Preparation for Future Teachers to Meet the Needs of English Language Learners: A Proposal for Curriculum Reform

Alyson Haley
PREPARING FUTURE TEACHERS TO MEET THE NEEDS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS: A PROPOSAL FOR CURRICULUM REFORM

by

Alyson Haley

A Thesis Submitted to Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for a Degree with Honors (Secondary Education)

The Honors College
University of Maine
May 2022

Advisory Committee
Dr. Timothy Reagan, Advisor, Professor of Applied Linguistics and Foreign Language Education,
Christopher Mares, Honors College Preceptor
Dr. Tammy Mills, Assistant Professor of Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction
Kendra Rand, Instructor in the Department of Communication and Journalism
Maria Sandweiss, Lecturer in Spanish.
ABSTRACT

English language learners are an underserved population within the public school system, and there is not enough being done to prepare future teachers to teach these students. The University of Maine College of Education and Human Development is one of the leading teacher preparation programs in Maine, but they no longer offer undergraduate courses on how to teach ELL students. The classes offered at the University address ELLs within the special education context and teaching multiculturalism in a mainstream classroom. Teaching ELLs is different than teaching native English-speaking students, therefore the instructional strategies used within a mainstream classroom are not always effective when teaching ELLs. This thesis analyzes and determines how the University of Maine College of Education and Human Development should best prepare future teachers to meet the needs of English language learners.

After reviewing the empirical literature and instructional practices, I developed a one-semester course that addresses the language acquisition process and teaching methods for ELLs to be used within the UMaine undergraduate education preparation programs. This course would be required for all education students regardless of major and specialization. As a result of this course, future teachers may be better equipped to teach ELLs.
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INTRODUCTION

Over the last ten years Maine, along with the rest of the nation, has experienced a large increase in English language learners (ELLs). As of this current 2021-2022 school year, there are 5,614 ELL students representing over 40 languages (Maine Department of Education, 2021). With the rise in the ELL population, there is an increased need for English language support for these students. This thesis will focus on the discrepancies between the statements made and the practices of teachers in the state of Maine regarding the education of ELLs. The state and the university both are outspoken in advocating for cultural diversity and respect within their communities, but preservice and in-service teachers are not given either adequate initial training or professional development in this subject. For example, as of the Fall 2018 semester, the University of Maine College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) no longer provides a degree concentration in Teaching English as a Second Language. Maine is a member of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) which is dedicated to designing and implementing equitable educational opportunities for ELL students, but preservice teachers at the university level are not exposed to this resource.

The goal of this study is twofold. The first goal is to review the current state of instruction for ELL students in Maine and the ways mainstream teachers are prepared to aid these students. Specifically, this will include a policy review of the Maine Department of Education, resources and professional development for current teachers, and a review of the COEHD teacher preparation courses. As a result of research in current practices and professional development across schools nationwide, this thesis will serve as a resource and call for the university to improve its teacher education program,
so that all future teachers have a basic understanding of how to provide and include
instruction to ELL students. The second goal of this study is to develop a core, required
course syllabus for all education students that introduces the concept of adapting and
providing instruction to ELL students, and by doing so will encourage the University to
make ELL education a priority within our growing multicultural society.

Due to the nature of this project and its time constraints, this thesis will only
address the identified problem and a proposed solution. If this study were to be conducted
under the guise of a master’s thesis, I would conduct a longitudinal study that would
implement the course at the University, as well as follow preservice teachers through
their student teaching and initial teaching years to see if this course did have any effect on
ELL instruction in the mainstream classroom.
BACKGROUND

Legislation

English language learners (ELL) are students within the K-12 population whose primary language is something other than English and are in the process of learning English. Generally, students considered ELLs receive education by teachers that are specialized in the field of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). Ideally, this specialized instruction will provide ELL students, of any age, the resources necessary to eventually integrate to the mainstream classroom and receive the taught curriculum.

The 1974 Lau v Nichols Supreme Court decision set the precedent that schools across the United States must acknowledge the language barrier present in ELL students, and that “providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum” is not equal or equitable education (Lau v Nichols, 1974). In this case, only about half of the Chinese immigrant students in the San Francisco Public Schools System were provided with English language courses, and classes were taught exclusively in English (Lau v Nichols, 1974). It was decided that the lack of supplemental English was in violation of providing equal education as per the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Lau v Nichols, 1974). Since the 1974 case, the ELL field has grown exponentially, and most school systems have put in work to develop an understanding of how ELL students learn and how to best teach these students.

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) has worked to maintain that all educational institutions identify and begin an educational plan for ELL students within 30 days of the beginning of the school year (Every Student Succeeds Act, 2015, p. 58). The ESSA is a revamped version of the 2002 No Child Left Behind Act enacted by Congress
and signed by President George W. Bush and has a direct focus on equal opportunity of education for all students.

Within the state of Maine, teachers are required to fulfill instruction that are aligned to Title III of the *Elementary and Secondary Act* (ESEA), which includes specialized instruction and programming for ELLs (Maine Department of Education, 2021). However, that is not happening. There is virtually no standardized programming or training across the state. Services are randomized based on teacher, and very few schools have established programs. For example, a rural district in Maine recently welcomed two new early primary students into their school that did not speak English. The school did not have an ELL teacher on staff, so the classroom teachers had to try and teach the students themselves with little professional help. The Maine DOE offers ELL professional development opportunities, but they are not required.

University of Toronto professor Jim Cummins first introduced the idea of Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) in 1979, just five years after the *Lau v Nichols* case (Cummins, 1999). BICS and CALP suggest a timeline in which second language acquisition occurs (Cummins, 1999). BICS refers to the “conversational fluency” a person has whereas CALP refers to one’s “ability to understand and express, in both oral and written modes, concepts and ideas that are relevant to success in school” (Cummins, 2008). CALP is specific to the context of schooling due to the “academic” nature in which students are exposed to higher-level vocabulary (Cummins, 2008). Though the validity of BICS and CALP has been widely debated over the past few decades, the general timeline of acquisition has been used to inform ELL practices. In the case of BICS, students develop
the phonological awareness of the target language earlier on and often plateau early
(Cummins, 2008). The distinction arose out of a 1980 study of over 400 teacher referral
forms within the Canadian school system. The study found that most teachers believed
there were little to know disparities in ELL students if they could converse easily in
English, however, these students then tended to perform poorly on English assessments
(Cummins, 2008). The need to distinguish between conversational and academic
language abilities developed into the BICS and CALP distinction.

**English Language Learner Populations**

As of 2018, 10% of the United States’ public-school population are classified as
ELL students receiving ESOL services; 3.4% of the total ELL student population are
from Maine (National Center for Education Statistics, 2021). Across the United States,
71% of ELL students in 2010 spoke Spanish at home. Further complicating the picture is
the fact that six of the top ten languages spoken by ELLs (Chinese, Korean, Hindi,
Arabic, Russian, and Miao/Hmong) do not use the Latin alphabet (Soto, 2015). Though
the vast majority of ELL students are familiar with a Romance language and its alphabet
and vocabulary, there is still a large population of students that are introduced to the
English language with little prior knowledge or exposure to the grammar and semantics.
A student’s native language can affect L2 learning, especially in pronunciation and
vocabulary (Denizer, 2017, p. 45). Due to migration patterns, most of the ELL population
within the United States is concentrated in urban locations, but 4% of the ELL students in
the United States reside in rural and suburban areas - areas which are most akin to Maine
(National Center for Education Statistics, 2021).

In Maine, 1,178 students speak Somali at home, 884 speak Portuguese, and 698
speak Arabic (Maine Department of Education, 2021). Out of the top three languages spoken by students in Maine, only one of those is included in the nation’s top ranked spoken languages by ELLs.

**Connections to the University of Maine**

The University of Maine is Maine’s flagship institution; it is the largest university in the state and among the largest producers of teachers in the state. It is also a research university, holding R1 status. The University of Maine currently offers five undergraduate degree programs within its COEHD and its teacher preparation programs are accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (COEHD, 2014).

The four teacher preparation programs consist of: Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Child Development and Family Relations, and Kinesiology and Physical Education. Within each degree program, students must take a group of core educational courses, regardless of program, as well as declaring a specialization. These core courses include: EHD 101 (The Art and Science of Teaching), EHD 202 (Education in a Multicultural Society), EHD 203 (Educational Psychology), EHD 204 (Teaching and Assessing Student Learning), EHD 301 (Classroom-Based Prevention and Intervention: Supporting Positive Behavior and Academic Achievement), and SED 302 (Adapting Instruction for Students with Disabilities). Of these courses, only EHD 202 and SED 302 specifically target the instruction of ELL students. EHD 202 is:

“An interdisciplinary and multicultural examination of the school-society relationship in the United States. Participants examine their own and others’ assumptions about multiculturalism, globalization, and the political, economic,
ecological, social, ethical and academic purposes that shape teaching and learning in the twenty-first century” (University of Maine, 2022).

Topics included in this course the integration of multicultural texts in a classroom, as well as building opportunities for acknowledging students' cultures outside of the mainstream, white American experience. SED 302, the mandatory special education course aims to:

“Develop knowledge and understanding of students with disabilities. Topics include: adaptation of instruction, legal and ethical issues, family and social relationships and collaboration between school and community agencies” (University of Maine, 2022).

The University of Maine’s teacher preparation program works in conjunction with the Maine Department of Education to ensure that all preservice teachers are receiving the information and training necessary to comply with and perform their legal responsibilities. However, the lack of focus on teaching ELL students is concerning. Though they make up a small percentage of students, only 4% of teachers in Maine are qualified to teach ELL students, and most of these teachers are within Androscoggin and Waldo county, where 11% of teachers are certified ELL teachers (Johnson et al., 2020).
LITERATURE REVIEW

Case Studies

Going into this project, I was most interested in the specific characteristics that teachers need to possess in order to assist their students’ language learning and usage. I was familiar with the process of second language learning from the linguistic perspective, so I investigated the specifics of the teacher’s role to provide any new pedagogical information that pairs with the linguistic process.

The first article I chose surrounds the specific teacher characteristics that can impact the development of key bilingual skills of young students regarding language, literacy, and mathematics. Working in classrooms with dual language learners (DLL) and developing cultural competency has a positive impact on receptive language and literacy development. This publication examined the school readiness skills of 217 latinx DLL students. The students were placed into two groups based on age and were assessed at three different points throughout the year; group 1 was followed for one year of Head Start and group 2 was followed for two years. There is a direct correlation between the amount of time spent training on how to educate DLLs and the students’ literacy skills, but this training is not happening widely across the United States (Ramírez, et al. 2018).

A possible shortcoming of this study is that it does not address school systems where there are not a large number of DLL students or communities with a significant degree of cultural diversity. This article also specifically addresses the Spanish speaking population but not necessarily the ELL population as a whole. While the trends in DLL development were expected, they have led me to wonder if the same outcomes will translate into a general ELL classroom, and whether or not the instructor’s language plays
a large factor in this. Previously I had believed that it would be most effective for the teacher and student to share a language when developing language and literacy competency, but I am interested to see if cultural diversity and competency overall has a similar effect.

While beginning my search into pedagogical information, I wanted to ensure that I was widening my search to include ELL instruction in all subjects. The next case study I examined focused on the reflections of six elementary teachers as they taught science to ELL students. The study used a “web-based video analysis tool as [the teachers] viewed video of their science teaching” (Deaton et al., 2014). The basis of this study is grounded in teacher reflection, which is a skill introduced in teacher preparation programs early on. By videoing the teachers, teachers were then able to view their current practices within the context of their goals and current teaching (Deaton et al., 2014). The goal of this study was to examine what instances informed a teacher’s decision-making regarding working with ELLs (Deaton et al., 2014).

This study took place over a “year-long professional development experience for elementary teachers” and looked specifically at “reflective practice and environmental science content for Kindergarten through fifth grade” (Deaton et al., 2014). This professional development opportunity had six teachers meet during a 2-week summer workshop and eight meetings throughout the academic year: two group follow-up meetings, three individual meetings, and three phone meetings (Deaton et al., 2014). None of the prompted reflection questions were targeted toward the teachers’ work with ELL students, however, each of the participants worked with a large population of ELLs; the focus of this study was not intended to be ELL students (Deaton et al., 2014).
The study found that most of the teachers think more about their students’ cultural backgrounds, and how they relate to content, than the content itself (Deaton et al., 2014). While the findings in this study are important to keep in mind when looking at ELL instruction, this study should not be used as mentor material. I was interested to see how ELLs may influence scientific teaching methods, however, this was not an area largely focused on. I was surprised to see how much of this study was reliant on reflective practice, as this was not an aspect of teaching that I had actively thought about prior.

After looking into current instructors and their practices, I began to think more about what is being done in teacher preparation programs. The first article I looked at studied two sets of preservice teachers. The first group of 62 preservice teachers “completed a survey on: (a) their perceived preparation and self-efficacy regarding ELL students, (b) their attitudes towards ELL students in mainstream classrooms and their parents. They also completed an ELL knowledge test” (Yucesan Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010). The second study observed different high school classrooms that include ELL students to “were observed to determine what these students experienced in a mainstream classroom and how the preservice teachers interacted with them” (Yucesan Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010).

The results from the studies showed that overall, preservice teachers were not well prepared to teach ELLs. Most of the preservice teachers self-reported that they had neutral views toward their preparedness for teaching ELLs as well as interacting with them. Similarly, mentor teachers provided little to no guidance on teaching ELLs, aside from reliance on ELL instructors; the observations looked at how, and if, teachers used “additional resources, classroom activity alterations, and personal modifications elicited
to aid the ELL students” (Yucesan Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010). Overall, they found a lack of support across all teacher roles (preservice, mentor, and supervising) led to varying levels of neglect; preservice teachers would not focus their attention on ELLs, so peers began to provide that support instead (Yucesan Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010).

The bulk of this study focused on the mentor teacher, their practices, and how they influenced their preservice teachers. A shortcoming of this is that there is little known about what instruction the preservice teachers are receiving in their preparation programs. Do they learn about ELL students at all, or do they not interact due to prejudices? While mentor teachers do provide a wealth of knowledge to their preservice teachers, they are not their only source of instructional practices and management techniques, so it is important to look at all of those factors.

**Curriculum and Instructional Strategies**

With the decision to create and propose a course to include the University of Maine’s teacher preparation programs, it was important to not reinvent the wheel. There are a plethora of resources available to educators to help multilingual learners succeed.

The first resource I reviewed was WIDA, an educational consortium consisting of 40 state departments of education, Puerto Rico, and the Northern Mariana Islands. WIDA provides resources focused on language development; they offer “a comprehensive, research-based system of language standards, assessments, professional learning and educator assistance” (WIDA, 2022). WIDA’s main resource is their ELL screener and annual test, ACCESS, that students in grades kindergarten through Grade 12 can take. The goal of the ACCESS assessments is to “monitor students’ progress in learning academic English” (WIDA, 2022). The ACCESS assessments assess the four main
components of language: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. WIDA offers a variety of assessment formats in order to accommodate all students and schools (WIDA, 2022).

While the WIDA site is very informative and provides an established framework, the ACCESS assessments will only be useful once a curriculum has been established. The WIDA framework is a tool that schools should use when assessing their ELL students, but this is not necessarily a resource that preservice educators, and their instructors, should base their methods courses on. Instead, this could be a supplemental tool when learning how to assess ELL students.

After looking at WIDA’s assessment tools, I turned to another consortium of researchers, teachers, and teacher educators to find an established curriculum targeted to educators that can be applied in their classrooms completely. The International Coalition for Multilingual Education and Equity, through the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, has created a set of instructional packets for grades K-12, addressing Levels 1-3 of English proficiency: Entry into English, Building Background, Interdisciplinary Inquiry (ICMEE, 2022). ICMEE partners with WIDA, the California Action Network for Mathematics Excellence and Equity (CANMEE), the National Learning Coalition, and Observations of Pedagogical Excellence in Teachers Across Nations (OPETAN).

Each packet addresses the four core subjects (Math, Social Studies, English Language Arts (ELA), and Science) aligned to Common Core standards, as well as Art and Physical Education. Each packet includes a dictionary that students can use to keep track of words they did not know or find interesting, a journal where students are encouraged to write in their preferred language, and extension activities related to the unit’s themes (ICMEE, 2022). The packets also include a weekly plan that students and
teachers can follow. As students progress through the levels and the packets, their work becomes more student-directed and focuses less on teacher instruction.

The ICMEE curriculum is a great resource to be used as supplemental material for ELL materials but does not provide a framework for adapting work within the mainstream classroom. In my opinion, the ICMEE curriculum is the goal. The framework of the packets is something that teachers can strive to mimic when adapting their own curriculum. However, there is not a clear guide to implementation or where this material would be used in the school setting; this is a universal curriculum to be used at any school, so they are unable to align to specific content. Given the nature of the packets, it is difficult to imagine that this material is to be used in the mainstream classroom. While ICMEE does offer workshops for educators, it would be interesting to see their implementation guide and recommendations for applying this to the mainstream classroom.

As far as instructional strategies, The Teaching Channel’s *ELA for ELL* series provides a comprehensive, six-part video series focused on an ELA unit for middle school ELL students. When looking for existing curriculums, the *ELA for ELL* series provided the best example of the content and implementation that teachers can use. I like how succinct the videos are, but also how universal they are. The series addresses all levels of ELA skills from basic reading and writing skills, to advanced figurative language and comprehension skills. Not only does the series provide a demonstration of the lesson or unit, but The Teaching Channel also provides supplemental material like a full unit plan, slides, anchor charts, and worksheets.

The Teaching Channel is a resource curated by teachers and created for teachers.
Each mini unit is easily adaptable to specific ELA content being taught in the classroom and serves as a guide for educators. Although this series is geared toward ELA classrooms, these strategies can also be employed in other subjects. Video three, “Interacting with Complex Texts: Scaffolding Reading”, and video four, “Extending Understanding: Vocabulary Development”, could be easily used in Social Studies, Science, and even Math classrooms. The vocabulary mini unit provides worksheets and supporting material that is not content specific. While this series seems to be the most effective for preservice teachers, as it can easily fit into a methods course, and it seems easily adaptable to other subjects, the specificity around ELA makes me wonder if there are strategies that are best suited for other subjects. Although the focus on vocabulary and comprehension could be helpful for other subjects, I believe this series would be more beneficial if the series was expanded.

Though I was focused mostly on ELL instructional strategies, it was important to remember that my research was centered around ELLs in the mainstream classroom. As a future teacher, who will more than likely teach on the east coast, I know that a majority of my students will not be ELL students. Given that, it is just as important for students to be culturally aware, as it is for teachers.

I began looking into ways that teachers can prepare students more effectively to interact with peers from other cultures or peers that speak other languages. Finland is arguably as monocultural as Maine, so when I discovered that Finland’s education system began incorporating multicultural literature, I was interested to know if they saw any changes in their school culture.

This study examined how traditional minority groups in Finland were presented
through literature and how immigration has been represented throughout children’s literature (Aerila & Kokkola, 2013). In the 1990s there was a large wave of immigrants moving into Finland, just as there was a recession, which was followed by a very public, negative reaction that was present in most Finnish media. Yet the “cultural transformation” had little to no effect on Finnish children’s literature; only 15 adolescent novels published between 1990 and 2007 had multicultural themes or characters, however they typically portray non-Finnish characters in a derogatory manner (Aerila & Kokkola, 2013). Due to this lack of quality multicultural Finnish literature, schools began reading multicultural fiction within the context of their English studies. Classrooms that began reading multicultural literature saw an increase in cultural awareness as well as enabling students to “engage empathetically with complex issues” (Aerila & Kokkola, 2013).

The study began by examining 14- and 15-year-old students and their perceptions of other cultures in order to establish a baseline. They then began to read fragments of contemporary Finnish literature that contained multicultural themes (Angels in the Snow by Olli Hakkarainen, Dumdum by Kari Levola, and Alex, Aisha, and Sam by Marja-Leena Tiainen), and then write what they thought the ends of the stories would be (Aerila & Kokkola, 2013). The students were influenced to write about multicultural issues, though many “revealed their previously held values in the anticipatory stories they wrote” (Aerila & Kokkola, 2013). After establishing the initial attitudes (mostly negativity powered by fear), teachers began reading more mentor texts and comparing them with the anticipatory stories that the students had written, not only did students find that their perceptions were often different from their peers, but they were also different than reality.
(Aerila & Kokkola, 2013).

This study reinforced the idea that as teachers, we cannot lose sight of every aspect that makes up our classroom. It is important to practice efficient and effective instructional strategies, but it is also important to maintain a productive classroom environment. A shortcoming of this study is that it did not follow or produce any specific instances, which I believe would have only further highlighted the impact of multicultural literature. It is also important to remember that this was done in Finland, which has a much different population make-up than the United States, and a different history of immigration. I would be interested to see a study similar to this done within the United States, as well as one that addresses a specific community.

**Public Testimony**

When beginning this project, I began with a broad search of ELL curriculums and studies to start gaining a greater understanding of the field. In this search, I found many journal articles about ELL education and ELL students, however I found a lot of personal testimonies from educators, parents, and students, which is something I was not expecting.

The ACLU of Maine conducted interviews with over one hundred students, parents, and educational professionals throughout the state of Maine in regard to experiences immigrants and students of color have had. The goal of this report was to highlight the discrimination faced by minority students in Maine, specifically within the school setting. The report drew information from schools in Auburn, Bangor, Belfast, Biddeford, Calais, Gardiner, Gorham, Lewiston, MSAD 37 (Addison, Columbia Falls, Harrington, and Milbridge), Portland, South Portland, and Westbrook (ACLU, 2017).
The bulk of the research was based on the immigrant student experience, so it encompassed religious, racial, and language discrimination, and aimed to serve as a tool for educators to improve equity in their schools.

Throughout this study, the ACLU found that discrimination happens across the entire state and spans all grade levels. Students experienced slurs, physical violence, threats, and a general tone of unwelcomeness. The discrimination students faced extended past students and the classroom; many students reported open harassment from teachers as well as administrators and bus drivers (ACLU, 2017). After conducting their research, the ACLU developed “programs focused on three areas: educator and school community awareness; equity in access and outcomes; and parent and family outreach” (ACLU, 2017).

While the programs created by the ACLU do not specifically address ELL students and how they can be supported linguistically in the classroom, the study raised alarms for me as a future educator. Schools play a critical role in society and adolescent development; schools are supposed to be a safe space for students to learn and grow. The experiences captured by the 2017 study demonstrate the exact opposite atmosphere that these students should be in. Though the ACLU’s report did not aid my understanding of how to teach preservice teachers to interact pedagogically with ELL students, it became a driving force behind the need to ensure teachers are culturally responsive and strive for equity.
PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

It is essential that all educators are prepared, and supported, to teach a diverse classroom, regardless of where they are. The declining interest in the English as a Second Language concentration within the COEHD, to the point of removing it from the undergraduate course of study, proves that reimplementing the concentration may not be the best way to educate preservice teachers on the subject matter. However, implementing a mandatory, 3-credit course for all education majors provides the University the opportunity to reach a population of teachers that otherwise may not receive the proper training.

Addressing the needs of ELLs within the mainstream classroom is still a relatively new field, so there is little known about how specifically this service should be provided, however many teacher preparation programs are beginning to address ELLs within their general methods courses. Preservice teacher education is the foundation of teacher development in teaching ELLs (Lucas & Villegas, 2013). While many universities have dedicated specific majors or minors to ELL education, others have taken “an infusion approach” (de Jong & Naranjo, 2019).

The proposed course, entitled Teaching English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom, and led by faculty within the COEHD, would meet multiple times a week and would span the length of a semester. This course would follow the University’s typical Monday, Wednesday, Friday schedule, or the Tuesday, Thursday schedule. Depending on which days the course would occur, each session would either be 50 minutes or one hour and 15 minutes. Potential mentor texts for this course include *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning, Second Edition: Teaching English*...
Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom by Pauline Gibbons, Second Language Learning and Language Teaching by Vivian Cook, and Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (Cambridge Language Teaching Library) by Jack Richards. The purpose of this course would be to prepare preservice teachers to interact and adapt instruction for ELL students with the acknowledgement that they may not always have a certified ELL instructor at their disposal.

Unit 1: Introduction to Linguistics

As this course is intended for preservice teachers to learn how to adapt instruction for ELL students, it is important that teachers understand how students acquire language; the first few weeks of the course will be spent overviewing the basics of linguistics and second language acquisition specifically. The first week of the course will serve as an introduction to the course where the instructor will lay the foundation for the course by explaining topics that will be covered, course objectives, and the assessments.

The second week will focus on communication and language. There are two subsections to this week’s content: the nature and characteristics of human language, and the components of human language. Within components of human language, the course will cover phonology, morphology, and semantics. This week will look at languages, as well as looking specifically at the English language as a reference and to set a baseline understanding. Students will be able to compare and contrast different language families and their language components. Week three will transition into language acquisition. Students will begin learning about L1 acquisition, followed by L2 acquisition and the Critical Age Period. In order to understand second language acquisition, it is important to first have a basis for language learning in general.
The final week of the first unit will be an introduction to Stephen Krashen’s five hypotheses of second language acquisition. Week four’s focus will look at the Acquisition-Learning hypothesis, the Monitor hypothesis, the Natural Order hypothesis, the Input hypothesis, and the Affective Filter hypothesis. Students will be required to read Krashen’s *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*, how all hypotheses will be covered; additional readings will be provided in Brightspace. Week four will also introduce the compare and contrast report that will be due in week five.

**Unit 2: Sociolinguistics**

The second unit will focus on sociolinguistics and how it is present in the classroom. Week five will cover language appreciation and socialization. Students will be provided with Jin Sook Lee and Mary Bucholtz’s chapter “Language Socialization Across Learning Spaces” from *The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction* as required reading material. Language appreciation is an ideology that aims to remove bias from perceptions of language and introduce a mindset that focuses on the positive qualities of languages and multilingualism. Language socialization looks at the intersection of culture and language.

Week six will continue looking at language diversity by focusing specifically on different language biases that exist today. Students will be asked to think about their opinions on English, Spanish, African American English, and Russian before engaging in discussion about their beliefs. Conversation will cover cultural topics associated with the language as well as specific language features like how the language sounds or looks. The instructor will then lead the class in a discussion of how many of the language biases have arisen.
Week seven will begin to turn the course toward classroom instruction with an overview of culturally responsive teaching. The two main focuses of this week will be multiculturalism and literacy - specifically multicultural literature. Students will be required to read the ASCD’s *A Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching* prior to class. It is important to revisit multiculturalism in the classroom because teachers need to also keep in mind their classroom environment when they are teaching. Multiculturalism and multicultural literature are a topic covered in EHD 202, however revisiting the topic will provide preservice teachers more resources on how to integrate their ELL students’ cultures into the classroom. Creating a respectful classroom environment is vital to all student learning. This week will also introduce the Multicultural Book Talk assignment that will be due in week eight.

**Unit 3: Instructional Strategies**

Week eight will shift the focus of the course to specific instructional strategies. Week eight will look at instructional strategies in general (whole language, cooperative language learning, content-based instruction, task-based language teaching, etc.). Students will be required to read selected chapters from *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (Cambridge Language Teaching Library).

Weeks nine and ten will cover teaching reading and teaching writing. Week nine will focus on teaching reading by looking at building phonemic awareness in students as well as the reading process. In addition to selected chapters from *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning*, students will be asked to view “Interacting with Complex Texts: Scaffolding Reading” by the Teaching Channel. In week nine, students will be asked to begin their Reading strategy Try-it, which will be due in week ten. Week ten will
introduce teaching writing strategies. This week will cover the continuum from speaking to writing and how to scaffold writing.

Week eleven will focus entirely on different assessment strategies. Determining the level of an ELL student will be covered, however this is not a responsibility of the classroom teacher. Students will be required to read *Assessing English-Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom* prior to class. A main focus of this week will be for preservice teachers to learn how to align assessments to the state standards for ELL students specifically, and the differentiation that must occur.

**Unit 4: Connection to the Classroom**

The final unit of the course will begin to put everything together and how teachers will adapt their instruction for ELLs. Week twelve will focus specifically on adapting curriculum. Students will learn how to use ELLs’ literacy status to modify and guide instruction. Students will refer to the chapter in *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (Cambridge Language Teaching Library) which details content-based instruction. Other focuses of this week are activating students’ prior knowledge and extending student understanding through vocabulary development - these are two strategies that can be used when trying to teach specific content instead of reading and writing skills.

Week thirteen will focus on the role of an ELL instructor and how the relationship they have with the classroom teacher and the student. While caseload and teacher availability may not always guarantee an ELL instructor is always present, it is still important to know what ELL instructors do and how they can be a resource for mainstream classroom teachers. This week will also cover working with the special
education program, as many schools tend to address their ELL students within the special education department. It will be noted that linguistic diversity is not a learning disability, and IEPs should only be presented if a specific learning disability is identified. The final week of the course will be student presentations of their Adapted Lesson Presentations.

Assignments

There will be six major assignments in this course that will be supplemented with required readings and class discussions. Each assignment will have a designated point value, and the total of all the assignments will equal 100 points. The first assignment students will complete is a compare and contrast report of two of Krashen’s acquisition hypotheses. After learning about Krashen’s theories in week four, students will complete a two-three-page report that compares two theories of their choice. Students will outline the acquisition hypotheses, state their similarities and differences, identify which theory aligns most with their own beliefs, and how they could see their preferred hypothesis playing out in their future classroom. This assignment will be worth ten points and will be due at the end of week five.

The next assignment students will complete will be introduced in week seven and will be due by the end of week eight. This assignment will be worth ten points. After reviewing a list of multicultural novels, students will select one to read and write a one-page review. The review should include a brief synopsis of the book, their opinion of the book, and why it should or should not be featured in a classroom. Students will give a two-minute book talk at the start of session two in week eight as a way of sharing their books with their classmates.
The third assignment students will complete is a Reading Strategy Try-It. After learning about different reading strategies to help ELL students, preservice teachers must select one reading strategy and describe how they might use that strategy in their classroom. Students are encouraged to make this content related. The Try-It does not need to be a full lesson, but rather a one-page write-up of their ideas. This assignment will be due at the start of week ten and will be worth 15 points.

Following the Reading Strategy Try-It, students will be then tasked to complete a Writing Strategy Try-It. Using the same guidelines, students will select one writing strategy and think of a way that they can apply that to their own instruction. Students are once again encouraged to align this strategy with a content specific lesson. This assignment will be due at the beginning of week eleven and will be worth 15 points.

Ahead of submitting the final assignment, students will need to submit a Reading Journal. The Reading Journal assignment is one that will be introduced in the first week of class. Students will maintain a reading log that addresses the chapters of *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning* that they are reading, as well as any other supplemental reading and viewing material. For each assigned reading, students will be tasked with identifying things that they are seeing, thinking, and wondering about each reading’s topic. Students will be prompted to write things they are seeing, noticing, or observing about the topic, connections, and ideas the topic makes them think about, and anything the assigned reading is making them wonder. As this is a semester long assignment, students will submit their logs at the end of week fourteen. This assignment will be worth 10 points.
The final assignment of the course will consist of two parts: the adapted lesson plan and the presentation. The Adapted Lesson Plan Project will be introduced to students in week eleven and will be due during week fifteen, before the students present. For the lesson plan portion of the assignment, students will need to create a lesson plan by using the Universal By Design (UBD) template that modifies instruction for an ELL student. Students can select any topic of their choice. This lesson plan must specifically address how the lesson will be modified for the ELL student. The lesson plan portion of the assignment will be worth 30 points. In the last week of the course, students must present their adapted lesson plan. The presentation must address the lesson topic, lesson objectives, the procedure, what modifications were made, and any formative and/or summative assessments included in the lesson. The presentation will be worth 10 points.
ANTICIPATED RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As this is a proposal for curriculum reform, and has yet to be implemented, we do not know how this will impact preservice teachers at the University of Maine. It is the hope that if the University implements this course, future teachers graduating from the University of Maine will be better prepared to teach ELL students regardless of whether or not they have adequate access to an ELL instructor, or their own foreign language knowledge.

As one of the leading institutions in Maine in preparing future educators, it is essential that we are providing these teachers with the most well-rounded education, so that they are able to teach and assist all students. Providing an equitable education to all students should be the goal for all educators, as it is a legal obligation. While engaging in professional development opportunities once in the field is an excellent way to serve students, if the University can provide that initial education, teachers may be a step ahead in the long run. Learning how to adapt instruction for all students is an ethical obligation of teachers and school districts. If, for some reason, the school district is unable to provide adequate support for students with outside resources, teachers must be knowledgeable enough to provide as much support as they can.

Instructional strategies for mainstream students differ enormously from instructional strategies for ELL students, so it is imperative that teachers have those skills and the background. While the University of Maine does offer courses in instructional and assessment strategies, there are none that teach this special differentiation skill. Language diversity is not a disability, so it should not be treated as such. Though assigning students to a resource room may seem like a beneficial solution due to staffing
concerns, the supports needed for ELL students differ from the supports needed for special education students. Differentiating assessments for ELL students is similar, but still very different from differentiating instruction for students with specific learning disabilities or intellectual disabilities. While those strategies can be used, they are not always the best, most effective practices.

While we do not know if this specific course will be an effective teacher preparation course, or if providing education on this topic to preservice teachers will be effective enough for real-world applications, we do know that ELL training overall works. It has been proven that ELL students' knowledge of the English language is not comparable to their general knowledge, and that many times ELL students struggle in school because they do not know the specific content related words (Cummins, 1999). Something as simple as providing a vocabulary sheet for the student can go a long way.

On average, ELL students tend to lag behind their native English peers - in both fourth grade reading and eighth-grade math, it is about 40 percentage points (Murphey, 2014). Similarly, ELL students may display academic readiness for more advanced courses, yet about 60% of ELL students never take classes more challenging than college-prep courses (Mitchell, 2016). In all cases, targeted ELL instruction is considered the best practice for ELL students regarding language acquisition, however it often alienates ELLs and does not provide enough sociocultural learning opportunities. Keeping these students in the mainstream classroom as much as possible has the opportunity to not only help them learn academically, but also grow as members of their community. Excluding ELL students from the mainstream classroom prevents them from
receiving content and social content. This is something that cannot be done if teachers are not given the necessary tools.
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Course Description

This course is designed to introduce future teachers to the theoretical and practical foundations of teaching English Language Learners (ELLs) in public school classrooms. It includes the study of second language acquisition (SLA) theories, social, cultural, and educational barriers to SLA, and teaching strategies and skills that mainstream teachers can use when interacting with and adapting instruction for ELLs.

Prerequisites

Teacher candidacy or permission of instructor.

Required Textbook and Readings

There are two required textbooks for this course:


Additional readings will be posted on Brightspace. Students will also be required to watch selected videos from The Teaching Channel’s ELA for ELL series. All reading assignments should be completed before the class for which they are assigned.

Indigenous Land Acknowledgement

The University of Maine recognizes that it is located on Marsh Island in the homeland of the Penobscot Nation, where issues of water and territorial rights, and encroachment upon sacred sites, are ongoing. Penobscot homeland is connected to the other Wabanaki Tribal Nations — the Passamaquoddy, Maliseet, and Micmac — through kinship, alliances, and diplomacy. The university also recognizes that the Penobscot Nation and the other Wabanaki Tribal Nations are distinct, sovereign, legal and political entities with their own powers of self-governance and self-determination.

Ties to the Conceptual Framework

The Conceptual Framework for the University of Maine’s College of Education and Human Development provides the basis for coherence among the programs, curricula, instruction, scholarship, service, candidate performance, assessment, and evaluation of the College. The overarching theme that drives our professional education programs is the idea that reflective practice is critical to the development of excellent professionals.

In order to become reflective practitioners, we are guided by three primary principles: 1) excellence in teaching and learning, 2) the synthesis of theory and practice, and 3) collaboration and mentoring.

- It is our belief that reflective practice requires a thoughtful and evaluative analysis of the many forces and factors that affect teaching, learning, and schooling.
- We believe that reflective practice requires recursive self-evaluation and systematic assessment of students and programs.
- Reflective practice draws upon shared, ambitious standards and expectations for teaching, research, and service.
- Reflective practice promotes personal and professional understanding of one’s own actions and potential and contributes to continually improving performance.
- The reflective educator is continually developing understandings regarding what content is important to teach, how students learn, and how to teach so that students will learn.
- When faced with educational decisions, the reflective educator knows how to identify and interpret relevant information that can be used to make an informed, rational, and justifiable decision regarding educational practices.

The ultimate outcome of reflective practice is to implement educational practices that are equitable, meaningful, and relevant for student and societal welfare.
The Conceptual Framework aligns the professional and State standards with candidate proficiencies expected by the unit and programs for preparation of educators in that all UMaine proficiencies have been clustered in relationship to the three central principles that guide the Conceptual Framework that detail expectations for candidates’ knowledge, skills, dispositions, and impact on student learning.

In addition, the Conceptual Framework explicitly affirms and addresses the unit’s professional commitments and professional dispositions, especially its ongoing commitments to diversity and technology integration, as these critical components are embedded throughout all levels of our program and are continually assessed throughout the candidate’s development into a reflective practitioner.

Commitment to Diversity

Ours is a diverse nation founded upon the protection of rights and liberties regardless of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, religion, exceptionalities, language, and sexual orientation. The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) identifies these identity groups, along with geographic region, in its definition of diversity and expects that diversity will be a pervasive characteristic of any quality preparation program. Other identity groups include, but are not limited to, age, community, family status, institutional affiliations, political beliefs, personality styles, interests, and abilities. Schooling, especially public schooling, continues to have a central role in educating our nation's citizens for life in this diverse and pluralistic society. Choosing to teach in public schools means accepting the moral and ethical responsibilities inherent in building a strong democratic republic. In this course you will have many opportunities to examine your beliefs regarding diversity and the challenges of providing equitable and fair educational opportunities for all.

Course Attendance and Participation
Attendance and active participation are required in all classes, both Lectures and Discussion Sections. All course assignments should be submitted by or before the day they are due, even in the case of an excused absence. Any unexcused absences can impact your final course grade; multiple absences can result in failing the course. Religious holidays and observances are covered by a different set of University policies. For such holidays and observances, see the Observance of Religious Holidays/Events section below.

Course participation involves a number of different things. First, you should arrive at class fully prepared: be sure that you have completed all of the required readings for class, watched or listened to all required materials, and thought about and considered the topics to be addressed. Part of this preparation will include taking notes that summarize and analyze these materials. You should also arrive at class with questions, comments, or concerns that you may have about the materials. Second, you should be prepared to engage with others – both the Discussion Section Instructor and the other students in the course – through discussion, dialog, group work, and class projects.

Course Learning Outcomes
By the end of this course, the student will be able to:
1. identify and understand the components of language;
2. identify and understand the stages of second language acquisition;
3. explain Krashen’s theory of acquisition;
4. understand language biases and how they may present themselves in an English medium classroom;
5. find multicultural literature that supports a respectful and productive classroom environment;
6. develop culturally responsive lesson plans;
7. describe at least ten instructional strategies for use in the classroom that will support ELL students;
8. describe five strategies for differentiating instruction for ELL students;
9. identify different assessment strategies for ELL students;
10. collaborate effectively with peers to mimic the relationship to the ELL teacher; and
11. analyze and assess adapted lessons for ELL students.

Grading and Course Expectations

Final grades in the course will be determined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Krashen’s Hypotheses Compare/Contrast</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multicultural Book Talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reading Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Writing Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reading Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adapted Lesson and Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL POINTS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grading scale used to determine final grades in this course is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points (Out of 100)</th>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93-100</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-92</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-89</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-87</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-82</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-79</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-77</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-72</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-69</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-67</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Krashen’s Hypotheses Compare/Contrast
After reviewing Stephen Krashen’s five hypotheses of second language acquisition, students will select two to compare and contrast. This will be a two-to-three-page report. This report must also include which hypothesis aligns most closely to their beliefs, as well as how they believe this acquisition theory may appear in the classroom.

Multicultural Book Talk
Students will select a multicultural novel to read and complete a one-page review of. The review must include a brief synopsis of the book, the student’s opinion the book, and whether it would be useful to include in a classroom’s library or not. Students will also present a two-minute book talk to their classmates.

Reading Strategy Try-It
Students will select one reading strategy and complete a one-page write up about how they could implement it in their future classroom. Students are encouraged to make this content specific. This write-up does not need to be in the form of a UBD lesson but should rather just be an explanation of their ideas.

Writing Strategy Try-It
Students will select one writing strategy and complete a one-page write up about how this could be implemented in their future classroom. Students are encouraged to make this content specific. This write up does not need to be in the format of a UBD lesson but should rather just be an explanation of their ideas.

Reading Journal
Students maintain a reading journal throughout the semester and will write entries based on the week’s assigned readings. Each entry will include one paragraph about what students are seeing, noticing, or observing in their readings, one paragraph about what the readings are making them think about, and one paragraph about what the readings are making them wonder about.

Adapted Lesson and Presentations
Students will create an adapted lesson plan, using the UBD template, that could be used in their future classroom. Students are encouraged to choose any topic of their choice. Students will then present their adapted lesson plans to their classmates. Each presentation must address the lesson topic, objectives, the procedure, what modifications were made, and any formative and/or summative assessments included in the lesson.
University of Maine Policies

**Mutual Respect**

It is expected that students will conduct their affairs with proper regard for the rights of others. All members of the University community share a responsibility for maintaining an environment in which actions are guided by mutual respect, integrity, and reason.

**Confidentiality**

All academic records of students are maintained in the highest of confidence as directed by FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act). For more information on the University of Maine FERPA Policy, please click on the following link: http://catalog.umaine.edu/content.php?catoid=50&navoid=1001.

**Non-Discrimination and Non-Sexist Language**

The University of Maine does not discriminate on the grounds of race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, including transgender status and gender expression, national origin, citizenship status, age, disability, genetic information, or veteran’s status. Questions and complaints about discrimination should be directed to the Director of Equal Opportunity, 101 North Stevens Hall, 207.581.1226.

The University has made a firm public commitment to non-sexist language in all of its classrooms and communications. For further information, see: http://www.umaine.edu/womensstudies/home/non-sexist-language-policy.

**Use of Electronic Communications**

All users at the University of Maine are expected to use network systems with proper regard for the rights of others and the University. For more information on the University of Maine Electronic Communications Policy, please click on the following link: http://www.umaine.edu/it/policies/communication.php.

**Academic Honesty Statement**

Academic honesty is very important. It is dishonest to cheat on exams, to copy term papers, to submit papers written by another person, to fake experimental results, or to copy or reword parts of books or articles into your own papers without appropriately citing the source. Students committing or aiding in any of these violations may be given failing grades for an assignment or for an entire course, at the discretion of the instructor. In addition to any academic action taken by an instructor, these violations are also subject to action under the University of Maine Student Conduct Code. The maximum possible sanction under the student conduct code is dismissal from the University. Please see the

Students Accessibility Services Statement

If you have a disability for which you may be requesting an accommodation, please contact Student Accessibility Services, 121 East Annex, 581.2319, as early as possible in the term. Students who have already been approved for accommodations by SAS and have a current accommodation letter should meet with Prof. Reagan privately as soon as possible.

Course Schedule Disclaimer (Disruption Clause)

In the event of an extended disruption of normal classroom activities (due to COVID-19 or other long-term disruptions), the format for this course may be modified to enable its completion within its programmed time frame. In that event, you will be provided an addendum to the syllabus that will supersede this version.

Observance of Religious Holidays/Events

The University of Maine recognizes that when students are observing significant religious holidays, some may be unable to attend classes or labs, study, take tests, or work on other assignments. If they provide adequate notice (at least one week and longer if at all possible), these students are allowed to make up course requirements as long as this effort does not create an unreasonable burden upon the instructor, department, or University. At the discretion of the instructor, such coursework could be due before or after the examination or assignment. No adverse or prejudicial effects shall result to a student’s grade for the examination, study, or course requirement on the day of religious observance. The student shall not be marked absent from the class due to observing a significant religious holiday. In the case of an internship or clinical, students should refer to the applicable policy in place by the employer or site.

Sexual Discrimination Reporting

The University of Maine is committed to making campus a safe place for students. Because of this commitment, if you tell a teacher about an experience of sexual assault, sexual harassment, stalking, relationship abuse (dating violence and domestic violence), sexual misconduct or any form of gender discrimination involving members of the campus, your teacher is required to report this information to Title IX Student Services or the Office of Equal Opportunity.

If you want to talk in confidence to someone about an experience of sexual discrimination, please contact these resources:
For confidential resources on campus: Counseling Center: 207-581-1392 or Cutler Health Center: at 207-581-4000.

For confidential resources off campus: Rape Response Services: 1-800-871-7741 or Partners for Peace: 1-800-863-9909.

Other resources: The resources listed below can offer support but may have to report the incident to others who can help:

For support services on campus: Title IX Student Services: 207-581-1406, Office of Community Standards: 207-581-1409, University of Maine Police: 207-581-4040 or 911. Or see the OSAVP website for a complete list of services.

Incomplete Grades

I, for “Incomplete.” This grade means that, in consultation with the student, the instructor has postponed the assignment of a final grade to allow the student to complete specific work not turned in before the end of the semester. Instructors assign the “I” grade only when they are persuaded that event beyond the student’s control prevented the completion of assigned work on time and when the student has participated in more than 50% of the class.

A grade of I (Incomplete) is assigned if a student has been doing work of acceptable quality but, for reasons satisfactory to the instructor, has not completed all of the work required to earn credit by the end of the semester or session.

The work must be completed and submitted to the instructor by the date agreed to with the instructor, but not later than one year (i.e., 12 months) from the end of the semester or session in which the incomplete was granted.

A grade of I remains on the transcript permanently if not resolved or if a written request for an extension is not approved within the allotted time period for removing the incomplete. The request for an exception to regulation, listing the circumstances necessitating the extension, the work that remains unfinished and a specific deadline for completion, must be approved by the instructor, the student’s advisor (for degree students), Graduate Program Coordinator, and Dean. An extension will be granted only under unusual circumstances. For grades of I, it is the student’s responsibility to reach and maintain an understanding with the instructor concerning the timely completion of the work. Source: https://studentrecords.umaine.edu/files/2013/03/2012-2013-Undergraduate-Catalog.pdf.

Course Outline
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Welcome  
Course Overview  
*Reading Journal (due in week 14) |
| 2    | Communication and Language  
Nature and Characteristics of Human Language  
Components of Human Language  
Phonology  
Morphology  
Syntax |
| 3    | First Language Acquisition  
Introduction to Second Language Acquisition (SLA)  
L1 Stages  
Critical Age Period  
L2 Stages |
| 4    | Krashen’s Monitor Theory of Language Acquisition  
Five Hypotheses  
*Compare/Contrast Hypotheses assessment (due in week 5) |
| 5    | Language Diversity and Sociolinguistics  
Language Appreciation  
Language Socialization |
| 6    | Language Biases  
Spanish  
African American English  
Russian  
English  
Linguicism |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7    | Culturally Responsive Teaching  
*Multicultural Literature Book Talk (due in week 8) |
| 8    | TESOL Strategies for the Classroom |
| 9    | Learning to Read and the ELL Student  
*Reading Strategy Try-It (due in week 10) |
| 10   | Learning to Write and the ELL Student  
*Writing Strategy Try-it (due in week 11) |
| 11   | Assessment  
Determining ELL Status  
Assessing ELL Students  
Progress Monitoring  
*Begin Adapted Lesson Plan Project (due in week 15) |
| 12   | Adapting the Curriculum for ELL Students  
How to Plan and Adapt |
| 13   | Adapting the Curriculum  
Working with Other Professionals  
Language Different is not a Disability |
| 14   | Working with Other Professionals |
| 15   | Adapted Lesson Plan Presentations |
APPENDIX B

Glossary

Anchor Charts - Anchor charts are used in classrooms to display students’ and teachers’ thoughts and ideas in one place during a lesson or unit.

Anticipatory stories - Tools used in Language Arts classes to practice making inferences; students read a portion of the story and write what they believe is going to happen in the rest of the story.

BICS – Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills; basic linguistic skills needed in everyday, face-to-face interactions.

CALP – Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency; proficiency in academic language and language in varying classroom contexts.

Content-Based Instruction – An integrated approach to language teaching in which instruction is centered around the content students will learn.

Cooperative Language Learning – A language learning strategy that partners ELLs with peers to aid in the learning of concepts and content.

Critical Age Period – A period child brain development in which full native competence is possible when acquiring a language.

Culturally Responsive Teaching – A research-based approach to teaching that connects students’ cultures, languages, and life experiences to what they learn in school.

Curriculum – A course of study.

Differentiation – Adapting instruction to meet individual students’ needs.

Dual language learners (DLL) – Students that are learning a second language while continuing to develop their home language at the same time.
**English language learners (ELL)** – Students that come from non-English speaking homes and are learning English.

**Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)** – A federal education law that commits to equal opportunity for all students.

**Human language** – A distinct form of communication specific to humans and is compositional.

**IEP** – Individualized Education Program; details special education instruction, supports, and services a student may need established by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

**L1** – L1 refers to a student’s first language.

**L2** – L2 refers to a student’s non-native or target language.

**Language appreciation** – An ideology that aims to remove bias from perceptions of language and introduce a mindset that focuses on the positive qualities of languages and multilingualism.

**Language acquisition** – The process by which humans gain the ability to learn and use a language.

**Language biases** – Prejudiced toward a language due to cultural practices and beliefs.

**Language socialization** – The study of how linguistic and cultural development are linked.

**Lau v Nichols** – A 1974 Supreme Court Case in which the Court decided that the lack of supplemental language support for ELLs in public schools was a violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

**Linguicism** – Discrimination based on language or dialect.
Linguistics – The study of language and its structure.

Literacy – The ability to read and write.

Mainstream classroom – A general education classroom for students that do not require accommodations.

Mentor teacher – In-service teachers that provide support and mentoring to preservice and first-year teachers.

Methods – Courses within a teacher preparation program that specifically teach instructional strategies.

Monocultural – Relating to a culture that is the same across a large area.

Morphology – The study of the form of words.

Multicultural literature – Literature about people who are from diverse cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, and religious backgrounds.

Multiculturalism – The way a society deals with cultural diversity.

Multilingualism – The knowledge of more languages than a native language.

Pedagogy – The method and practice of teaching as an academic subject.

Phonology – The aspect of linguistics that deals with systems of sounds.

Preservice teacher – Students in a teacher training program; the teacher is engaged in a period of teaching that is supervised by a mentor teacher.

R1 – Status that universities can hold if they meet specific benchmarks in research activity.

Scaffolding – A method of instruction where teachers provide support to students as they learn and develop a new skill or concept.
Semantics – The branch of linguistics associated with the meaning of a word, phrase, or sentence.

Sociolinguistics – The study of language in relation to societal factors.

Special Education – Instruction designed to meet the needs of a child with a disability.

Specific Learning Disability – A learning disability that affects a student’s ability to listen, think, speak, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations.

Task-Based Language Teaching – A language teaching approach that has students solve a task using authentic language use and instead of using simple grammar and vocabulary questions.

Teacher Preparation Program – A state approved program designed to prepare future teachers to meet the requirements for initial teacher licensure.

TESOL – Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Whole Language teaching – A teaching strategy that advocates teaching L2 in a way that resembles L1 learning.
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