



ISSUE
PAPER

PREPARING TEACHERS OF
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS



**TQ Connection Issue Paper on
Improving Student Outcomes in
General and Special Education**

Preparing Teachers of English Language Learners

September 2009

Kristin L. McGraner, Ed.D.
Vanderbilt University

Laura Saenz, Ph.D.
University of Texas–Pan American



1100 17th Street NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036-4632
877-322-8700 • 202-223-6690
www.tqsource.org

Copyright © 2009 National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, sponsored under government cooperative agreement number S283B050051. All rights reserved.

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under cooperative agreement number S283B050051. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.

The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality is a collaborative effort of ETS, Learning Point Associates, and Vanderbilt University.

P_3987_09/09



Contents

	Page
Overview.....	1
Policy Background.....	1
Teacher Preparation and English Language Learners	2
Innovation Configuration on Instructional Practices for Mainstream Teachers of ELL Students ..	4
Components of the Innovation Configuration	4
Recommendations.....	10
Conclusion	13
References.....	14
Appendix: Innovation Configuration for Preparing Mainstream Teachers of ELL Students.....	18

Overview

More than five million English language learners (ELLs) attend school in the United States (NCELA, 2009). This population has increased by approximately 57 percent during the last decade, drawing sharp attention to the individual and instructional needs of children who are nonnative speakers of English (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008). With the rising number of ELLs in American classrooms, general “mainstream” teachers will undoubtedly teach a student who is not proficient in English and therefore unable to access the academic curriculum. These mainstream teachers are expected to teach academic content and raise student achievement while simultaneously developing ELL students’ facility in and command of the English language. Emerging research indicates that mainstream teachers are ill equipped to effectively teach ELL students and have little access to preservice and in-service education focused on what to teach and how to teach this underserved population (Ballantyne et al., 2008; Hollins & Guzman, 2005). Coupled with these expectations are the challenges in making sense of the highly politicized debates over English-only and bilingual instruction. For these reasons, preparing effective teachers for this complex classroom and policy environment is critical, and the role of teacher education programs is paramount.

This Issue Paper presents a review of the policy environment for ELL instruction and the preparation of mainstream teachers to address the needs of ELL students. It also describes the key features of effective instructional practices for ensuring ELL students’ learning of academic content supported by empirical evidence. Finally, the paper presents the Innovation Configuration for Preparing Mainstream Teachers of ELL Students, a tool for evaluating mainstream teacher preparation programs and in-service professional development.

Policy Background

The 2001 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind) prompted an unprecedented focus on the academic achievement of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. The goals of Title III, also known as the “English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act,” include the following points(*emphasis added*):

- (1) to help ensure that children who are limited English proficient, including immigrant children and youth, attain English proficiency, develop high levels of academic attainment in English, and *meet the same challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards as all children are expected to meet*;
- (2) to assist all limited English proficient children, including immigrant children and youth, *to achieve at high levels in the core academic subjects* so that those children can meet the same challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards as all children are expected to meet, consistent with section 1111(b)(1);...
- (8) to hold State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools accountable for increases in English proficiency and *core academic content* knowledge of limited English proficient children by requiring—

(A) demonstrated improvements in the English proficiency of limited English proficient children each fiscal year; and

(B) adequate yearly progress for limited English proficient children, including immigrant children and youth, as described in section 1111(b)(2)(B).

Not only does the legislation hold agencies accountable for the language development of ELL students, but it also holds agencies accountable for ELL students' achievement in core academic content areas (science, mathematics, social studies, etc.). Therefore, mainstream teachers are expected to bolster student learning of academic content, and schools must demonstrate adequate yearly progress (AYP) for ELL students in core content areas. No longer can the learning needs of ELL students be dismissed to ELL specialist teachers, nor are mainstream teachers absolved from the responsibility to provide highly effective instruction to LEP students.

The dual focus of the legislation should be noted. First, Title III calls for LEP students to attain proficiency in English, which encompasses such skills as phonological awareness, decoding, vocabulary development, reading comprehension, and fluency. The second component, however, emphasizes LEP students' learning of academic content as reflected in states' core content standards. Gersten and Baker (2000) argue that these aims are distinct and should be treated as such:

We encourage researchers and educators to consider learning and content-area learning as distinct educational goals, rather than assuming that increased use of oral language in school will automatically lead to increased academic learning and the development of higher-order thinking skills...[I]nstruction for English language learners should work to blend oral language engagement and intellectual (or cognitive) engagement. (p. 460)

The twin foci of Title III present challenges to schools as they work to integrate and coordinate the work of ELL specialist teachers and mainstream content teachers. Moreover, teacher preparation programs must provide a content-rich and context-specific curricula for their teacher candidates. Content-rich programs bolster candidates' knowledge of content and pedagogy in their subject matters, while context-specific curricula instruct candidates on the distinct learning needs of particular student populations, including ELL students.

Teacher Preparation and English Language Learners

There is no shortage of criticism on teacher preparation programs. Research has consistently documented the failure of programs to adequately prepare teacher candidates for the realities of the classroom (e.g., Lewis et al., 1999). More specifically, the literature on preparation for teaching diverse student populations shows few changes over the last twenty-five years in how teachers are being prepared to address the individual needs of ethnic minority students and ELLs (Hollins & Guzman, 2005). While the research in this area is largely inconclusive, points of promise have emerged—specifically those related to the ability of field experiences to bolster candidates' capacity to understand, relate to, and work with diverse populations (Hollins & Guzman, 2005). Because teacher candidates are largely white, female, middle-class, and from suburban or rural environments (NCES, 2007), exposing them not only to the sociocultural

characteristics of the ELL population but also preparing them to enact effective instructional practices for ELL student learning is critical.

Moreover, the story becomes grimmer when examining the preparation of mainstream teachers to instruct ELL students. For instance, Menken and Atunez (2001) found that fewer than one sixth of teacher education institutions address ELL content in their preparation curricula. Moreover, only three states require all mainstream teachers to complete coursework focused on the instruction of English language learners (*Education Week*, 2009). Because teachers and schools are held accountable for the academic performance of ELL students, the lack of adequate preparation for mainstream teachers in ELL instruction is alarming.

Innovation Configuration on Effective Instructional Practices for Mainstream Teachers of ELL Students

This Issue Paper presents an innovation configuration on effective practices for preparing mainstream teachers of ELL students that can be used to evaluate general teacher preparation programs. It appears in the Appendix.

Innovation configurations have been used for at least 30 years in the development and implementation of educational innovations and methodologies (Hall & Hord, 1987; Roy & Hord, 2004). They most often have been used as professional development tools to guide implementation of an innovation within a school and to facilitate the change process. Innovation configurations also have provided a form of self-assessment and reflection and can be used in program evaluation as a means to determine the degree to which educational policies are implemented within coursework and supervised field experiences.

Innovation configurations typically are established through tables that have two dimensions: one specifying the key principles, and the other specifying levels of implementation (Hall & Hord, 1987; Roy & Hord, 2004). The *essential components* of the innovation or program form the rows of the table's far-left column, along with descriptors and examples to guide application of the criteria to program coursework, standards, and classroom practice. The second dimension is the *degree of implementation*. The top row of the table defines several levels of implementation. For example, no mention of the essential component is the lowest level of implementation and might be assigned a score of a zero. Increasing levels of implementation are usually assigned progressively higher scores.

The innovation configuration described in this Issue Paper is designed to improve teacher preparation, which, in turn, may lead to improved ELL student achievement in the core content areas. The components of this innovation configuration and the description thereof in this paper provide a broad overview of the competencies taught and practiced within general teacher preparation programs as they relate to providing quality instruction to ELL students. Use of this innovation configuration may advance collaborative practices among mainstream teachers, teacher educators, and ELL specialists while also encouraging an examination of the similarities, differences, and gaps among programs.

Components of the Innovation Configuration

We conducted a review of the literatures on mainstream teacher education, teacher preparation for ELL teaching, and instructional practices in ELL teaching to identify the topical components of the innovation configuration and their corresponding essential competencies. While researchers and practitioners often debate the merits of particular programs and practices in the education of ELLs, the purpose of this paper is not to resolve this debate. Rather, herein we present a set of codified practices for mainstream teacher preparation programs to use as one of many tools in evaluating the content and quality of their programs.

The key components of the innovation configuration on effective practices for mainstream teachers of ELL students are the following:

- Sociocultural and political foundations for teaching ELL students
- Foundations of second language acquisition
- Knowledge for teaching academic content to ELL students
- Effective instructional practices for teaching academic content to ELL students
- Assessment practices and accommodations for ELL students
- Professional engagement and collaboration

These components are drawn from the literatures on teacher preparation and learning, English language development and instruction, and sociocultural and sociopolitical contexts of ELL teaching and learning referenced in this paper. The following sections briefly describe the components of the innovation configuration that should be addressed by mainstream teacher preparation programs. Preparing teacher candidates in these core competencies may result in more effective instructional processes and outcomes and the advancement of ELL student learning in academic content areas.

Sociocultural and Political Foundations for Teaching ELL Students

While we know very little about the effects of foundation courses on teacher candidates' knowledge for teaching, instructional practices, and student achievement, the scant literature on the topic suggests that candidates' learning of education foundations may be an important means of shaping their attitudes and dispositions toward working with diverse populations (Floden & Meniketti, 2005). Candidates' understanding of the complex web of sociocultural and political contexts of ELL teaching is particularly critical because of the mass of language minority students in U.S. classrooms and the consistent wave of immigration. School is often ELL students' first point of contact with U.S. culture, and educators must be well poised to ensure this contact results in strong family, community, and academic engagement (Gay, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Finally, sociocultural and political foundations should address the nonacademic characteristics of ELL students and their families, while also tending to how these characteristics shape English language and academic content learning.

Foundations of Second Language Acquisition

No doubt mainstream teachers must possess knowledge that will help them understand how ELL students become effective speakers of English; but the depth and breadth of that knowledge is a topic of considerable debate even among researchers who focus exclusively on recommendations for teachers who specialize in working with ELL students (e.g., Adger, Snow & Christian, 2003; Tellez & Waxman, 2005). Prominent ELL researchers and teachers educators (e.g., Adger, Snow, & Christian, 2003; Tellez & Waxman, 2004) agree on the value of concentrated and extended study of second language acquisition but disagree on how and whether teacher preparation programs can realistically integrate such knowledge when state policies limit the amount of coursework teacher candidates can take. An ambitious program would include such specialized topics as the study of educational linguistics, language irregularities, how the lexicon (vocabulary) is acquired, and standard versus vernacular dialects, to name a few (Fillmore & Snow, 2003). The Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL, 2003)

organization provides a more realistic view of what teachers should know. TESOL holds that in order for ELL students to receive an appropriate, effective, and meaningful education, *all* school personnel should understand the basic issues of second language acquisition, bilingualism, the difference between social and academic language proficiency, and the roles that language and culture play in learning. Providing a review of second language theories to be learned or studied is beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, we provide a brief discussion of relevant second language acquisition knowledge.

Research on English language learning indicates that language acquisition occurs in stages (e.g., Ortiz & Kushner, 1997; Roseberry-McKibbin, 2002) and all academic and nonacademic environments (Cummins, 1984). Second language learning is complex and not perfectly linear in its sequence or application across contexts (Brown, 1980; Spolsky, 1989). Mainstream teachers must recognize that although predictable stages of second language development have been identified, failing to advance through these stages in a predictable fashion is not evidence of learning difficulties.

For decades researchers have proposed various models of second language learning and development and hypothesized the role of individual characteristics, knowledge, environments and interactions in the learning of language and content (e.g., Fillmore, 1985; McLaughlin et al., 1983). Examples of these variables are age, motivation, aptitude (Ioup, 2005), first language knowledge, learning style (DeKyser & Juffs, 2005), and sociocultural variables such as immigrant status and acculturation (Gass & Selinker, 2001). Teachers must understand the critical role that context plays in the second language learning process and how the language and knowledge required in academic and non-academic contexts differ (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Heath, 1983; Solomon & Rhodes, 1995). Moreover, teachers must understand that students may demonstrate a solid command of conversational or social English and may be successful in nonacademic environments without possessing the knowledge and skills required to successfully access and master academic core content in academic environments. Researchers agree that mastering academic English language skills is essential for ELL students' academic achievement and educational attainment (Ballantyne et al., 2008; Gersten & Baker, 2000; Slavin & Chueng, 2005), so teachers should be able to differentiate between students' conversational and academic language needs and outcomes. With respect to bilingualism, teachers must understand the undeniable positive effect of bilingual proficiency and biliteracy on academic achievement in one's first and second language (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2005). Finally, as teachers strive to understand second language learning, they should evaluate their own perceptions and dispel any misconceptions that may affect their teaching practices (Baca & Escamilla, 2003; McLaughlin, 1992). Common misconceptions among teachers are related to the role of native language use and instruction, how and who acquires a second language with the most ease and efficiency, the ideal instructional placement with the best result, and the most effective language programs (McLaughlin, 1992; Samway & McKeon, 1999). As Baca and Escamilla (2003) so succinctly state, teachers must understand that "second language learning takes longer, it is harder and more complex, and involves a great deal more effort than [teachers] have been led to believe" (p. 77).

Knowledge for Teaching Academic Content to ELL Students

Student achievement depends to a great extent on teachers' abilities to foster rich conceptual understandings of academic content (NCTAF, 1996). Research suggests, however, that teachers often lack the requisite content and pedagogical knowledge to teach for conceptual understandings (Ball, 1990; Ma, 1999; Shulman, 1987). Deficiencies in teacher knowledge are often attributed to low-quality teacher preparation programs that fail to deepen candidates' knowledge of content and how students learn content (Cohen, McLaughlin, & Talbert, 1993; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995).

Teacher preparation should bolster candidates' content knowledge in their academic subject areas, as well as pedagogical content knowledge and curricular knowledge (Grossman, 2005; Shulman, 1987). In addition, teacher candidates should work toward understanding the key concepts, fundamental principles, and tools of inquiry in their subject areas, a knowledge that will be utilized and transformed into sound instruction for student learning. In addition, teacher candidates must recognize the types and forms of curricular resources that facilitate student learning of content, as well as appropriate assessments that serve as instructional, learning, and assessment tools. Before mainstream teachers can effectively teach ELL students academic content, they must have solid knowledge of teaching their subject matter(s).

Effective Instructional Practices for Teaching Academic Content to ELL Students

General Pedagogy. The scant attention to ESL or bilingual methodology within mainstream teacher preparation programs is due, in part, to the misconception or assumption that effective teaching of ELL students consists of applying generic strategies typically recommended for diverse student populations (de Jong & Harper, 2005). Yet another problem related to the identification of effective practices for teaching ELL students is that much attention has been given to the debate over programs, placement, and language of instruction with less attention to effective teaching practices. As we consider what constitutes effective teaching practice for ELL students, we examine the recommendations from the work of the Center for Research, Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE; Tharp, Estrada, Dalton, & Yamauchi, 2000), which provides not a comprehensive list of all existing effective instructional practices, but guiding principles for planning, selecting, and delivering effective instruction.

Researchers from CREDE (Tharp et al., 2000) have established five standards for effective pedagogy (CREDE, 2002) and have directly examined the application of those standards to ELL students (Doherty, Hilberg, Pinal, & Tharp, 2003). The development of the standards was spurred by the criticism that much importance has been given to standards for what ELL *students* should be able to do with sparse attention to what *teachers* should do to facilitate the learning of ELL students. The five CREDE standards are joint productivity through teacher and student collaboration, developing language and literacy across the curriculum, making meaning by connecting school to students' lives, teaching complex thinking, and teaching through conversation. An effective and popular instructional model employing the five standards is the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2007).

The first CREDE standard, *joint productivity*, asks teachers to design instruction that focuses on facilitating learning through teachers and students working together on a common product or goal and having the opportunities to talk about their work as it is completed (Doherty et al., 2003). Working together toward a common goal yields opportunities for teachers and students to engage in more complex, meaningful language that can be tied to the real world.

The second CREDE standard is *developing language proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing across the curriculum* and through the school day. The acceptance of this standard can be seen in states' adoption or development of language proficiency standards holding teachers accountable for purposefully matching their content objectives with ELL students' English proficiency levels (Gottlieb, Carnuccio, Ernst-Slavit, & Katz, 2006; Gottlieb, Cranley & Oliver, 2007). The belief is that classroom instruction that integrates second language development with quality content area instruction ensures that ELL students acquire English language proficiency and learn the knowledge and skills needed to reach their full academic potential.

The third CREDE standard is *making meaning for students by contextualizing teaching and curriculum* in the experiences and skills of students' homes and communities. The teacher begins with what students know and have learned from their homes, community, and school and designs and varies instruction accordingly. Teachers go beyond activating prior knowledge and deliberately integrate students' experiences into their lessons to make explicit connections for students (Dalton, 1998).

The fourth CREDE standard, *teaching complex thinking*, stresses instructional time devoted to higher-order academic skills and not just repetition and rote memorization. Implicit in this standard is the notion of presenting challenging activities and materials paired with clear standards, scaffolded support, and systematic performance feedback. Researchers have thoroughly documented the positive effects of teacher feedback on student learning (e.g., Black & Wiliam, 1998; Shepard, 2000). Preparation programs should educate teacher candidates on how to provide targeted feedback both on students' English language use and on their understanding of academic concepts. It is critical that teachers not only respond to students' progress in language development, but also—something more important for mainstream teachers—that they provide feedback on how students are meeting content learning objectives.

The final CREDE standard, *teaching through conversation*, emphasizes instruction that offers students the opportunity to dialogue with the teacher and their peers about the academic content they are learning. Teachers are asked to examine the balance between teacher talk and student talk and to assist students' learning through conversation by questioning, restating, praising, encouraging, and so on. ELL students must have the opportunity to speak and hear academic vocabulary in the classroom, and thus preparation programs should instruct teacher candidates on how they may structure academic talk and facilitate classroom discourse on core content. Furthermore, research on classwide peer tutoring programs has suggested that ELL students benefit from using oral language with peers (Coelho, 1994; Long & Porter, 1985; Saenz, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2005), thus becoming acculturated both socially and linguistically (Schumann, 1986). Such practices not only encourage ELLs' language engagement, but also prompt the cognitive engagement of all students in the classroom.

Teaching Academic Content. Preparation programs often instruct teacher candidates to “differentiate instruction” using a variety of instructional strategies for diverse student abilities. But teacher preparation institutions must explicate what differentiated instruction and appropriate instructional methods for ELL students are, what they look like in practice, and how to make appropriate instructional decisions based on individual student needs. Gersten and Baker (2000) call for the “modulation” of effective instructional practices for native speakers in the teaching of academic content to ELL students:

Effective instruction for English language learners is more than just “good teaching.” It is teaching that is tempered, tuned, and otherwise adjusted, as a musical score is adjusted, to the correct “pitch” at which English language learners will best “hear” the content (i.e. find it most meaningful). (p. 461)

This metaphor illuminates the need for teachers to understand the individual differences of ELL students while also making thoughtful and evidence-based decisions on appropriate modes of instructional delivery.

Researchers have identified promising instructional practices that have been shown to effectively increase ELL students’ learning of content and development of language proficiency. First, *instruction should be explicit and systematic* (e.g., August & Hakuta, 1997; Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006; Slavin & Cheung, 2003). Teachers should scaffold students’ learning of concepts and word meanings and provide direct, intensive instruction as students acquire knowledge of academic content. Teacher candidates should learn two complementary approaches to teaching ELL students academic content: (1) whole-group instruction for all students and (2) “supplemental intervention for the subgroup of children who experience sustained difficulties despite effective class-wide instruction, and whose skills are significantly below their peers” (Francis et al., 2006, p. 19).

A second effective instructional practice is the *teaching of academic vocabulary*. Explicit teaching of word meanings both before and during ELL students’ reading of or encounters with academic texts is critical to vocabulary development, reading comprehension, and conceptual understandings of academic content (Beck & McKeown, 1985; Nagy, 1988; Rousseau, Tam, & Ramnarain, 1993; Saunders, O’Brien, & McLean, 1998). Gersten and Baker (2000) highlight Echevarria et al.’s (1998) description of how academic language may be taught:

One form of vocabulary development includes short, explicit segments of class time in which the teacher directly teaches key vocabulary. These five minute segments would consist of the teacher saying the vocabulary word, writing it on the board, asking students to say it and write it and defining the term with pictures, demonstrations, and examples familiar to students. (Echevarria, 1998, p. 220, as cited in Gersten & Baker, 2000, p. 663)

Structuring and facilitating classroom discourse about academic content is a third critical contributor to ELL student learning (Francis et al., 2006). ELL students must have the opportunity to speak and hear academic vocabulary in the classroom, and thus preparation programs should instruct teacher candidates on how they may structure academic talk and facilitate classroom discourse on core content. Furthermore, research on classwide peer tutoring programs has suggested that ELL students benefit from using oral language with peers (Coelho, 1994; Long & Porter, 1985; Saenz, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2005), thus becoming acculturated both

socially and linguistically (Schumann, 1986). Such practices not only encourage ELLs' language engagement, but also prompt the cognitive engagement of all students in the classroom.

Next, preparation programs should instruct mainstream teacher candidates to *effectively use visuals in teaching ELL students academic content*. Visual representations of concepts and word meanings have been shown to facilitate students' learning of content and development of English language proficiency (Reyes & Bos, 1998; Saunders et al., 1998).

The final effective practice for the teaching of academic content to ELL students is *purposeful, consistent, and systematic feedback*. Researchers have thoroughly documented the positive effects of teacher feedback on student learning (e.g., Black & Wiliam, 1998; Shepard, 2000). Preparation programs should educate teacher candidates on how to provide targeted feedback both on students' English language use and on their understanding of academic concepts. It is critical that teachers not only respond to students' progress in language development, but also—something more important for mainstream teachers—that they provide feedback on how students are meeting content learning objectives.

Assessment Practices and Accommodations for ELL Students

English language proficiency and knowledge of academic vocabulary are critical determinants of ELL students' performance on assessments (Abedi et al., 2000; Francis et al., 2006). Not only should mainstream teachers understand basic principles of assessment and measurement, but also they should know how to design classroom assessments that assess ELL students' knowledge of academic content using testing language appropriate to the objective being measured and students' language proficiency. Moreover, preparation programs should educate teacher candidates on the appropriate use of testing accommodations for ELL students, their purposes, and their appropriate uses. For instance, researchers have found the following accommodations for ELL students to be effective: (1) English and bilingual dictionaries and glossaries; (2) simplified English; (3) extra time; and (4) dual language tests. Researchers caution, however, that while some accommodations may be “bundled” and used simultaneously, educators should be aware that not all bundles will lead to improved student achievement or valid test results (Rivera et al., 2006). The complexities of English language development and testing accommodation with diverse populations make it important for mainstream teacher candidates to be instructed to work collaboratively with ELL specialists and teachers with deeper, more specialized knowledge of ELL learning and assessment.

Recommendations

This section describes recommendations for enacting high-quality preparation programs for mainstream teachers of ELL students. The recommendations are clustered under the four dominant themes found in the literature on teacher preparation and ELL instructional practices. These recommendations are intended to guide the implementation of the content encapsulated within the innovation configuration. The preceding discussion of essential competencies for the mainstream teaching of ELL students coupled with the following recommendations may allow teacher education institutions to better evaluate the effectiveness of their programs. These

recommendations are certainly not exhaustive and implementation of the tool will often depend on local needs.

1. Deep knowledge of content and ELL-specific pedagogy is essential. Completing coursework in multicultural education is not enough (Hollins & Guzman, 2005). Teacher candidates must deepen their knowledge of effective instructional practices for teaching academic content to nonnative speakers. This recommendation requires attention to taking the following actions:

- Provide mainstream teacher candidates ample opportunities across the curriculum to obtain, develop, and apply knowledge for teaching ELL students. Preparation programs should consider integrating the knowledge of ELL students and requisite instructional strategies into existing courses, thus promoting inclusivity of all students and illuminating the similarities and differences in instructional methodologies for diverse student groups.
- Design candidate assessments to identify and track the development of candidate knowledge of ELL students, ELL learning of academic content, and effective instructional strategies for teaching students with various language proficiencies. Gather program data on the effectiveness of coursework in bolstering candidates' knowledge and skill in teaching academic content to ELL students.

2. Knowledge and skill in direct and systematic instruction for ELL students is critical. Preparation programs should teach candidates how to enact highly effective instruction that is direct, systematic, and geared toward ELL students' learning of academic language (Ballantyne, 2008; Francis, 2006).

- Design field experiences, practica, and student teaching placements in classrooms populated by ELL students, thus providing mainstream candidates opportunities to observe, interact, and teach these diverse learners.
- Develop structured observation, reflection, and action-research protocols to guide and refine candidates' understandings of teaching ELL students within the general education classroom. These tools should focus candidates' attention to the distinctive learning needs of ELL students, the role of sociocultural interactions within the classroom contexts, and effective means of formative and summative assessments aligned to core content standards.

3. It is important for teacher educators to understand how to access ELL expertise and leverage such resources in their professional practice. Mainstream teacher candidates must learn to engage trained ELL professionals and actively seek opportunities for collaboration and the deepening of knowledge for teaching academic content to ELL students.

- Provide opportunities for mainstream teacher candidates to consult and collaborate with ELL specialized teachers and teacher candidates to illuminate the benefits of professional collaborations and information exchange. Moreover, illustrate how candidates may access and apply external expertise in designing instruction for ELL students in the mainstream classroom.

- Maintain alumni networks for ongoing and sustained collaboratives among specialized ELL teachers and mainstream teachers and candidates.

4. Professional standards for general mainstream teachers should address the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to effectively teach ELL student academic content (Ballantyne, 2008). Teacher preparation programs and state and local education agencies should work to strengthen and align ELL standards and core content standards in ways supportive of both English language learning and academic curricula learning. These standards should act as the foundation for high-quality preparation and in-service teacher training and professional development.

Conclusion

This paper outlined the essential competencies mainstream teacher candidates should possess to effectively teach ELL students, provided recommendations for preparation programs as they thoughtfully assess how mainstream candidates are prepared to teach diverse student groups, and presented an innovation configuration for use by teacher education institutions in evaluating their mainstream preparation programs. The fast-growing population of ELL students presents many challenges to the nation's public education enterprise. It is critical that teacher preparation programs equip their candidates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to effectively teach ELL students. The responsibility for ELL student learning no longer rests on the shoulders of specialized ELL teachers. All teachers will encounter nonnative speaking students and must provide high-quality and appropriate instruction for these learners (*Education Week*, 2009). The role of teacher education is paramount as the nation works to build the capacity of every classroom to meet the needs of an increasingly complex student population.

References

- Ball, D. L. (1990). The mathematical understandings that prospective teachers bring to teacher education. *Elementary School Journal*, 90(4), 449–466.
- Ballantyne, K. G., Sanderman, A. R., & Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Retrieved September 21, 2009, from <http://www.ncele.gwu.edu/files/uploads/3/EducatingELLsBuildingTeacherCapacityVol1.pdf>
- Brown, H. D. 1980. *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall.
- Center for Research, Education, Diversity and Excellence [CREDE]. (2002). *The five standards for effective pedagogy* [Website]. Berkeley, CA: Author. Retrieved August 18, 2009 from <http://gse.berkeley.edu/research/credearchive/standards/standards.html>.
- Coelho, E. (1994). *Learning together in the multicultural classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cohen, D. K., McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (Eds.). (1993). *Teaching for understanding: Challenges for policy and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cummins, J. P. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. San Diego, CA: College Hill Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(8), 597–604.
- De Jong, E. J. & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(2), 101–124.
- DeKeyser, R., & Juffs, A. (2005). Cognitive considerations in L2 learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 437–454). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Doherty, R. W., Hilberg, R. S., Pinal, A. & Tharp, R. G. (2003). Five standards and student achievement. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 1(1), 1–24.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. J., & Short, D. (2007). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Education Week. (2009). Quality counts 2009: Portrait of a Population. *Education Week*, 28(17).

- Floden, R., & Meniketti, M. (2005). Research on the effects of coursework in the arts and sciences and in the foundations of education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.). *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 261–308). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Francis, D. J., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006). *Research-based recommendations for the education of English language learners*. [Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners series]. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction. Retrieved September 21, 2009, from <http://www.centeroninstruction.org/files/ELL1-Interventions.pdf>
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (2nd ed.). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gersten, R. & Baker, S. (2000). What we know about effective instructional practices for English-language learners. *Exceptional Children*, 66(4), 454–470.
- Gottlieb, M., Carnuccio, L., Ernst-Slavit, G. & Katz, A. (2006). *PreK–12 English Language Proficiency Standards*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Gottlieb, M., Cranley, M. E., & Oliver, A. R. (2007). *Understanding the WIDA English language proficiency standards: A resource guide*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.
- Grossman, P., Schoenfeld, A., & Lee, C. (2005). Teaching Subject Matter. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 201–231). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1987). *Changing in schools: Facilitating the process*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Holdheide, L. R., & Reschly, D. J. (2008). *Teacher Preparation to Deliver Inclusive Services to Students with Disabilities*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved September 21, 2009, from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/TeacherPreparationtoDeliverInclusiveServices.pdf>
- Hollins, E., & Guzman, M. T. (2005). Research on Preparing Teachers for Diverse Populations. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.). *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 477–548). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Ioup, G. (2005). Age in second language development. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 419–436). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lewis, L., Parsad, B., Carey, N., Bartfai, N., Farris, E., & Smerdon, B. (1999). Teacher quality: A report on the preparation and qualifications of public school teachers. *Education Statistics Quarterly*, 1(1), 7–11.
- Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 207–228.
- Ma, L. (1999). *Knowing and teaching elementary mathematics: Teachers' understanding of fundamental mathematics in China and the United States*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Menken, K., & Atunéz, B. (2001). An overview of the preparation and certification of teachers working with limited English proficient (LEP) students. Washington, D.C., National Clearinghouse of Bilingual Education.
- Nagy, W. E. (1988). Teaching vocabulary to improve reading comprehension. Newark, DE: International Reading Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 298–471).
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future [NCTAF]. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.
- Ortiz, A. A., & Kushner, M. I. (1997). Bilingualism and the impact on academic performance. *Academic Difficulties*, 6(3), 657–679.
- Reyes, E. T., & Bos, C. S. (1998). Interactive semantic mapping and charting: Enhancing content area learning for language minority students. In R. M. Gersten & R. T. Jimenez (Eds.), *Promoting learning for culturally and linguistically diverse students: Classroom applications from contemporary research* (pp. 133–152). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Roseberry-McKibbin, C. (2002). *Multicultural students with special language needs* (2nd ed.). Oceanside, CA: Academic Communication Associates.
- Rousseau, M. K., Tam, B. K. Y., & Ramnarain, R. (1993). Increasing reading proficiency of language-minority students with speech and language impairments. *Education and Treatments of Children*, 16(3), 254–271.
- Roy, P., & Hord, S. M. (2004). Innovation configurations chart a measured course toward change. *Journal of Staff Development*, 25(2), 54–58.
- Saenz, L. M., Fuchs, L. S. and D. Fuchs. (2005) Peer-assisted learning strategies for English language learners with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 71(3), 231–247..

- Saunders, W., O'Brien, G., Lennon, D., & McLean, J. (1998). Making the transition to English literacy successful: Effective strategies for studying literature with transition students. In R. M. Gersten & R. T. Jimenez (Eds.), *Effective strategies for teaching language minority students* (pp. 99–132). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Schumann, J. H. (1986). Research on the Acculturation Model for Second Language Acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7(5), 379–392.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations for the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57 (1), 1-22.
- Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for second language learning*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Tharp, R. G., Estrada, P., Dalton, S. S., & Yamauchi, L. A. (2000). *Teaching transformed: Achieving excellence, fairness, inclusion, and harmony*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Appendix: Innovation Configuration for Preparing Mainstream Teachers of ELL Students

	Code=0	Code=1	Code=2	Code=3	Code=4	
<p>Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria specified from 0 to 4. Score and rate each item separately.</p> <p>Descriptors and examples are bulleted below the components.</p>	<p>No evidence that the concept is included in the class syllabus.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in class syllabus.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, required readings, and tests and/or quizzes.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, readings, tests, assignments, and projects for application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations • Lesson plans • Classroom demonstrations • Journal response 	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, required reading, tests, projects, assignments, and teaching with application and feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fieldwork (practicum) • Tutoring 	<p>Rating: Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.</p>
<p>Sociocultural and Political Foundations for Teaching EL Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects of globalization and immigration • Social and cultural contexts of educating nonnative speakers • Federal policy formation related to ELL teaching and learning, including development and implementation of standards-based ELL instruction • Relationships among political constituencies and subsequent influences on instructional policy 						<p>Rating:</p>

	Code=0	Code=1	Code=2	Code=3	Code=4	
<p>Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria specified from 0 to 4. Score and rate each item separately.</p> <p>Descriptors and examples are bulleted below the components.</p>	<p>No evidence that the concept is included in the class syllabus.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in class syllabus.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, required readings, and tests and/or quizzes.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, readings, tests, assignments, and projects for application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations • Lesson plans • Classroom demonstrations • Journal response 	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, required reading, tests, projects, assignments, and teaching with application and feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fieldwork (practicum) • Tutoring 	<p>Rating: Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.</p>
<p>Foundations of Second Language Acquisition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theories second language acquisition • Stage models of second language acquisition • Factors influencing variation in second language acquisition • How bilingualism is achieved and degrees of bilingualism • Differences between academic and social language proficiency • The role of language and culture in overall learning • Misconceptions and myths related to second language learning 						<p>Rating:</p>

	Code=0	Code=1	Code=2	Code=3	Code=4	
<p>Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria specified from 0 to 4. Score and rate each item separately.</p> <p>Descriptors and examples are bulleted below the components.</p>	<p>No evidence that the concept is included in the class syllabus.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in class syllabus.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, required readings, and tests and/or quizzes.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, readings, tests, assignments, and projects for application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations • Lesson plans • Classroom demonstrations • Journal response 	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, required reading, tests, projects, assignments, and teaching with application and feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fieldwork (practicum) • Tutoring 	<p>Rating: Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.</p>
<p>Knowledge for Teaching Academic Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject-matter knowledge • Pedagogical and curricular knowledge of subject matter(s) taught • How students learn content, common misconceptions of content • Integration of assessment to inform instruction 						<p>Rating:</p>

	Code=0	Code=1	Code=2	Code=3	Code=4	
<p>Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria specified from 0 to 4. Score and rate each item separately.</p> <p>Descriptors and examples are bulleted below the components.</p>	<p>No evidence that the concept is included in the class syllabus.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in class syllabus.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, required readings, and tests and/or quizzes.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, readings, tests, assignments, and projects for application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations • Lesson plans • Classroom demonstrations • Journal response 	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, required reading, tests, projects, assignments, and teaching with application and feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fieldwork (practicum) • Tutoring 	<p>Rating: Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.</p>
<p>Effective Instructional Practices for Teaching Academic Content to EL Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint productivity: collaboration between teacher and students toward a common goal • Language proficiency across the curriculum • Instruction linked to students' home and communities • Instruction on high-order complex skills • Using conversation as a means of instruction 						<p>Rating:</p>

	Code=0	Code=1	Code=2	Code=3	Code=4	
<p>Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria specified from 0 to 4. Score and rate each item separately.</p> <p>Descriptors and examples are bulleted below the components.</p>	<p>No evidence that the concept is included in the class syllabus.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in class syllabus.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, required readings, and tests and/or quizzes.</p>	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, readings, tests, assignments, and projects for application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations • Lesson plans • Classroom demonstrations • Journal response 	<p>Concept mentioned in syllabus, required reading, tests, projects, assignments, and teaching with application and feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fieldwork (practicum) • Tutoring 	<p>Rating: Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.</p>
<p>Assessment Practices and Accommodations for EL Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles of measurement and assessment • Appropriate use of classroom accommodations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ English and bilingual dictionaries and glossaries ▪ Simplified English ▪ Extra time ▪ Dual language tests 						<p>Rating:</p>