set, if a time keeper is not in place, teachers can be easily thrown off task." Similarly, Teacher C said, "The school does a good job in allocating time to plan with colleagues, weekly grade level plans, and some of the PD time, after school allocated for ELD instruction. It depends on the grade levels and the focus teachers have to stay punctual." Teacher D also noted the designated time for planning, "There are designated ELD meetings during PD 1-2 times a month, and during grade level weekly planning. Again time is set aside, punctuality is important to keep the teachers moving forward and on task." As a grade level, each team should review norms and address the key concerns so that the planning time continues unaffected by something resolves prior to planning. This concern was one that teachers could address in satisfaction surveys and the principal, as the overall goal was student success. Table 9 presented participant responses to the tenth interview question.

Observation Results *RQ 3*

Theme 3. Curriculum Content

Theme 3 addressed research question two. In all 12 observations, teachers strategically presented curriculum content in order to ensure that students of all ELD

levels benefited. Teacher A presented clear and concise curriculum content to the students at the beginning of the observed lessons. After the students practiced the skill for the lesson, Teacher A employed activities that allowed and encouraged the students to apply the content to scenarios for better understanding. She told her class they would use the Conversation Pattern Guide to remind them of the pattern. Teacher A reviewed the prompt and response starters used during the academic conversations.

The teacher asked students to point to the Constructive Conversations Listening Task Poster and read each of the questions. The students listened while the teacher read the poster prompts. The teacher also reminded students how to use the Conversation Pattern Guide. Hand gestures in conjunction with saying the word Clarify supported student talk. Throughout the observations, teacher A reviewed the prompts, posters, expectations, and objectives for the lessons.

During an observation of Teacher B, she introduced the Constructive Conversation skill CREATE. The teacher told students they would share their ideas and take turns using a visual text with partners. The teacher explained the skill of the day was used to help to communicate ideas as created and learned from each other. The teacher also defined create and went on to establish conversation norms to ensure good listening and speaking skills. The teacher modeled the five conversation norms from a poster. She then used a model and non-model for the focus word CREATE. The teacher then presented students with the visual text for the lesson. The teacher also gave the students

a model script (script that is already written to use with the language of the skill CREATE). The teacher and students read the model script and used the Listening Task Poster to guide and ask questions. The students were able to provide evidence of a model and non-model example. Teacher B coupled the use of the poster with an explanation of the curriculum content. She said, “When we create, we say what we think or notice about something. We will also establish conversation norms to ensure good listening and speaking skills.” Teacher B modeled the five conversation norms from the poster. Teacher B displayed posters that reiterated concepts and ideas that aligned with instructional content. That ensured the students had a visual of the lessons they covered.

Teacher C also used posters to introduce students to curriculum content and fostered conversation surrounding the content. The teacher continued to provide think time, academic conversation, and question and answer response. The teacher also provided opportunities for students to review a model and non-model.

The teacher had students look at the model script on the board to find the evidence of the skills create, clarify, and fortify. The students and teacher discussed the ideas and keywords in the script to see if the model script was using the language of the skill. The teacher stated the examples of the skill fortify when student A asked a question to student B. Student B provided evidence from the text by specifically answering the question using detail. The teacher handed out sample scripts to all the students and asked

students to reread the script with their groups. Students discussed what skills the model students focused on.

The students highlighted or circled the information and then wrote the skill as they practiced using model scripts. The teacher told the class they would share the information as a whole group. The teacher walked around the class and listened to students as they worked on the activity. Once the students finished the model the teacher then asked the students to look at the non-model. The students' task was to then look at a non-model and improve the non-model to make the constructive conversation create using language skills. The teacher did one example for the class. Teacher C used the SPF to monitor how well the students were using the specific language of the skill.

The curriculum content and standards were the same for all classes mandated for ELD students so Teacher D employed the same curriculum content as Teachers A-C. Teacher D began the year by assessing students' current competencies and then utilized the curriculum content to focus on raising each student's competency. This was similar across every teacher participant. An example of this was during one of the activities, the students referred back to table tents on their tables. The table tents were small academic conversation prompts. Those were additional scaffolds provided by some teachers as needed.

The teacher explained the reason the students worked on specific skills was to become better with academic conversations and learn new vocabulary. The students

began working in small groups only after they practiced the skill with the teacher in a whole group setting. The objective was clear and practiced several times before students practiced with each other. The conversations continued between students and teacher and then moved to students and partners with the same prompt, 'In the visual text, what does this mean?'

The students A and B took turns responding to each other. After a few minutes, the teacher asked the students to go back to their seats and look for five key vocabulary words from the story. Students also used illustrations to help clarify what the vocabulary words meant. The teacher told students to write down the vocabulary words they found and share how the illustration helped support or clarify meaning of new words. As students found their seats, the teacher walked around the classroom listening to the students as they shared their ideas.

Small group instruction gave students different opportunities to collaborate and practice their skills. While students worked on activities, the teacher used the Constructive Conversation Language Sample, which is a Student Progress Form (SPF). The form was a document used to assess how well the students used the specific language of the skill. Teacher D used the SPF to assess how to provide small group activities for the next lesson. Teachers used those SPFs to assess and monitor lessons.

The teachers captured the informal data by simply recording student comments. In addition, teachers used a scripted lesson that provided direction for the students. The

differentiation among the teachers reflected from the ELD levels of the students in each of the classes. That gave teachers the information to guide how differentiation for future planning of small group activities.

Results for Research Question 3

RQ3. What are the driving factors that determine the approaches used by teachers for ELLs?

In this section, I described the findings from this research that addressed research question three. This includes tables with participants' responses to the interview questions and discussions of these responses. I focused on interview and observational data to present theme four.

Table 10 RQ 3 Results

Interview Question 3: Results

	IQ 3. What are the driving factors that determine the approaches you use for ELLs?
Teacher A	"Students ELD levels will help determine what the starting point is for you in the classroom."
Teacher B	"Students vary in their levels as some classes need more scaffolds and more sentence modeling."
Teacher C	"The new curriculum focuses on language and practice, how to communicate using a modeling approach to help students build their vocabulary."
Teacher D	"You have to assess students to see how you can work with your students to give them the best opportunity to become effective communicators in the classroom."

Interview Results for RQ3

The teachers all stated that ELL levels help decide how to teach ELLs and how much guidance and modeling to provide. The amount of time spent on explicit instruction depended on the students in the classroom. ELLs varied in their level of language, understanding, and social conversation. These factors determined how to best present lessons. Teacher A stated "ELD level will help determine what the starting point is for you in the classroom." Teacher B responded, "Students vary in their levels; some classes need more scaffolds and more sentence modeling." Teacher D's response was similar to that of Teacher B: "You have to assess students to see how you can work with your students to give them the best opportunity to become effective communicators in the classroom." Teacher C also added, "The new curriculum focuses on language and practices of how to communicate using a modeling approach, to help students build their vocabulary." Table 10 outlined participants' responses to interview question three.

Table 11 RQ 3 Results

Interview Question 6: Results

	IQ 6. How well aligned are your current teaching materials with the CCSS required materials?
Teacher A	"The materials are well aligned."

Teacher B	"Materials are aligned with our state standards and help student with the overall academics."
Teacher C	"Every student can benefit from this type of lesson. These lessons specifically focus on building effective communicators and students that can think and answer questions. It gives students a chance to think about what they are learning."
Teacher D	"The common core standards can be met with these students because we're really pushing them to be the best students by providing so many scaffolds for them to be best prepared."

Interview Results for RQ3

The ELD lessons and materials aligned with the CCSS. The ELD standards and the progression of language identified in three stages. Those stages of proficiency were key factors of language acquisition. The ELD Standards document was a tool used by teachers to make informed decisions. The expectations within each proficiency level were the descriptive factors used by teachers to determine how successful students were. All teachers felt the material aligned with CCSS. Two of the four teachers felt the teaching materials were very well aligned, while the other two teachers felt the material to be aligned, they also thought that any student, outside of ELLs, could benefit from ELD instruction. For example, Teacher A said, "the materials are well aligned." The benefits of academic conversation and student collaboration during ELD instruction provides skills and strategies that all students could use. In addition, Teacher B stated, "Materials are aligned with our state standards and help students with their overall academics." Teachers C and D replied to this question noting, "Every student can benefit from this type of lesson, regardless if they are EO or ELL. These lessons specifically focused on

building effective communicators and students that can think and answer questions." (Teacher C) and "The common core standards can be met with these students because we are really pushing them to be the best students by providing so many scaffolds for them to be best prepared" (Teacher D). Table 10 presented the responses to interview question six.

Table 12 RQ 3 Results

Interview Question 8: Results

	IQ 8. How would you change the time block(s) if you could?
Teacher A	"I think there is a lot of new material for students and teachers and some of the lessons can take much longer than you initially plan for."
Teacher B	"I think I would change the fast pace of the lessons. Some parts of lessons can take longer to teach your class. I would need more time to reteach and make sure my students understand what they are learning."
Teacher C	"Add more time to allow time to cover all material in depth."
Teacher D	"The pacing can work for students and some teachers, but I would prefer to add more time to present these lessons so that I can feel confident students are getting the most out of the lessons."

Interview Results RQ3

All teachers noted that they would prefer more time to continue instruction as they feel that, currently, they do not have enough time due to the fast pace of instruction. For example, Teacher C said, "Add more time to allow time to cover all materials in

depth." Teachers A, B, and D expounded on this matter a bit more and stated, "I think there is a lot of new material for students and teachers and some of the lessons can take much longer than you initially plan for" (Teacher A), "I think I would change the fast pace of the lessons. Some parts of lessons can take longer to teach your class. I would need more time to reteach and make sure my students understand what they are learning before moving to the next component" (Teacher B). And "The pacing can work for the students and some teachers, but I would prefer to add more time to present these lessons so that I can feel confident students are getting the most out of the lessons. It is better to dig deep and gain understanding than to just go through lessons on the surface without building foundational skills" (Teacher D). The consensus among teachers reflected the need for additional time to focus on the needs of their students. Table 11 presented the answers to interview question eight.

Observation Results *RQ3*

Theme 4. Differentiation

The fourth theme was best determined through teacher observations and participants' actions during instruction. I was able to note this commonality and used it as a recurring theme. This theme aligns to RQ3, which asks what the driving factors are that determine how a teacher best supports ELL students in the classroom. Every teacher prepared differentiated lessons to present instruction to students at all levels to ensure academic understanding. Teacher A used a variety of tools such as, anchor charts,

conversation posters, sentence stems, and table tents to present instructional material to her students. Teacher A moved students into small groups during her time block to allow students to work with each other. She paired high performing students with low performing students to allow student engagement and enrichment, while monitoring students' participation in an activity using these various tools. With each student working with one another, Teacher A observed low performing students receiving help and guidance from high performing students while also stepping in to provide guidance regarding their activity. Teachers provided a variety of scaffolds in each lesson to ensure student understanding.

Teacher B employed differentiated instruction via group discussions, partnered exercises, and making constructive conversation posters of their own. All the while students had anchor charts and posters as a guide to refer to as needed. Teacher C followed up the lesson with enrichment activities that allowed students to work on creating their own visual scripts. Teacher D used games to differentiate the instruction that she delivered to her students. She utilized the Constructive Conversation Game. She stated that, "The teacher uses this [game] to assess how well the students used the specific language of the skill. The skill the students were working on earlier in the lesson was CREATE." Teachers were able to modify or enrich the activities based on how well students understood the lesson for the day. Students in need of reteach or additional practice worked in a teacher led group while other students collaborated to practice the

skill of the day. The focus on the lesson was academic conversation to build language skills for ELD students. The students referred to the academic conversation posters on the board to guide the questions during their conversations. Students had prompt starters and response starters to guide the conversations.

Summary

The interviews revealed the common theme of concern, which was planning time. Teachers wanted to be successful in the classroom but loss of planning time with a new curriculum was the top concern. The teachers felt they needed the most amount of time to plan effectively, they feared lost planning time had an impact on student progress. Teachers felt the structure, materials, and training for the ELD lessons were effective but modified at times. The teachers also agreed that the lessons were beneficial to the students and that students were engaged in their activities. The next section, Section 3, presents the project results of the study data.

Section 3: The Project

Introduction

This section will present an overview of the project study and the rationale that supports it. I will present the results within a 3-Day PD for this school site. The purpose of this project study was to identify how teachers provided academic instruction to support ELLs. I was able to explore and collect data to gain insight as to how the ELL teachers actualized the ELD curriculum provided to teachers as a guide to support instruction. Vygotsky (1978) stated a child learns best when he interacts with others in his environment to help him solve problems. Teachers and students become the active participants within the learning process. The teacher take initiative as the leader and gradually the child begins to require less guidance from the teacher. Eventually the child requires less scaffolds and become a self -directed learner. This development stems from social and internal interactions. My objective was to provide evidence of how teachers prepared ELLs. I utilized a narrative of the interviews and observations and based on those responses the following four themes emerged from the data analysis: (a) classroom environment, (b) curriculum content, (c) academic language, and (d) differentiation. The PD will provide research-based instructional strategies and methods that can be used to support and improve active engagement of ELLs in learning language and increasing student achievement. Teachers' instructional methods are the most effective factors in language acquisition and academic proficiency (Arghode, 2013; Freeman, 2017;

Maftoon, &Sarem, 2012). Teachers will identify their students' needs and plan how incorporate strategies, methods, and skills into the ELD lessons.

I used the qualitative analysis to generate a PD program for ELL teachers. This 3-day PD would provide teachers with collaboration time to help establish a sense of community and partnership among teachers. In a review of the literature, I focused on a PD as a way to support ELL teachers. Teachers can receive clarification on their current methods used during ELD instruction as well as how to move forward in providing the most meaningful student instruction to close the existing achievement gap between ELLs and non-ELL students. Shokouhi, Moghimi, and Hosseinzadeh (2015) stated that using PDs and PLCs help teachers to reflect on their knowledge and teaching practice from a sociocultural perspective.

Included in this section is a discussion of implementation of the PD, data analysis, and literature review. The collected data resulted in a PD plan designed to support the need of educators at the local school site. The section also included discussion of how the project affects the school, local community, and the district as a whole. I conclude this section with the project evaluation and discussion of implications for social change.

Description and Goals

Description of the Professional Development Program

The professional development plan (Appendix A) aligned to support and enhance ELD instruction. Section 2 highlighted the concern that teachers were having with the

implementation of a new ELD curriculum. This new curriculum was extensive and required planning time to teach effectively. Teachers were using a new curriculum to support ELD instruction. Teachers felt that the ongoing support would be beneficial for new/and or struggling teachers who seek ongoing ELL instructional support. The teachers' concerns were that the new implementation the district provided for ELL teachers is much more rigorous than what the students in the ELD classrooms can do. Teachers need additional scaffolds, accommodations, and modifications within their instruction to support ELL students. Burke, Morita-Mullaney, and Singh (2016), suggested that teachers and administrators look closely at testing accommodations and decide which are most appropriate for each student at varying English proficiency levels to make choices based on individual levels.

Teachers need time to reflect on their practice and approach, implementing a PD specific to an area of concern allows for teacher learning and growth. Elfers and Stritikus (2014) found that there is a need to find the link between leadership practices and the achievement of English learners. This recent shift in both scholarship and practice focuses on a learning-centered leadership that is imperative for the success of English learners.

Goal of the Professional Development Program

My goals for the project were to provide teachers with more training and opportunities to collaborate to enhance their ELD lessons and share best practices. The

PD is an important part of teacher preparedness. All teachers in this study responded as having inadequate preparation during PDs or PLCs. Researchers support that professional development for teachers not only improves their classroom instruction through increased knowledge, but also through the use of research-based pedagogy practices, collaboration and self-confidence (Dixon et al., 2014; Krasnoff & Education Northwest, 2015; Lin et al., 2015).

The time and activities were allocated so that teachers could improve instruction, create detailed lessons, and plan for and discuss differentiation based on what the teachers have observed in their classrooms. The key factors that contributed to the creation of this PD was determined based on the participants' responses.

Rationale

I collected data via interviews and observations to gain more insight as to how the teachers actualized the ELL curriculum. My objective was to provide evidence of how teachers prepared the ELL student population. The significance of this research was to present the findings and see where teachers can differentiate instruction to continue to develop effective practices and improve their current success with ELLs. Teachers reported feeling that the lack of time to work together has an impact on student performance. Cellante and Donne (2013) found that low levels of achievement among ELLs leave teachers with a feeling of not succeeding or providing quality instruction.

Data analysis provided the insight to recognize various approaches in teaching ELL students and the instructional outcomes.

The teachers in this study felt the need for more opportunities to collaborate and plan strategies. This meant a gap existed for teacher preparedness in planning for ELD instruction. A 3-Day PD plan was developed, based on the data results. This plan would provide strategies, tools, and a skillsets to foster growth in ELD instruction for educators at the target school. Moving forward, 3-day PD would provide these teachers with a professional learning community to improve their teaching practices. An ongoing format to share effective strategies on how to provide the best opportunity for students to use academic language during the ELD instruction.

Review of the Literature

In the literature review, I identified factors most influential in promoting student achievement and successful ELL instructional practices. The following topics and keywords were used: English Language Learners, Effective strategies for ELLs, English Language Development, SDAIE, Billings-Ladson, and Vygotsky. I used several databases to gather materials for the literature review: SAGE, ProQuest Central, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), and Google Scholar.

The PD project provided teachers with an opportunity to collaborate for planning to support ELD instruction. This support leads to more confident, prepared teachers. The

design for the PD was to benefit both teachers and students as well as for ELL teachers to review/revise current instructional practices.

Not only are ELLs performing below grade level in language-related instruction, but they also show notable gaps in core subject areas due to these high language demands (Alt, Arizmendi, Beal, & Hurtado, 2013). Students need interactions and multiple opportunities to practice language throughout the school day. ELLs require a high level of English proficiency to perform daily tasks. Most ELLs do not have English language comprehension to complete academic tasks. Finding the most effective tools and strategies to promote academic language usage and skills is necessary.

The teachers' responses to interviews revealed collaboration and additional strategies as the greatest area of concern and need to accommodate ELL learners. The more experience a teacher has improves her or his confidence and ability to teach a lesson. Mastery experiences affect teachers' perceptions and classroom environments; school setting can serve as a social influence for new teachers to facilitate teachers' competence, identity, and ability to positively affect student learning (Parkison, 2008; Woolfolk Hoy, 2000). Schools must create support tools and utilize language resources to help teachers better provide for their linguistically diverse student population.

The implementation of the PD was to better prepare and serve teachers through collaboration and planning, key factors affecting student success. Teachers who feel frustrated and inundated share a sense of insecurity when providing lessons to their

students. Teachers with sufficient planning, training, and collaboration feel more confident, thus providing effective lessons. Dixon, Yssel, McConnell, and Hardin (2014) found that teachers who have had PD for differentiated instruction for ESL classes were better prepared, provided effective instruction, and had the confidence to teach their students. Teachers who had the time to collaborate and plan felt confident; thus, students benefited from these planning times. Classroom instruction improves through practice, planning, and implementation. The quality of instruction improves with PDs for teachers as that they can learn to allocate instructional time effectively when teaching ELLs to promote academic English proficiency. PD are a necessary part of a teacher's training and support system to build teacher competency (Tong, Irby, Lara-Aleciom Yoon & Mathes, 2010).

Professional Training

Teachers need specialized training for specialized instruction. Research supported this proposition: teachers who do not receive specialized training for their work with ELLs are not well prepared to meet the needs of these children (Ballantyne et al., 2008). Teachers that have confidence feel prepared because they have had training, PDs, and understood their role as a teacher. This PD will provide participants time to collaborate, reflect, and provide time for collaboration with colleagues. As stated by Song (2016) lessons from valuable professional development opportunities also lead to the importance of practicality of information in teacher learning. This will give participants more

opportunities to increase their own level of understanding as it pertains to each teacher and their level of student differentiation in the classroom.

By presenting the findings and reviewing the needs for teachers, teachers can now access this PD to plan, adjust, or modify their ELL instruction. Moghimi, and Hosseinzadeh (2015) suggested the use of PDs along with PLCs as PLCs have been found to help teachers reflect on their knowledge and teaching practice from a sociocultural perspective. The end goal is for teachers to develop strategies that would benefit their ELL students to improve their academic performance. Planning lessons involved recognizing many aspects of students' cognitive levels. Given the shortage of teacher capacity to meet the needs of English learners, the role of the principal must shift to a focus on learning, instruction, and the support of inclusive practices that address the needs of English learners (Elfers & Stritikus, 2014).

Instructional Strategies

The data from the project study showed teachers were receiving PLCs, however the collaboration time needs to be improved. Meeting time must be used identify strategies and instructional goals to plan for supportive student outcomes. Teachers must also differentiate and plan based on their students' needs. In an effort to meet the needs of ELLs in California, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing mandated that all instructors receive specialized training on how to teach ELLs (Johnson & Wells, 2017). Teachers must spend much time planning, organizing, and assessing the needs of

students. ELL students must not only acquire the language but also standards that taught simultaneously.

Educational experts believe the strongest educators to teach discipline-specific and/or academic English are ELL teachers (Echevarría, Vogt, and Short 2013). Teachers need to stay current on the most effective teaching methods. Professional Development provides teachers with these opportunities to get accurate current methods, planning, lessons, and strategies that target the needs of their students, especially ELL students. The ACT-ESL model designed based on effective PD practices (Lieberman and Miller, 1999). Lieberman and Miller (1999) indicated key conditions to help teachers change are: (a) understanding the theory or reason for change, (b) observing the demonstration of the changed practice in a real classroom, (c) taking time to practice in an environment where risk-taking is supported, and (d) receiving feedback and coaching from colleagues.

ELL Annual Training Review

Teaching methods must be current and based on the needs of your ELL students. Research continues to support the belief that an affective ELL teacher will carry similar traits and characteristics of any teacher with good teaching practice (Goldberg, 2013). Teachers want their students to be successful. A general education teacher provides support to students based on their needs. An ELL teacher will accommodate the teaching practice to serve the needs of the ELL students. English Language Learners (ELLs) are the fastest growing student population in United States (US) public schools (National

Center for Educational Statistics, 2015) therefore the need for teachers with experience or knowledge to teach ELLs has never been greater (de Jong, Harper & Coady, 2013).

ELL teachers need service and training on how to meet the needs of ELL students. Researchers Collins and Liang (2015) pointed out ELL teachers' needs for professional development can be more complex because of the cultural and educational background differences between teacher and student. According to the U.S. Department of Education, the percentage of English language learners (ELLs) among public school students in the United States in 2010–2011 was higher (10%, about 4.7 million students) than in 2002–2003 (9%, about 4.1 million students; National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2013). As the ELL student population continues to increase, the relevance of qualified teachers in high ELL schools was an important factor in the school's academic success. Roy-Campbell (2012) noted that content teachers would be ones trained to teach ELL students, given their high accountability in documenting student progress.

ELL PD Trainings

Many school districts have begun requiring PD for their content area teachers to help the teachers make appropriate instructional accommodations for the increasing number of ELLs in their classes (Berube, 2000). Many schools need more opportunities to provide and train teachers' affective ELL strategies. Researchers continue to evaluate and study quality instruction; and how this can empower ELL achievement (Slavin et

al. 2011; Cheung and Slavin, 2012). The research continues to look more closely at how academic success of grade levels is key for ELLs. Researchers Tong et al. (2014) found that second and third grade levels were foundational for building academic English, as this is when students transition from learning to read to reading to learn.

As the ELL student population continues to increase, school districts must provide teachers professional development for teachers to be adequately prepared. The research on ESOL teacher preparation stated teacher candidates need an understanding of ways to supplement and modify written and oral forms of the English language (Banks, Cochran-Smith, Moll, Richert, Zeichner, LePage & McDonald, 2005; Coady, et al., 2011; de Jong, et al., 2013; Lucas et al., 2008). Funding for professional development time (modeled lessons, observation, teacher collaboration, and peer coaching) was an effective method to use with teacher preparedness (Kim et al.2014). School districts must provide Professional Development for ELL teachers. Palmer and Martinez (2013) stated educators must become better prepared and face their own deficit to address the needs of the ELL student population.

Teachers needed to be open and ready to take this on. Studies have shown the impact appropriate training had on teachers who worked with ELL students (Fitts and Gross, 2012). Teachers that lack training will not provide the most effective successful teaching practices to the ELL student population, thus providing a disservice to these students. Insubstantial training is one reason there are few teachers in many schools

feeling prepared in teaching in an ESL classroom (Cirocki et al. 2014). School districts need to implement opportunities for learning communities addressing the needs of the teachers. NCLB's Title III funds support public schools' ESOL programs but despite the attempts aimed at reforming ESOL education, the research indicated ELLs have not made grade level expectations therefore teachers are underprepared to teach ESOL instruction (NCES, 2015; USDOE, 2015).

If not enough professional development is specific to the needs of the school site, both teachers and students would miss out of learning opportunities. Lee and Buxton (2013) pointed out collective participation specific to individual schools works best to develop a plan that meets common needs. Common goals, an exchange of effective teaching practice, strategies, and lesson planning can be grade level specific.

PD is effective in providing teachers with the tools they need to provide best practices in the classroom. As stated by Gandara and Santivanez (2016), one of the most effective ways to improve instruction for English language learners may be to provide the time for teachers to observe lessons, collaboratively plan, and support from coaches. The framework that aligned well with this project was based on how teachers, adult learners learn. The theories I used reflected collaboration as a key element of success in teacher training and preparedness.

Project Description

Implementation

From the results of this study and its findings, a professional development plan was developed. The findings from the one-on-one interviews supports the need for more teacher planning time to be most effective in teaching ELL students. This allocated time would provide teachers with an opportunity to explore various strategies and instructional strategies through collaborative efforts. This is one option as a way to enhance their teaching practice. The objective for this professional development (PD) is to be presented to administrators, the instructional coaches, and teaching staff that work with ELL teachers. The goal for the PD is to give teachers support time to share high-quality best practices for instructional strategies, in any setting, and with any cohort of students.

The common barrier amongst teachers is a teacher collaboration component. There are lesson guides, anchor charts, and posters that are available and used during ELL lessons. These existing supports do not meet the differential needs of many ELL students. Meaningful teacher interaction during PDs is used to review how to foster academic student interactions and provide a clearer understanding for instruction. A solution to supporting these teachers is to discuss how to best use cohesive texts and review of additional resources (visual texts, sample writings, scaffolds) helping to directly support content learning and encourage more students to participate. Teachers will share lesson plan ideas and successful strategies or areas of concern or weakness that

needs to exploration. The sessions will have specific objectives and goals. There will be a power point presentation to guide the professional learning. Teachers will work on independent activities to address greatest areas of concerns and strengths. Teaches will take the time to recognize the lesson format and review how to meet the objective to these lessons. Teachers will work together to plan lessons based on various student ELL levels.

Teachers will have a copy of the power point presentation and refer back to it as needed as an additional resource. The researcher and the power point presentation created the agenda. One of the requirements is the ability to access the internet to access the online presentation and write lesson plans through a word document or with google drive.

A potential barrier to this PD is that teachers will not feel comfortable sharing in the discussion when participating. If there is no administrative mandate or incentive to participate in this PD, teaches would solely participate because of need or interest.
A solution to the participate would be to have the PD set as a mandated meeting so that participants would plan ahead if they are aware that this is part of their regular PLC duties, at the start of a school year. I would request the principal provide the agenda prior to the day of the PD so that teachers are aware of what is on the agenda for the meeting day. The process for the PD takes place after the initial proposal for the professional development, then is reviewed and presented by the principal of the local school site. The PD was to include three days for teachers, coaches, and administration to collaborate

and provide an effective implementation of teacher preparedness for ELL instruction (See Appendix A).

The goal is for ELL teachers to get more planning time to better develop strategies, lesson plans, and assessments with emphasis on teacher/student success.

Project Evaluation Plan

The success of this PD depended on how well the teachers implemented the plan. For this PD to be most beneficial, the teachers must be willing to use the three-day PD to learn and align it with their current instructional practice. Cellante and Donne (2013) and Peterson (2016) continued to elaborate on the purpose of a program evaluation is to provide "timely and constructive" information used to make decisions regarding the program that's evaluated. This PD is an out-come based evaluation. The purpose of the PD is to help teachers achieve their aims. The request of the audience was to gain more planning time to fulfill their best instructional practices to meet learners' needs. Teachers collaborate and plan instruction then it take back to the classroom. The indicators or evaluation goal would be the success rate of this PD. As an outcomes-based evaluation will focus on the effectiveness of the PD. The short evaluation given to participants to complete will identify whether, if any, additional changes need to occur.

Part of growing as an educator is to attend workshops and training to stay engaged, current, and aware of the current teaching practices. The outcome of the project developments depended on the teacher implementation. The local school site, teachers,

and students may benefit from using this type of plan. Teachers share an opportunity for professional learning and collaboration to become experts in their content areas.

Project Implications Including Social Change

Local Stakeholders

Providing teachers an opportunity to collaborate and learn best practices will better prepare and motivate teachers. This study provided an account of one school within a large district that sought to provide the best ELL instruction. The information gained within this study could improve professional development for ELL teachers with specific strategies and practicum in place. Lesson planning and teacher collaboration would provide the teachers with more knowledge thus giving students a more improved educational foundation.

Larger Context

This research study provided an insight as to what the needs for ELL teachers were at this school. The Professional Development plan may align with other schools within the district. Professional Development implementation of support for ELL teachers is necessary in many districts, not just at the local site. A long term implication for this study is the ELL PD that teachers received was content specific, relevant and, if followed, will lead to a change in practice (King, 2014; Molle, Short, 2013; Tait-McCutcheon & Drake, 2016). It is important to share the teachers' needs and find solutions to accommodate those needs.

Conclusion

In Section 4, I address the PD plan and literature review. The study sought to provide teachers most current research based strategies, resources, collaboration time, and training to improve teacher practice to promote student success. This study serve as an exemplar to bring more awareness for ELL instruction to support student improvement. Attention rests on the implementation of various instructional approaches to promote success for all and implications for social change. The next section will address any reflections and conclusion.

Section 4: Reflections and Conclusions

Project Strengths and Limitations

The purpose of the study was to gain an understanding about ELL instruction for ELLs in a California school district. I gathered the qualitative data from interviews and observations of four teachers in Grades 1-3. Each teacher had a range of ELLs consisting of ELD Levels 1-3 in her classroom, and the average student-to-teacher ratio was 22:1. The teachers were all certified ELL teachers in one elementary school with a high ELL population. The selected participants fit the descriptors needed as part of the qualitative study.

The proposed 3-day PD in-service (see Appendix A) based on findings, addresses the concerns ELL teachers had about having the time to implement lessons effectively. Section 4 completes the project, and includes my reflections on the process of developing the professional development project. This section contains reflections on the project's strengths, limitations, and recommendations for alternative approaches. The section also contains discussion of what I learned in terms of being a scholar, a project developer, and practitioner.

Project Strengths

The strength of this PD in-service stems from the methodology. Teachers had the opportunity to voice their concerns and identify areas in which they felt inadequately supported in order to develop a targeted PD. The collected data resulted from interviews

and observations. The teacher observations provided strong evidence of what teachers need, lack, or excel in. Although the teachers received district training for ELD instruction, they felt they needed more planning time to provide the most effective and consistent ELD lessons for their students. A qualitative approach was appropriate because it allowed me to provide teachers with professional development recommendations based on their needs. The 3-day PD design provided ELL teachers the time and opportunity to collaborate and observe one another regarding effective and consistent ELD lessons for their students.

Project Limitations

One of the limitations of this project study is the small sample population. I would like to have more schools within the districts as well as other school district in California participate to determine what the ELL teachers' needs resemble on a larger scale.

The members for this PD will be ELL teachers, only some of whom participated in this study. It is ideal for teachers to be open to collaboration and the benefits of a PD. This PD will be presented as a requirement for all ELL teachers at the school site. A second limitation is that this school district has a high ELL student population with many strategies already in place. Not all teachers may feel the need to collaborate with teachers and share additional strategies. The PD supports ELLS as an additional training and resource to share strategies and planning time to better support the diverse learning population. The third limitation is that many schools have PDs in place to support ELL

instruction. However, many school districts do not have specific ELL PDs that focus on the needs and support of the onsite teachers. Most of the ELL PDs are the same for all schools; not based on specific individual school or student needs. These needs vary based on each school; therefore, trying to create a PD that meets the needs of teachers within a specific school seemed most practical and beneficial.

Recommendations for Alternative Approaches

An alternative approach for a PD would be to have all teachers take part in PD. Teachers who have not taught ELL students would have an opportunity to collaborate and be more aware of the academic needs of these students. One recommendation moving forward would be to choose a sample of participants with a smaller ELL support system in place at the school site. The results of this type of research study may differ in teachers' needs.

Scholarship, Project Development, Evaluation, and Leadership and Change

Scholarship

I have been passionate about teaching ELL students since my start in education in 2000. I have learned many strategies to support students but continued to seek more opportunities to become a better teacher. I become motivated to learn the most current techniques and research based strategies. Self-reflection is an important part of a learning process, I reflected on my current practice as this provided me with an opportunity to critique, justify, and grow as an individual and professional. I have written proposals and

created professional development for staff, I have never completed such a huge undertaking as this study. I chose this study because I had an interest as an educator and have always tried to provide students with successful strategies, open minds, and a willingness to thrive. I was interested in learning about the challenges and successes other teachers have in working with ELLs. I had to see ELL instruction as a bystander so that I could view the current issues from a scholarly point of view and then seek to identify the needs of others.

As a scholar, one must stay current, continue to practice, and collaborate with colleagues. A review of literature allowed me to stay current on ELL instructional practices and in tune with the latest research to support ELL students and teachers. I can and continue to provide equitable opportunities for students so that they can reach their potential.

Project Development and Evaluation

The design of the project development resulted from the information collected in the qualitative study. I reviewed professional journals, leadership articles, and ELL instructional practice guides to implement the PD. The goal of the PD was to provide teachers with an opportunity to plan and organize their ELD instruction so that they felt more prepared and confident when providing ELD lessons to their classes. The findings supported a project for a specific school but may also be used for other ELL teachers, schools, and districts with an ELL student population. The research based instructional

strategies benefit ELL teachers. The PD reflected input from research findings, allowing teachers to share best practices with ELL instruction, and therefore was an appropriate genre for this project. This research gave me an opportunity to see how teacher input can determine what type of PD to create for teachers. I was able to learn what teachers were doing during instruction and how they felt about the presentation of their lessons. In turn, the data collection allowed teachers to share their approaches, concerns, and accomplishments in their current level of teaching.

Leadership and Change

A leader is one who others value and believe in. If you are passionate about your idea and have a clear vision, then change will follow. Great leaders are those who build community. In creating this PD, I have more understanding of how to adjust and reflect on my own teaching practice. I am a better teacher, colleague, and leader. I now have a clear vision of what good leadership looks like. My doctoral degree has meaning and relevance. I am focused and aware of what it takes to succeed. I understand how to create a meaningful plan and follow through. I was able to create a PD which targets the needs of ELL teachers. I had to become proactive while maintaining a culture of professionalism. I maintained a desire to succeed and found an approach to learning that works for me. An educator needs to be willing and have an open mind to accept new ideas, strategies, and approaches in learning. I have learned how to become more collaborative and follow best practices to succeed.

I have learned how to create a PD that will support many schools, directly impact students and teachers at the study site, while also being culturally relevant to all stakeholders.

I am growing as an individual. I have joined a team of educators who are working collaboratively to provide best practices approaches for the 21st Century classroom. The goal is to support teacher performance and increase student achievement.

Analysis of Self as a Scholar

This journey gave me confidence in feeling as though I am making a difference. I have a deeper understanding of issues faced by teachers. The opportunity to research topics has given me more value as an educator. I am aware of issues affecting our future in education. I can now provide analysis and appreciate the effort involved in educational research. I share evidenced-based research to colleagues, provide learning opportunities for students, and bring academic conversations to students on a daily basis. I now have an understanding of qualitative and quantitative data. I am more aware of cultural relevance and the importance of equitable instruction for all students.

Analysis of Self as Practitioner

I have been an educator for many years. The passion for teaching continues. The shift to more personalized learning in the classroom provides the need to continue to stay current on research practices. I use my experiences, research, and best practices with everyday applications in my teaching experiences. My personal growth has given me an

opportunity to share my experiences with others through collaboration, facilitation, and research. I now have the confidence to share the knowledge I have with others and I am able to provide strategies, research, and examples when asked about ELL instruction. I will continue to conduct research, apply new concepts, and work to promote success for all students.

Analysis of Self as Project Developer

My passion to help teach and provide students with opportunity led me to this project study. I have spent much time trying to create effective lessons and strategies for my students. The PD plan was a way to provide teachers with the opportunity to collaborate and share their needs, successes, and reflections. The proposed project was created based on the findings of the study. This project provides teachers with time to collaborate and share ELL instructional practices. The benefits for teachers' instructional practices are limitless as the opportunities to collaborate and share resources, create a network of skills and strategies, and gain knowledge to promote student success. This PD allows teachers to see the value of who they are as educators and to help build a stronger learning community.

Reflection on Importance of the Work

This work was important because I wanted to acknowledge the desire for teachers to have the tools to teach ELLs. I provided and created a PD for teachers in a professional

learning community to collaborate and plan how to best implement lessons and provide the most effective ELL teaching strategies.

I had to learn effective ELL strategies myself. Learning about theorists, philosophies, and various studies set the tone for learning and moving into a new direction. This journey provided the pathway to pursue my degree. The PD meets the needs of what these teachers asked for. The goal of the PD is to provide teachers an opportunity to provide support and implement a crucial component for ELL instruction. I learned that teachers continue to strive to make the best choices for their students and are committed to providing quality lessons. As an advocate to provide equity and equality in the classroom, I would like to see educators working to ensure ELL students are receiving the services, support, and education they are entitled to receive.

Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research

This study focused on how teachers of English language learner (ELL) students provided instruction during designated English Language Development (ELD) time to serve ELL students. Locally, this qualitative study generated the knowledge to provide educators with targeted professional development to improve instructional practice to ensure an ongoing increase of student growth, as these students continue to struggle with learning academic language and instruction. The empirical implication of developing professional development material through interviews with teachers was to gain a strong sense from teachers themselves of what they actually needed to teach more effectively. In

this way, the study was able to provide information to teachers with targeted development of teaching strategies and approaches to take into the classroom to support the needs of their students. It was important that teachers communicate with their colleagues and continue to share best practices. In addition, teachers within many school districts will have opportunities through training to increase knowledge and student academic outcomes.

This study can provide a positive impact as ELL professional development is specific to content, academics, and relevant to teachers, and in doing so lead to a change in practice (King, 2014; Moll, Short, 2013; Tait-McCutcheon & Drake, 2016). School districts must be aware of their student needs and teacher preparedness. The work of a teacher is socially meaningful, the vulnerabilities and daily challenges must embrace the skills of change.

Change allows teachers to reach student potential. A growth mindset seeks ideas for influencing change and taking initiative to stay committed to improve program innovation. The PD will provide additional strategies, resources, and skills to use in the classroom to support ELL student learning. This PD can improve ELL instruction by providing strategies and resources for ELLs so they can develop their language skills and academic language.

The positive social change implications included knowledge useful for educators, principals, school districts, and researchers to provide the best teaching practices to make

any advancement. Also of note would be to explore to what degree the ELL students benefited from ELD instructional blocks compared to students who did have access to mandated ELD instruction. A future research path would be to observe how teachers use some of the same learning strategies for ELL students with their struggling readers, outside of the ELL student population. A fundamental aspect of that research would be to note how some of these techniques work with the non-ELL students that need support with academic language.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the completion of this research study has given me an opportunity to acknowledge the role of an educator and the impact it has on the ELL student population. Student success is in large affected by how well each teacher is prepared. A substantial amount of planning time is key in setting the tone for how well teachers will be prepared to teach students. The most recent data documents that the ELL student population continues to grow while falling behind in the achievement gap when compared to their English-speaking peers. The data does not address the challenges faced by teachers on a daily basis to provide the support to their ELL student population. The expectation is that teachers are prepared to teach a diverse student population. School districts presume quality ELL instruction regardless of teacher experience, confidence, knowledge, expertise level, or abilities.

The findings of the study revealed teachers perceive their planning time as insufficient. The results of this research project brings an awareness to the importance of planning time for teachers to explore, share, and identify how to produce academic success with ELL students within a school district. The study's purpose was to examine and then identify what teachers' instructional practices were and how to implement effective pedagogical strategies to enhance students' learning outcomes. The findings of the study revealed that teachers' perceived their instruction was insufficient. The 3-Day PD developed from the results of the study, would give teachers the training to present ELD lessons with confidence to support ELL students.

This research study allowed me analyze myself. I have had the opportunity to reflect on my research abilities as a scholar, practitioner, and program developer. I described implementation and possible positive results moving forward for both ELL teachers and students.

References

Alt, M., Arizmendi, G.D., Beal, C.R., & Hurtado, J. (2013). The effect of test translation on the performance of second grade English learners on the KeyMath-3. *Psychology in the Schools*, *50*(1), 27-36. doi.org10.1002/pits.21656

Babayiğit, S. (2015). The relations between word reading, oral language, and reading comprehension in children who speak English as a first (L1) and second language (L2): A multigroup structural analysis. *Reading and Writing*, *28*, 527–544. doi: 1007/s11145-014-9536-x

Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). *Teachingacademic content and literacy to English language learners in elementary and middle school* (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE). Retrieved from the NCEE website: http://ies.ed.gov/wwc/publicationsreviews.aspx.

Ballantyne, K.G., Sanderman, A.R., & Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learner students: Building teacher capacity*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/practice/mainstream_teachers.htm.

Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory.*Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4*(3), 359-373. doi:10.1521/jscp.1986.4.3.359

Bandura, A. (1995). Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies* (pp. 1-45). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511527692.003.

Batalova, J., Fix,M., & Murray, J. (2007). *Measures of change: The demography and literacy of adolescent English learners.* New York, NY: Migration Policy Institute, Carnegie Corporation. Retrieved from https://www.colorincolorado.org/research/measures-change-demography-and-literacy-adolescent-english-learners.

Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., & McDonald, M. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 232-274). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-5902

Baecher, L., Farnsworth, T., & Ediger, A. (2014). The challenges of planning language objectives in content-based ESL instruction. *Language Teaching Research, 18*(1), 118–36. doi: 1177/1362168813505381

Bell, C. C., Hilsmier, A. S., Finn, D. M., & Stone, G. A. (2014). The impact of response to intervention on minority and non-minority special education referrals in a K–5 setting. *Educational Collaborative, 4*(2), XX-YY.

Bennett, S. M., & Hart, S. M. (2014). Addressing the "shift": Preparing preservice secondary teachers for the Common Core. *Reading Horizons*, 53(4). Retrieved from https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/readinghorizons/vol53/ iss4/5

Berman, P., Chambers, J., Gandara, P., McLaughlin, B., Minicucci, C., Nelson, B. . . . Parrish, T. (1992). *Meeting the challenge of language diversity: An evaluation of programs for pupils with limited proficiency in English.* Berkeley, CA: BW Associates.

Berube, B. (2000). *Managing ESL programs in rural and small urban schools*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL International Association (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED462831)

Blackwell, J. R. (2013). Teaching strategies and practices that impact English language learners' vocabulary and language proficiency in reading *(Doctoral dissertation, Jones International University).* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED552833)

Bourdieu, P. (1973). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. Retrieved from language http://eric.ed.gov.

Boyd, F. B. (2013). Wading Through the Consequences of Policy Decisions. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 57(1), 12-15. doi:10.1002/JAAL.207

Bunch, G. C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*(1), 298-341. doi: 10.3102/0091732X12461772

California Department of Education. (1993a). A report on specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE). Sacramento, CA: Prepared by the work group of the Commission on Teacher Credential aligned and the California Department of Education. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/creds/english-learners-faq.

California Department of Education. (2012a). Data Quest English learner demographics. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/creds/english-learners-faq

htttp://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/page2.asp?level=State&subject=LC&submit1=Submit.

California Department of Education. (2012b). English language development standards implementation Website resource available http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/eldstandards.asp#Implementation

California Department of Education. (2013). 2012–13 Accountability Progress Reporting System. Retrieved from https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ay/documents/aypinfoguide13.pdf

California Department of Education. 2014. *DataQuest*. Sacramento: California Department of Education https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/eldstndspublication14.pdf

California Department of Education. (2009). English-language development standards for California public schools: Kindergarten through grade twelve. Retrieved from http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/documents/englangdevstnd.pdf

California Department of Education Educational Demographics Unit. (2009). Statewide English Learners by language and grade, 2007–08. Retrieved from http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/LEPbyLang1.

Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J.Passel, J., & Herwantoro, S. (2005). The new demography of America's schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act *Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.* doi 10.1037/e723122011-001

Cellante, D., & Donne, V. (2013). A program evaluation process to meet the needs of English language learners. *Education 134* (1). 1-8 doi: 10.5539/elt.v10n9p198s

Cirocki, A. 2013a. *Conducting Research in the EFL Classroom. Modern English Teacher, 22(1), 76–8*1.

Cirocki, A., Tennekoon, S., & Calvo, A. P. (2014). *Research and Reflective Practice in the ESL Classroom: Voices from Sri Lanka. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 39(4)*. doi:10.14221/ajte.2014v39n4.2

Coady, M., Harper, C., & de Jong, E. (2011). From preservice to practice: Mainstream elementary teacher beliefs of preparation and efficacy with English Language Learners in the state of Florida. Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the

National Association for Bilingual Education, 34(2): 223-239. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2011.597823

Collins, L. J., & Liang, X. (2014). Task Relevance in the Design of Online Professional Development for Teachers of ELLs: A Q Methodology Study. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *15*(3), 268-28. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1137401

Cook, H.G., Linquanti, R., Chinen, M., & Jung, H. (2012). *National Evaluation of Title III Implementation Supplemental Report: Exploring Approaches to Setting English Language Proficiency Performance Criteria and Monitoring English Learner Progress. Draft.* Retrieved from ERIC database.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2014). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory. *Sage publications.* doi: 10.4135/9781452230153.n2

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.). *Boston: Pearson.*

Ctc.ca.gov. (2018). English Learner Authorization. [online] Available at: https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/ela.

Daniel, S. M., & Conlin, L. (2015). Shifting attention back to students within the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol. *TESOL Quarterly*, *49*(1), 169-187. doi.org/10.1002/tesq.213

Davis, E., Sinclair, S., & Gschwend, L. (2015). A mentoring program drills down on the

Common Core. *Phi Delta Kappa,* 96(6), 59-64. doi.org/10.1177/0031721715575302

DeCapua, A., & Marshall, H. W. (2015). Promoting achievement for ELLs with limited or interrupted formal education: A culturally responsive approach. Principal Leadership, 75(6), 48-51. doi:10.1111/lnc3.12183

de Jong, E. J., Harper, C. A., & Coady, M. R. (2013). Enhanced knowledge and skills for elementary mainstream teachers of English language learners. Theory Into Practice, 52(2), 89-97. doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.770326

DeLozier,C.K. (2014). *A phenomenological investigation of instructional practices of general education teachers for English language learners* (Doctoral dissertation) Liberty University. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/847/

Department of Education. (2012). National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction National evaluation of Title III implementation supplemental report: Exploring approaches to setting English language proficiency performance criteria and monitoring English learner progress. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-iii/implementation-supplemental-report.pdfDiaz-.

Diaz-Rico, L. & Weed, Z. (2002). *The cross-cultural, language, and academic development handbook* (2nd ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

DiCerbo, P. A., Anstrom, K. A., Baker, L. L., & Rivera, C. (2014). A review of the literature on teaching academic English to English language learners. Review of Educational Research, 84(3), 446-482. doi.org/10.3102/0034654314532695

Dixon, F. A., Yssel, N., McConnell, J. M., & Hardin, T. (2014). Differentiated instruction, professional development, and teacher efficacy. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, *37*(2), 111-127. doi.org/10.1177/0162353214529042

Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Strachan, S. L., & Billman, A. K. (2011). Essential elements of fostering and teaching reading comprehension. In S. J. Samuels & A. E. Farstrup (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (4th ed., pp. 51-93). Newark, DE: International Reading Association. doi.org/10.1598/0829.03

Dutro, S., & Moran, C. (2001). Rethinking English language instruction: An architectural approach. In G. Garcia (Ed.), *Reaching the highest level of English literacy* (pp. 227–258). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Echevarria, J., Frey, N., & Fisher, D. (2015). What It Takes for English Learners to SUCCEED. *Educational Leadership*, *72*(6), 22-26.

Echevarria, J., Richards-Tutor, C., Canges, R., & Francis, D. (2011). Using the SIOP model to promote the acquisition of language and science concepts with English learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *34*(3), 334-351. doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2011.623600

Echevarria, J., & Short, D. (2010). Programs and practices for effective sheltered content instruction. In California Department of Education (Ed.), Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches. Sacramento, CA: CDE Press

Echeverria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. Educational Programs.

Educational Programs. (2011). The growing number of English learner students. *Washington, DC:* Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/9/growingLEP_0809.pdf.

Elfers, A. M., & Stritikus, T. (2014). How School and District Leaders Support Classroom Teachers' Work with English Language Learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *50*(2), 305–344. https://doi-org.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/10.1177/0013161X13492797

English, B. (2009). Who Is Responsible for Educating English Language Learners? Discursive construction of roles and responsibilities in an inquiry community. *Language and Education*, *23*(6), 487-507.

Etchegaray, J. M. (2013). Understanding Evidence-Based Research Methods: Confirmatory and Exploratory Analysis. *Health Environments Research & Design Journal (HERD).* doi.org/10.1177/193758671300600409

Farrell, T. S. (2008). Reflective Practice in the Professional Development of Teachers of Adult English Language Learners. CAELA Network Brief. *Center for Adult English Language Acquisition*.

Fathman, A. K., & Crowther, D. T. (2006). Science for English language learners: K–12 classroom strategies. *Arlington, VA: National Science Teachers Association.*

Fisher, D., &c Frey, N. (2014). Speaking and listening in content area learning. The Reading Teacher, 68(1), 64-69.

Fitts, S. & Gross, L. Teacher Candidates Learning From English Learners: Constructing Concepts of Language and Culture in Tuesday's Tutors After School Program. Teacher Education Quarterly, 39 (4) (2012), pp.75-95

Frey, N., Fisher, D., & Nelson, J. (2013). Todo tiene que ver con lo que se habla: It's all about the talk. Phi Delta Kappan, 94(6), 8–13. doi.org/10.1177/003172171309400603

Forehand, C. T. (2014). Print-Rich Classrooms: Support for English Language Learners. *Virginia English Journal*, *64*(2), 71-77.

Gándara, P., & Santibañez, L. (2016). The Teachers Our English Language Learners Need. *Educational Leadership*, *73*(5), 32-37.

Genzuk, M. (2011). Specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE) for language minority students. Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research Digital Papers Series. Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research, University

of Southern California. Retrieved from http://www.usc.edu/dept/education/CMMR/DigitalPapers/SDAIE_Genzuk.pdf.

Goldenberg, C. (2013). Unlocking the research on English learners: What we know—and don't yet know—about effective instruction. American Educator, 27(2), 4–13. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1014021.pdf

Goldenberg, C., & Coleman, R. (2010). *Promoting academic achievement among English learners: A guide to the research*. Corwin Press.

Gonzalez, M. M. (2016). Preparing Teacher Candidates for the Instruction of English Language Learners. *Networks: An Online Journal for Teacher Research*, *18*(2). Retrieved from https://ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1152320&site=eds-live&scope=site.

Gottlieb, M. & Ernst-Slavit, G. (2014). Academic language: A centerpiece for academic success in English language arts. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Great Schools Partnership. (2015, July 27). Student Subgroup Definition. Retrieved from https://www.edglossary.org/student-subgroup/.

Hakuta, K., Butler, Y.G., & Witt, D. (2000). How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency? *Santa Barbara, CA: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute.* Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/13w7m06g

Hamann, E. T., & Reeves, J. (2013). Interrupting the professional schism that allows less successful educational practices with ELL to persist. *Theory Into Practice*, (2), 81 doi: 10.1080/00405841.2013.770325

Haneda, M. & Wells, G. (2012). Some key pedagogic principles for helping ELLs to succeed in school. *Theory Into Practice*, 51 (4), 297-304. doi:10.1080/00405841.2012.726059

Hansen, L. E., Auproux, J., Brown, S., Giarretto, B., & Worthington, A. (2015). Using "Perfect Pairs" of Picture Books to Support English Learners' Academic Language. *California Reader*, *48*(4), 20-26National Center for Education Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2009/2010458.pdf

Harris, T. L., & Hodges, R. E. (Eds.). (1995). *The literacy dictionary: The vocabulary of reading and writing*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Haynes, J., & Zacarian, D. (2010). Teaching English language learners across the content areas. Alexandria, Va.: ASCD. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/109032/ chapters/Creating_an_ELL-Friendly_Learning_Environment.aspx

Herrell, A. & Jordan, M. (2008) *50 strategies for teaching English language learners* (2nd Ed.) Upper Saddle River, New Jersey. Pearson Custom Publishing.

Hill, L. (2012). California's English Language Learner Students. Public Policy Institute of California. Retrieved from http://www.ppic.org/main/publication

Hodge, E., & Benko, S. L. (2014). A common vision of instruction. An analysis of English/Language Arts professional development materials related to the Common Core State Standards. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *13*(1), 169-96. Retrieved from https://edlinked.soe.waikato.ac.nz/research/files/etpc/files/2014v13n1art10.pdf

Holm, J. & Kajander, A. (2015). Lessons learned about effective professional development: Two contrasting case studies. International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology, 3(4), 262- 274. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1077799.pdf

Howatt, A. & Widdowson, H. (2004). A history of English language teaching, New York, NY: *Oxford Publishing.*

Hutchinson, M. & Hadjioannou, X. (2011). Better serving the needs of limited English proficient (LEP) students in the mainstream classroom: examining the impact of an inquiry based hybrid professional development program. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 17(1), 91-113. doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2011.538499

Jimenez-Castellanos, O., & Topper, A. M. (2012). The Cost of Providing an Adequate Education to English Language Learners a Review of the Literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *82*(2), 179-232. doi.org/10.3102/0034654312449872

Jimenez-Silva, M., & Olson, K. (2012). The confidence to teach English language learners: Exploring course works' role in developing preservice teachers' efficacy. The Teacher Educator, 47(9), 9–28. doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2011.632471

Johnson, T., & Wells, L. (2017). English Language Learner Teacher Effectiveness and the Common Core. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *25*(23). doi.org/10.14507/epaa.25.2395

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 40 (1), 4-10 Retrieved from https://eds-b-ebscohost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=19&sid=ad81d9d8-9222-4bb3-a3c6-e8067146645b%40pdc-v-sessmgr03

Kareva,V..& Echevarria, J. (2013). Using the SIOP Model for effective content teaching with second and foreign language learners. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*. *1*(2), 239-248. doi:10.11114/jets.v1i2.173

Kanno, Y., & Varghese, M. M. (2010). Immigrant and Refugee ESL Students' Challenges to Accessing Four-Year College Education: From Language Policy to Educational Policy.*Journal Of Language, Identity & Education*, *9*(5), 310-328. doi:10.1080/15348458.2010.517693

Ketzior, M. (2004). Education Policy Brief: Teacher Professional Development. University of Delaware. *Education Research & Development Center Website*, 15.

Kim, Y., Erekson, J., Bunten, B. A., & Hinchey, P. (2014). Toward Sustainable Educational Changes through School-Based Professional Development on ELL Assessment for New Teachers. *Theory Into Practice*, *53*(3), 228-235. doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2014.916966

King, F. (2014). Evaluating the impact of teacher professional development: An evidence-based framework. *Professional Development in Education. 40*(1), 89-111. doi:10.1080/19415257.2013.823099.

Ladson-Billings, G. 1. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, *34*159-165. Retrieved from https://nationalequityproject.files.wordpress.com/2012/03/ladson-billings_1995.pdf

Lieberman, Ann, and Lynne Miller. 1999. *Teachers – transforming their World and their Work*. Williston: Teachers College Press.

Lin, S., Cheng, W., & Wu, M. (2015). Uncovering a connection between the teacher's professional development program and student's learning. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(23), 66 – 74. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1079018.pdf

Lee, O., & Buxton, C. A. (2013). Teacher Professional Development to Improve Science and Literacy Achievement of English Language Learners. *Theory Into Practice*, *52*(2), 110-117. doi:10.1080/00405841.2013.770328

Lee, S. (2012). New talk about ELL students. Kappan, 98(8), 66-69.

doi.org/10.1177/003172171209300816

Lewis, S., Lee, O., Santau, A. O., & Cone, N. (2010). Student initiatives in urban elementary science classrooms. School Science and Mathematics, 110(3), 160–172. doi:10.1111/j.1949- 8594.2010.00018.x

Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education preparing classroom teachers to teach English language Learners. Journal of Teacher Education, 59(4), 361-373.

Marietta, G., Brookover, E., & Foundation for Child, D. (2011). Effectively educating PreK-3rd English language learners (ELLs) in Montgomery county public schools. A FCD Case Study *Foundation for Child Development*.

Markos, A. (2012). Mandated to learn, guided to reflect: Pre-service teachers' evolving understanding of English language learners. Issues in Teacher Education, 21, 39-57. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ986815.pdf

Maxwell, G., & Beattie, R. (2004). The ethics of in-company research: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Maxwell, J. A. (2012). Qualitative research design: An interactive approach: An interactive approach (Vol. 41). *Sage Publications* McDonnell,

McDonell, L. M., & Weatherford, M. S. (2013). Evidence use and the Common Core State Standards movement: From problem definition to policy adoption. *American Journal of* Education, 120 (1), 1-25.

Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/673163

McLaughlin, M., &Vogt, M.E. (1996). Portfolios in teacher education. *Newark, DE: International Reading Association.*

Menken, K. (2013). Restrictive Language Education Policies and Emergent Bilingual Youth: A Perfect Storm with Imperfect Outcomes. *Theory Into Practice, 52*(3), 160 - 168. doi:10.1080/00405841.2013.804307

Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation (2nd ed.).* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Migdol, R. (2011. Stanford researcher launches national K–12 English language learning initiative. *Stanford Report*. Retrieved from http://news.stanford.edu

Miller, D. L. (1997). One Strategy for assessing the trustworthiness of Qualitative research: operationalizing the external audit.

Miller, J. M. (2018). U.S. history state assessments, discourse demands, and English Learners' achievement: Evidence for the importance of reading and writing instruction in U.S. history for English Learners. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, *42*, 375–392. https://doi-org.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2017.12.001

Molle, D. (2013). Facilitating professional development for teachers of English language learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *29*,197-207. doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.002

Montelongo, J. j., & Hernández, A. a. (2013). The teachers' choices cognate database for K-3 teachers of Latino English learners. Reading Teacher, 67(3), 187-192. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/TRTR.1194

Murphy, A. F., & Haller, E. (2015). Teachers' Perceptions of the Implementation of the Literacy Common Core State Standards for English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *29*(4), 510-527. oi.org/10.1080/02568543.2015.1073200

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2002). National assessment of educational progress, 2002, reading assessments. *Washington, D.C.*: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2002/2003521.pdf

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction. (2011). National evaluation of Title III implementation supplemental report: monitoring English learner progress. *Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Studies Service*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-iii/implementation-supplemental-report.pdf

Hansen, L. E., Auproux, J., Brown, S., Giarretto, B., & Worthington, A. (2015). Using "Perfect Pairs" of Picture Books to Support English Learners' Academic Language. *California Reader*, *48*(4), 20-26

Li, Nan. (2013). Seeking Best Practices and Meeting The Needs Of The English Language Learners: Using Second Language Theories And Integrating Technology In Teaching. Journal of International Education Research. Volume 9, Number 3. Retrieved from: http://www.cluteinstitute.com/journals/journal-of-international-educationresearch-jier/

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2017. *Promoting the Educational Success of Children and Youth Learning English: Promising Futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/24677.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Digest of education statistics. Retrieved from: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_204.20.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2011b). The nation's report card: Science 2009. *Washington, DC: Author*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2009/ 2011451.pdf

National Research Council. 2012. A framework for K-12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. *Washington, DC: National Academies Press.* doi.org/10.17226/13165

National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2013). English language learners. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicatorcgf.asp.

Nguyen, H. T., Benken, B. M., Hakim-Butt, K., & Zwiep, S. G. (2013). Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Faculty's Preparation of Prospective

Secondary Teacher Candidates for Instructing English Language Learners. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 25(3), 305-315. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1029138.pdf

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002).

Office of English Language Acquisition. (2015). Profiles of English learners (ELs). Washington, DC: Department of Education. ⟨http://www.ncela.us/files/fast_facts/OELA_FastFacts_ProfilesOfELs.pdf⟩.

Olsen, L. (2010). Changing course for Long Term English learners: new research sheds light on what happens to English learners over the years they spend in school, and what effective programs for Long Term English Learners look like. *Leadership*, (2). 30. Retrieved from http://www.ctdev.changeagentsproductions.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Olsen.pdf

Olson, L. (2010). Reparable harm: Fulfilling the unkept promise of educational opportunity for California's long-term English learners. *Long Beach, CA: Californians Together.* Retrieved from http://www.ctdev.changeagentsproductions.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/ReparableHarm2ndedition.pdf

Orosco, M. J., Abdulrahim, N. A. (2017). Culturally responsive professional development for one special education teacher of Latino English language learners with math learning disabilities. Insights on Learning Disabilities: From Prevailing Theories

to Validated Practices, 14(1), 73-95. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1165723.pdf

Ovando, C., Collier, V., & Combs, M. (2003*). Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching multicultural contexts* (3rd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Palmer, D., & Martinez, R. Teacher agency in bilingual spaces: A fresh look at preparing teachers to education bilingual Latino/a children Review of Research in Education, 37 (1) (2013), pp. 269-297. doi.org/10.3102/0091732X12463556

Pang, Y. (2013). Graphic organizers and other visual strategies to improve young ELLs' reading comprehension. *New England Reading Association Journal 48*(2), 52-58. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/134c/d571e3ad9b58aed313ec6dbb2e1d1d5cf8d5.pdf

Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative research*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F. (2008). Reading, writing, and learning in ESL: a resource book for teaching K12 English learners (5th ed.). *Boston, MA: Pearson*.

Peterson J.L., (2016). Formative evaluations in online classrooms. *Journal of Educators Online, 13*(1), 1-24

Ouirk, M., Beem, S. (2012). Examining the relations between reading fluency and reading comprehension for English language learners. *Psychology in the schools 49*(6), 539-553. doi.org/10.1002/pits.21616

Review of Educational Research. (2009). Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English language learners: Applying research to policy and practice for teacher effectiveness. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov

Reyes, A., & Garcia, A. (2014). Turnaround policy and practice: A case study of turning around a failing school with English-Language-Learners. The Urban Review, 46(3), 349-371. doi:10.1007/s11256-013-0261-6

Roa, M. (2012). English Language Learners in Arizona Public Schools: Challenges and Opportunities for Achieving Quality Language Development (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University).

Robinson-Cimpian, J. P., Thompson, K. D., & Umansky, I. M. (2016). Research and Policy Considerations for English Learner Equity. *Grantee Submission*, 3. Retrieved from https://ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED571280&site=eds-live&scope=site.

Roy-Campbell, Z. (2012). Meeting the Needs of English Learners. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy 56(3), 186–188. doi-org.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/10.1002/JAAL.00125

Santos, M. Darling-Hammond, L., & Cheuk, T. (2012). Teacher development to support English language learners in the context of common core state standards.

Retrieved from http://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academic-papers/10-Santos% 20LDH% 20Teacher% 20Development% 20FINAL.pdf

Saunders, W.,Goldenberg, C. & Marcelletti, D. (2013) English language development.*American Educator37*(2), 13-39. Retrieved from https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/periodicals/Saunders_Goldenberg_Marcelletti.pdf

Saxe, G., Gearhart, M., & Seltzer, M. (1999). Relations between classroom practices and student learning in the domain of fractions. Cognition and Instruction, 17, 1–24.

Schensul, S. L., Schensul, J. J., & LeCompte, M. D. (1999). *Essential ethnographic methods: Observations, interviews, and questionnaires* (Vol. 2). Rowman Altamira.

Shokouhi, M., Moghimi, S. A., & Hosseinzadeh, S. (2015). Introducing reflective practice from a social cultural perspective: Toward a strategically mediated reflective practice framework. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 2* (4), 74-83. Retrieved from www.jallr.

Short, D.J., Fidelman, C.G. & Louguit, M. (2012). Developing academic language in English language learners through sheltered instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, *46*(2), 334-361. doi:10.1002/tesq.20

Short, D., Boyson, B., & Coltrane, B. (2003). Final project report. First national conference for educators of newcomer students and pilot study on newcomer

program literacy and assessment practices. *Santa Cruz, CA & Washington, DC.* Center for Applied Linguistics.

Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to* 123 *acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners.* New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation and Alliance for Excellent Education.

Slavin, R. E., N. A. Madden, M. Calderon, A. Chamberlain, and M. Hennessy. (2011). "Reading and Language Outcomes of a Multiyear Randomized Evaluation of Transitional Bilingual Education." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 33: 47–58 doi:10.3102/0162373711398127

Smith, S. U. (2014). Frameworks Shaping an Online Professional Development Program for K–12 Teachers of ELLs: Toward Supporting the Sharing of Ideas for Empowering Classroom Teachers Online. *TESOL Journal*, *5*(3), 444. doi.org/10.1002/tesj.154

Song, K. H. (2016). Systematic Professional Development Training and Its Impact on Teachers' Attitudes Toward ELLs: SIOP and Guided Coaching. *TESOL Journal*, *7*(4), 767-799. doi.org/10.1002/tesj.240

Sparks, S. (2016, May 11). Teaching English-Language Learners: What Does the Research Tell Us?

Retrievedfrom https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2016/05/11/teaching-english-language-learners-what-does-the-research.html.doi:10.1002/tesj.24

Staehr Fenner, D., & Snyder, S. (2017). *Unlocking English learners' potential: Strategies for making content accessible.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Stille, S., & Cummins, J. (2013). Foundation for Learning: Engaging Plurilingual Students' Linguistic Repertoires in the Elementary Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 630-638. doi.org/10.1002/tesq.116

Taie, S., & Goldring, R. (2017). *Characteristics of public elementary and secondary school teachers in the united states: Results from the 2015–16 National Teacher and Principal Survey: First look* (NCES 2017-072). Washington, DC: U.S. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED575193.pdf

Tait-McCutcheon, S., & Drake, M. (2016). If the jacket fits: A metaphor for teacher professional learning and development. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 55, 1-12. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2015.12.005

Téllez, K., & Varghese, M. (2013). Teachers as intellectuals and advocates: Professional development for bilingual education teachers. Theory Into Practice, 52, 128–135. doi:10.1080/00405841.2013.770330

Téllez, K. & Waxman, H. C. (Eds.). (2006). Preparing Quality Educators for English Language Learners: Research, Policy, and Practice. *New York, NY: Routledge*.

Tomlinson, C.A., Moon, T. and Imbeau, M.B. (2015). Assessment and student success in a differentiated classroom, Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Retrieved from www.ascd.org/ACSD/pdf/siteASCD/publications/assessment-and-di-whitepaper.pdf

Tong, F., B. J. Irby, R. Lara-Alecio, and J. Koch. 2014. "A Longitudinal Study of Integrating Literacy and Science for Fifth Grade Hispanic Current and Former English Language Learners: From Learning to Read to Reading to Learn." *The Journal of Educational Research*107 (5): 410–426. doi:10.1080/00220671.2013.833072

Trickett, E. J., Rukhotskiy, E., Jeong, A., Genkova, A., Oberoi, A., Weinstein, T., & Delgado,Y. (2012). "The kids are terrific: It's the job that's tough": The ELL teacher role in an urban context. Teaching and Teacher Education, 28(2), 283-292.

Umansky, I. M. (2016). To be or not to be EL: An examination of the impact of classifying students as English learners. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 38, 714–737. doi.org/10.3102/0162373716664802

Umansky IM, Reardon SF, Hakuta K, et al. *Improving the Opportunities and Outcomes of California's Students Learning English: Findings from School District-University Collaborative Partnerships. Policy Brief 15-1*. Policy Analysis for

California Education, PACE; 2015. https://ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED562543&site=eds-live&scope=site.

U.S. Department of Education (2006). Consolidated state performance report: Parts 1 and II: Elementary and secondary education as amended by the no child left behind act of 2001. Washington, DC. Retrieved from ⟨https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/sy05-06/tn.pdf⟩.

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). Mathematics 2009: National assessment of educational progress at grades 4 and 8 (NCES Publication No. 2010-451). Retrieved from http://www.ncela.us/files/uploads/9/growingLEP_0809.pdf

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2014).The Condition of education 2014.retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2014/2014083.pdf

U.S. Department of Education (2016) Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA). Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/index.html

U.S. Department of Education (2011). The condition of education 2011 (NCES 2011-033), U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, & U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. (2015). Ensuring English learner students can participate meaningfully and equally in educational programs. Retrieved from

https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/dcl-factsheet-el-students-201501.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics, Indicator 6. Washington, DC.

Valdés, G. (2011). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67,* 391-429.

Valdés, G., & Castellón, M. (2011). English language learners in American schools: Characteristics and challenges. In T.Lucas (Ed.), Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms (18-34). *New York, NY: Routledge*.

Van Lier, L., & Walqui, A. (2012). Language and the common core state standards. *Commissioned Papers on Language and Literacy Issues in the Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards*, 94, 44. Retrieved fromhttp://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academicpapers/04Van%20Lier%20Walqui%20Language%20and%20CCSS%20FINAL.pdf

Vialpando, J., Yedlin, J., Linse, C., Harrington, M., & Cannon, G. (2005). Educating English language learners: Implementing instructional practice*s*. *National Council of La Raza.*

Vogt, M. & Echevarria, J., (2015). Reaching English learners: Aligning the ela/eld framework with siop. *California Reader, 49*, (1) 22-33. Retrieved from

https://www.readinghalloffame.org/sites/default/files/siop_ela_eld_correlation_article_oct._15.pdf

Walqui, A., & Heritage, M. (2012). Instruction for diverse groups of English language learners. S*tanford, CA: Stanford University.* Retrieved from https://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academic-papers/09-Walqui%20Heritage%20Instruction%20for%20Diverse%20Groups%20FINAL_0.pdf

Wolf, M.K., Yuan, W., Blood, I., & Huang, B. H. (2014). Investigating the language demands in the common core state standards for English language learners a Comparison Study of Standards. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, *9*(1), 35-52.

Wooten, A., Bateman, M. & Crouch, M. (2014). Differentiating instruction to create access to learning for ELL and unengaged students. *Widening the Circle,* 303. Retrieved from http://archives.evergreen.edu/1989/1989-22/MIT/MiT%202012-2014%20Conference%20Proceedings.pdf

Zwiers, J. (2008). *Building academic language: Essential practices for content classrooms.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A: The Project

Professional Development: English Language Development (ELD) Teachers

The data collected from teacher observations and interviews led to the development of this professional development project. Based on the data I derived from the interviews and the classroom observations, teachers expressed a common need for ongoing support in their ELD classrooms. The teachers were working to create an environment to provide strategies and support for student learning. What I gleaned from the interviews was that the teachers felt the guided lessons did not align with the needs of some of their students. More specifically, the teachers felt the students needed more scaffolds and support not found within these lessons. Teachers also discussed the importance of collaboration and planning to provide ongoing student support. I determined after further review of the data that teacher discussions and collaborations would provide the link that seemed to be missing among these teachers. I surmised that a 3-Day PD program would provide more opportunities for teachers to collaborate, plan, prepare, and implement additional strategies to better support their students' needs and give the teachers additional training in ELD instruction.

That said, I recommended a 3-day implementation on ELL Teacher Training. I suggested this type of PD be at the beginning of a school year. The goal of this training was to bring additional support to meet the needs, support, and successes of ELL teachers. Scaffolds (posters, procedures, strategies) used in connection with the current

lessons did not provide enough differentiated student support. The objective was to provide more support and build ELL teacher confidence and comprehension. A strong foundation in ELL instruction would not only help to improve student achievement, but also provide teachers with the confidence and understanding they felt was needed to be more successful in working with their students. While teachers felt the current lessons provided the core of the instruction, a lack of resources on how to get students to this level was missing. The expectation is for ELLs to reach a level mandated within the school district and state level expectations for English Language Learners.

Audience

This is a 3-day PD for ELL teachers at the elementary level. I am proposing that the PD support ELL instruction at the beginning, middle, or end of the school year. Teachers will use this time for lesson plans, review, strategies, and evaluate their instructional needs.

Day 1 - How to Engage Student Response

Meeting Time & Location: Planning/Conference Room)

Members Present:

Members Absent:

Norms:

1. Presume positive intentions
2. Place inquiry at the center to allow for processing, probing, and think time
3. Build a network through respect and support

4. Be prompt
5.

Session 1 Time	Focus
Day 1 8:00-10:00 10:00-10:15 Break 10:15-12:00 12:00- 1:00 LUNCH 1:00 -2:00	Session 1: Introduction to the Responsive Classroom: What does whole group ELL Instruction Look Like? Questions to consider with teachers: 1. What does whole group instruction look like with comprehension? 2. What resources are available? 3. What might small group instruction look like? Questions to consider with school wide staff: 1. What school wide program is in place to support these students? 2. How are students assessed? How are parents involved? A power point will be used to provide the discussion for teachers of learning to use English and learning through content. This is all part of the ELD component for the mandated daily ELD instruction (slides 1-14) strategies are successful during whole group instruction? Teachers provide their knowledge of skills and strategies they are currently using and discuss what their needs and successes are. Teachers are able to review student data

2:000-2:15 Break 2:15-3:00 **Day 2- Planning for Instruction** 8:00- 9:30 9:30-9:45 Break 9:45-11:45 11:45-12:45 12:45-1:45 1:45 – 2:00 2:00-3:000 **Day 3- The Implementation of Lessons/Collaboration** 8:00- 9:45	and use this as a tool to assess whether the scaffolds provided is enough for students to reach the ELD standards. The ELD standards call for students to exchange information and ideas with others through oral collaborative discussions on a range of topics. Students are also supposed to offer and justify opinions, negotiate with, and persuade others when communicating. The goal is to foster academic interactions and clarify academic language during the ELD instructional block. Refer to the ELD Designated Frame of Practice to support teacher instruction on power point (15-30). **LUNCH** Session 2: The Steps to Successful Implementation of ELL Instruction (Prioritize what is needed to teach successfully) Teachers describe the varying levels of language proficiency and communication strategies (gestures,

9:45- 10:00 Break 10:00 – 11:30 Lunch 11:30 -12:30 _Lunch 12:30-2:00 2:00-2:10 Break 2:10– 2:50 2:50 – 3:00 Evaluation	drawing, intonation, synonyms) and strategy use of primary language to make academic language of texts and oral classroom discourse accessible to all students. How can we check for academic language comprehension? Teachers practice using different tactics, (asking questions, providing wait time, and written, verbal and nonverbal evidence) to check for comprehension of academic language at strategic times during the lesson. **What we want to see**: teacher using multiple approaches to check for academic language comprehension and appropriately adjusts instruction. Session 3: Planning for the classroom -Steps needed for teachers so that they can prepare time to implement the practices of a responsive ELL classroom based on CA ELD Standards. The participants will be reminded that the EL masterplan includes 6 principles that guide their work. Principles 1 and 3 relate to high expectations and providing challenging academic

	content to guide their work. The focus is to provide effective learning outcomes. • Continue to build understanding of the ELD Frame of Practice for Designated ELD instruction • Understand the connection between mentor text and ELD Part II Standards • Provide and receive feedback on a draft of a Designated ELD Lesson • Understand the connection between ELD Objectives and the ELD Standards Evaluation Form Session 1: Objective for Productive Proficiencies in ELL Students

	Session 2 Analysis of Student Work What does an engaged classroom display? LUNCH Session 3: Building Positive Relationships with Students (Strategies) Session 4: Planning for the ELL Classroom/Collaboration Reflection and Evaluation Session 1: Planning Session 2: Backwards Planning

	Lunch Session 3: Collaboration across Grade Levels Session 4: Teacher Planning, Collaboration, and Presentations Moving Forward Reflection

Timeline

The PD will focus on ELL teachers. Teacher collaboration is an integral part of a Professional Learning Community; teachers will work on creating lesson plans, strategies, and gain more resources and tools to feel confident when implementing this ELL curriculum. The teachers will meet during the regular school hours, with a scheduled morning and lunch break. Each day will end with a reflection and/or

evaluation to provide opportunities for teachers to share concerns, successes, and any new ideas moving forward.

A PowerPoint presentation will provide talking points throughout the PD. Laptops will so that they can access resources online as needed when lesson planning. Each teacher will receive a copy of the Power Point to follow and use for note taking. Materials: Reflection Form, Daily Agenda, paper, pencils, laptop, projector, ELL Curriculum Guides, handouts

Appendix B: Field Notes Observation Form 1

Writing Field Notes

Field Study Observation Form

Field Note No: Date: Location: Occasion: **Description**	**Teacher** **A, B, C, D**	**ELD Supports** **(Anchor charts, visual cues, sentence stems, posters)**
What is being observed (lesson, whole group, small group, one on one) . . .		

Appendix C: Classroom Observation Protocol

Instructions to the Observer: The focus of each observation is to identify what methods of teaching are teachers using to support English Language Learners (ELLs) as well as the approaches in teaching ELLs determined. The protocol is comprised of: (1) an initial description section, (2) focus areas, and (3) observable indicators and exemplars related to each focus area.

Before the Observation

Become as familiar as possible with each indicator prior to conducting the observations.

During the Observation

Provide as vivid a description as possible of the lesson, answering each question with the description section. Provide running observation notes related to each focus area, taking care to address every indicator.

After the Observation

Annotate your observation notes, as they are still fresh in your mind and then synthesize information from the interviews and your observation notes.

Appendix D: Teacher Interview Protocol

The sub questions (SQ) guiding this study are:

SQ1. What methods of teaching do teachers employ in teaching ELL students?

SQ2. How do teachers vary their approach in teaching ELL students?

SQ3. What are the driving factors that determine the approaches used by teachers for ELLs?

Interview Questions (IQ) for English Learner Teacher

1. How would you describe an effective teacher of ELL students? What methods of teaching do you employ when teaching ELL students? (RQ1)
2. In what ways do you vary your approaches in teaching ELL students? (RQ2)
3. What are the driving factors that determine the approaches you use for ELLs? (RQ3)
4. How similar or different are the materials you use with your ELLs compared with the English Only (EO) teachers? (RQ1)
5. In what ways do you change the instructional materials to accommodate your ELLs? (RQ2)
6. How well aligned are your current teaching materials with the CCSS required materials? (RQ3)

7. How similar or different are the time blocks you use with your ELLs compared with EO teachers? (RQ2)
8. How would you change the time block(s) if you could? (RQ3)
9. What portion of your common planning time would you estimate is used for teachers to collaborate on teaching techniques to support ELLs? (RQ1)
10. How often do you plan together with other teachers for ELLs? (RQ3)