

KANSAS PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE AND PREPAREDNESS IN
CREATING LESSONS DRIVEN BY KANSAS ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY
STANDARDS

By

2016

Jihyun Song

Submitted to the graduate degree program in the Curriculum and Teaching and the Graduate
Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

Chairperson Dr. Lizette Peter

Dr. Bruce Frey

Dr. Phil McKnight

Dr. Paul Markham

Dr. Suzanne Rice

Date Defended: April 29, 2016

The Dissertation Committee for Jihyun Song
certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

KANSAS PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE AND PREPAREDNESS IN
CREATING LESSONS DRIVEN BY KANSAS ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY
STANDARDS

Chairperson Dr. Lizette Peter

Date approved: May 3, 2016

ABSTRACT

This study explored Kansas pre-service ESOL endorsement seekers' knowledge and preparedness in creating lessons driven by Kansas English language proficiency standards. It elucidated the extent to which Kansas pre-service teachers consider Kansas English language proficiency (ELP) standards in their lessons, how well prepared they perceive they are to create ELP standard-driven lesson plans, and what challenges they face in planning for SDAIE (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English). In addition, this study examined to what extent pre-service teachers align Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to Kansas ELP standards in their thinking, planning, and practice, as well as their preparedness and challenges in aligning those two sets of standards. The participants of this study were 17 pre-service ESOL endorsement seekers who were enrolled in the School of Education at the University of Kansas. Both quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures were implemented to investigate the research questions of this study. There were three main sources of data: lesson plans, a questionnaire, and interviews.

Inferences based on data collected led to several conclusions: 1) The state ELP standards limitedly inform pre-service teachers' lesson plans; 2) Pre-service teachers experienced difficulty to understand the ELP standards and to meet unique language needs of ELLs with wide range of English language proficiency levels. Those factors contribute to the limited usage of the ELP standards. 3) Pre-service teachers are not sufficiently prepared to create lesson plans that derive from the ELP standards due to lack of exposure to the standards and lack of practice on the standards. 4) Pre-service teachers do not align the CCSS to the ELP standards in their lesson planning. On the contrary, pre-service teachers show strong confidence in their abilities to create lesson plans that derived from the CCSS. 5) Pre-service teachers mostly cited two factors as

primary challenges when creating lesson plans that align content and language objectives: a) lack of knowledge about language objectives and the ELP standards and b) lack of practice in writing and using language objectives. 6) Pre-service teachers need to learn about and practice on creating effective and supportive content objectives to promote ELLs' academic success. The findings of this study suggested that more emphasis should be placed on the ELP standards and language objectives during the preparation of pre-service teachers seeking ESOL endorsement. TESOL program educators in pre-service teacher programs need to reflect on the consistency and quality of both content and training opportunities available to pre-service teachers, in particular, ascertaining adequate knowledge and practice relevant to the ELP standards and language objectives; the alignment between the ELP standards and CCSS; and supportive and effective content objectives for ELLs. Although areas to be improved were identified, the results of this study revealed that pre-service teachers seeking ESOL endorsement through the university perceived the program as a worthwhile investment to become effective teachers of ELLs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I thank God for his endless love, mercy, and grace from the beginning and to the end of this long journey. My deepest gratitude goes to Dr. Lizette Peter, my academic advisor and mentor, for her dedication, support, guidance, help, encouragement, and kindness toward me and my dissertation ever since I have met her. Her generosity and patience enabled me to move forward and finish my doctoral program. I am truly blessed to be her student. I would like to thank my committee, Drs. Phil McKnight, Bruce Frey, Suzanne Rice, and Paul Markham, for their support at each important moment of my time in the doctoral program. My special thanks go to Dr. M'Balia Thomas. Her heartfelt encouragement and support kept me moving forward. I appreciate her insightful advice and feedback on my dissertation. I also want to appreciate Dr. Steven White, who is the chair of our department, for his feedback on my dissertation and support to help me finish my dissertation and graduate.

My appreciation goes to the undergraduate students who voluntarily participated in my dissertation study. This dissertation would not have been possible without their participation and kindness. I also would like to thank my colleague, Yusun Jung, for her help on rating lesson plans. She has been a good colleague and friend throughout my time at KU. I have special thanks to Dr. Dongil Shin, a professor at Chung-Ang University in Korea, who encouraged and motivated me to pursue the doctoral program. Although I have been away from him, his encouragement given to me has been in my heart.

Finally, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my family. My parents and parents in law have given me endless love, sacrifice, and prayers throughout this journey. I also would like to thank my two lovely sisters, who are also my best friends. My deepest gratitude

goes to my husband, Minsung Kim, for his support, love, and patience. I could overcome difficult moments with his unconditional love and support. He is the joy of my life. I thank my daughter, Grace, for being patient with her busy mom. I am blessed to be her mom.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Background Statement	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Research Questions.....	3
Significance of the Study	4
Definition of Key Terms	5
Chapter Summary	6
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
1. Standards-based Education	7
1.1. English Language Proficiency Standards in K-12 schools	9
2. Teacher Training for Pre-service and In-service Teachers of English Language Learners	12
3. SDAIE: Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English	15
3.1 Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP).....	17
Chapter Summary	17
CHAPTER 3: METHOD	19
Participants.....	19
Techniques for Data Gathering and Analysis	21
Lesson plan (see Appendix A)	21
Questionnaire (see Appendix B)	24
Structured Interviews (see Appendix C).....	25
Chapter Summary	27
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	29
Research Question 1	29
Lesson plan analysis	29
Interviews.....	31
Questionnaire	33
Research Question 1a.....	34
Interviews.....	34
Research Question 1b	36
Interviews.....	37
Questionnaire	42

Research question 2	44
Interviews.....	44
Research Question 2a.....	44
Interviews.....	45
Questionnaire	48
Research question 2b	50
Interviews.....	50
Questionnaire	51
Chapter Summary	52
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	55
Discussion.....	55
Research Question 1	56
Question 1a	58
Question 1b	59
Question 2	60
Question 2a	61
Question 2b	62
Recommendations for Practice	62
Limitations of the Study.....	67
Suggestions for Future Research.....	67
Conclusion	68
Chapter Summary	69
REFERENCES	71
Appendix (A): Lesson Plan Analysis Matrix.....	78
Appendix (B): Questionnaire	79
Appendix (C): Interview Questions	87
Appendix (D): Examples of Kansas College and Career Ready Standards.....	90
Appendix (E): Examples of English Language Proficiency Standards.....	93
Appendix (F): Informed Content Statement	94

List of Tables

Table 1 Organization of the ELP Standards in Relation to Participation in Content-Area Practices	10
Table 2 An Example of the ELP Standards	11
Table 3 Frequency by Gender and School type	20
Table 4 Frequency by class type	21
Table 5 Identified themes from interviews Transcripts	26
Table 6 Data collection and analysis techniques.....	27
Table 7 Descriptive Statistics.....	30
Table 8 Standards in Lesson Plan and Implementation	31
Table 9 Mean Component Scores by Year	31
Table 10 Questionnaire Item #15.....	33
Table 11 Survey Question 15.....	43
Table 12 Qualitative Explanation	49
Table 13 Questionnaire #18.....	51
Table 14 Qualitative Explanation of #18	51

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background Statement

The number of English language learners in the United States has been increasing dramatically. U.S. Census Bureau (2013) reported that 60.6 million people in the U.S. aged 5 or over (21 percent of the population) used a language other than English at home. As the consequence of this increase in non-native English speakers, the number of English language learners (ELLs) in K-12 schools has been growing as well. The National Center for Educational Statistics reported that 8.1 percent of students in Kansas public schools in 2010-2011 participated in programs for ELLs, and Kansas is one of the states with the largest increase of ELLs in public schools (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2013). This rising number of ELLs in K-12 Kansas public schools indicates that Kansas teachers have ELLs in their regular content classes; therefore, all teachers should be prepared meet the unique needs of ELLs. Research presents that ELLs lack academic language skills to acquire the grade-level content (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2013), and that it is challenging for ELLs to comprehend the academic content in content area classes without language consideration or supports. Yet, they are expected to pass state standardized tests in order to meet the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Therefore, subject classes with ELLs should contain both content and language instruction with carefully designed lesson plans to make academic content comprehensible.

Statement of the Problem

Research shows that U.S. pre-service teachers for English language learners are not prepared to teach ELLs in content area classes. Several studies explored the preparedness of pre-service teachers working toward ESOL (English to the Speakers of Other Languages) teacher

certification programs (Durgunoglu & Hughes 2010; Vacca-Rizopoulos & Nicoletti 2009). Research revealed that pre-service teachers lack TESOL-related knowledge and self-efficacy required to teach ELLs in regular classes along with non-ELLs. One of the major difficulties that pre-service teachers stated is integrating academic content with language in lessons (Baecher, 2012). In response to this information, it is necessary to examine their preparedness in detail.

The Department of Education in the state of Kansas recently released a new set of English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards that correspond to Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The ESOL Standards are designed for teachers in Kansas K-12 public schools to guide their instruction and assess their ELLs' achievements. Therefore, it is important that in-service and pre-service teachers of ELLs have knowledge about the ELP standards and the ability to apply the standards when planning lessons. Also, as a majority of Kansas teachers are likely to have ELLs in their classes, they are expected to design lessons including language and content objectives, activities, assessments, and materials that have been strongly driven by ELP standards and content standards.

Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) is one theory-based model widely adopted by school districts throughout the country to promote ELLs' academic success (Sobul, 1995; Cline & Nicochea, 2003). One of the main features of SDAIE is the integration of subject content and language instruction through the inclusion of language objectives as well as content objectives, both of which are driven by state academic content language standards (Echevarria et al., 2013). SDAIE language objectives map particular academic functions to key vocabulary and grammatical structures and forms. The language objectives of SDAIE determine the other components of lessons such as class activities, assessments, and materials at lesson preparation and implementing stages (Echevarria et al., 2013).

Since SDAIE and its associated models, such as *Sheltered Immersion Observation Protocol* (SIOP), have only recently been accepted as a viable means for content area teachers to include the needs of ELLs in their planning, the extent to which their professional development in SDAIE effects their teaching has only begun to be investigated. This study can therefore contribute to the growing body of research on pre-service teachers' preparedness to create lessons that align ELP and Common Core State Standards.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore Kansas pre-service ESOL endorsement seekers' understanding of the principles and practices of the SDAIE model. In particular, it elucidated the extent to which they consider Kansas ELP standards in their lessons, how well prepared they perceive they are to create ELP standard-driven lesson plans, and what challenges they face in planning for SDAIE. In addition, this study examined to what extent pre-service teachers align Kansas Common Core Standards to Kansas ELP standards in their thinking, planning, and practice, as well as their preparedness and challenges in aligning those two sets of standards.

Research Questions

1. To what extent do the Kansas state English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards inform pre-service teachers' lesson plans in terms of language objectives (functions/forms/ vocab) and lesson activities (strategy/materials/ assessments)?
 - a. What factors do pre-service teachers cite most often as challenges for creating lesson plans that derive from the ELP standards?

- b. How prepared do pre-service teachers feel they are to create lesson plans that derive from the ELP standards?
2. To what extent do pre-service ELP endorsement seekers align Kansas Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to Kansas ELP standards in their thinking, planning, and practice?
 - a. What factors do pre-service teachers cite most often as challenges for creating lesson plans that align content and language objectives?
 - b. What are pre-service teachers' perceptions of their preparedness to write content objectives for English language learners (ELLs)?

Significance of the Study

This study will provide a picture of the current knowledge and abilities possessed by ESOL Endorsement seekers (pre-service teachers) at the University of Kansas regarding implementation of SDAIE lessons. The study will also bring to light these teachers' perceptions of their preparedness in creating language standards-driven lessons and aligning content standards and language standards. Furthermore, the courses the teachers found most useful in developing this knowledge will be examined. The research findings will provide useful information to teacher educators at the University of Kansas such as faculty members of the Department of Curriculum and Teaching and ESOL practicum university supervisors as they examine the effectiveness of their current teacher education curriculum. The findings will also benefit teacher educators of TESOL-related programs in comparable contexts who have similar goals and concerns.

Definition of Key Terms

Pre-service Teachers: Undergraduate or graduate students working toward teacher credential programs

In-service Teachers: Teachers who currently work in K-12 schools

ESOL: English to Speakers of Other Languages

TESOL: Teaching English to the Speakers of Other Languages

ESL: English as a Second Language. A pull-out program of instruction designed for ELLs, given separately from non-ELL students.

ESOL Endorsement: The ESOL Endorsement program provides teachers holding an initial Kansas teaching license, or for those in the process of completing their initial license requirements, to be certified to teach in either a pull-out ESL setting or to implement SDAIE in the regular classroom setting.

English Language Learners (ELLs): Individuals whose first language is not English, and who learn English as an additional language.

Common Core State Standards (CCSS): Common academic standards for students in U.S. K-12 schools in the areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics adopted by Kansas in 2010.

English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards: The English language standards that Kansas adopted to use to teach and assess ELLs in Kansas K-12 schools.

Content area classes or mainstream classes: Inclusive classes that teachers teach academic subjects to students both ELLs and non-ELLs in K-12 schools.

ELL pull-out: A pull-out program of instruction designed for ELLs, given separately from non-ELL students.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided an overview of this study. Current research reveals that pre-service teachers are not generally well prepared to teach ELLs in content area classes. Creating lessons that combine content instruction and language instruction is one of the difficulties they have. SDAIE is an instructional model that helps teachers of ELLs plan lessons that integrate academic content and language instruction that contain content objectives and language objectives. Those objectives should be written based on the CCSS and ELP standards. This study will explore Kansas pre-service teachers' knowledge and implementation of SDAIE in planning their lessons for ELLs.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This study is informed by a conceptual framework composed of literature from different areas of research: academic standards, teacher education, specially designed academic instruction for ELLs. Combined, these areas serve to help answer the questions: 1) To what extent do the KS state ELP standards inform pre-service teachers' lesson plans in terms of language objectives and lesson activities? and 2) To what extent do pre-service ELP endorsement seekers align Kansas Common Core Standards to Kansas ELP standards in their thinking, planning, and practice?

1. Standards-based Education

Beginning in the early 1980s, the federal government of the United States raised concerns over the low academic achievement of American students in comparison to students in other countries. The publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and other similar reports initially led the leadership at federal and state levels to emphasize the development of educational policies and resources that enable American students to reach and perform a high-level of academic achievement (Sailor, Stowe, Turnbull, & Kleinhammer-Tramill, 2007, Swanson & Stevenson, 2002). This movement for boosting American students' academic performance resulted in the shift from the previous input-driven curricula to output-driven reforms. In response to this new focus, in the 1990s, 46 states developed curricula and standardized tests strongly aligned to higher academic standards (Swanson & Stevenson, 2002). The impetus for No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act is the standards-based reform that began in the 1990s. The purpose of NCLB is to certify that all students in the U.S. meet the state academic

content standards at their grade levels. As a result of NCLB, the focus of curriculum and assessments in U.S. schools was placed on a common set of standards so that every student would learn academic content driven by the state standards (Hoover & Patton, 2004).

In 2010, Common Core State Standards (CCSS) were developed for individual states to have common academic expectation for students in K-12 schools in the areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics. The CCSS project was led by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers. In the year 2013, 46 states, three U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia have adopted the CCSS (Center for Public Education, 2013; Porter, McMaken, Hwang, & Yang, 2011). In 2010, Kansas adopted the standards, called Kansas College and Career Ready Standards (KCCRS), and accepted two additional standards for Science and history/government/social studies in 2013 (Kansas PTA, 2013). Since then, Kansas educators in K-12 schools have received professional development to help them become familiar with the KCCRS to design curriculum, lessons, and assessments.

To follow the requirement of NCLB, every student should learn and achieve the academic standards (Hoover & Patton, 2004) and, ideally, teachers should differentiate lessons to ensure that every student including ELLs are provided with the opportunity to acquire the academic content and skills related to the standards. However, research shows that ELLs as a population lack academic language skills to acquire the grade-level content (Echevarria et al., 2013), and U.S. pre-service teachers are not prepared to teach and support ELLs to meet the academic standards (Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010; Vacca-Rizopoulos & Nicoletti, 2009).

1.1. English Language Proficiency Standards in K-12 schools

In response to the standard-based reform of the early 1990s, educators of content areas developed sets of academic standards to provide guidelines for curriculum and assessment design in public schools. After monitoring the drafts of the content area standards, the educators of English as a second or other language (ESL) were concerned that the drafts did not satisfactorily address the unique needs of English language learners (ELLs). Subsequently, teachers of English as a second or other language (TESOL) decided to develop standards specifically geared toward promoting academic language proficiency of ELLs. Led by the TESOL organization, the ESL Standards and Assessment Project began in 1995 and ‘ESL Standards for Pre-K-12 Students’ was published in 1997 (TESOL, 1997; Short, D.J. 2000).

In 2006, TESOL published a revised version of ‘ESL Standards for Pre-K-12 Students’ (TESOL, 2006). This new version titled ‘PreK-12 English Language Proficiency Standards’ does not only focus on ELLs’ academic success in academic content classes, it also reflects recent language acquisition theories and the value of ELLs’ native languages and cultures so that it provides the most helpful and updated guidelines for teachers of ELLs (TESOL, 2006). While the TESOL Standards reflect national perspectives of the needs of students in K-12 schools, individual states have modified the standards and adopted them to school districts (Snow &Katz, 2009).

Kansas was one of the members of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) consortium, along with 10 other states. Educational Testing Service (2013) addressed that the role of the consortium includes development of an assessment system for ELLs-

along with strategies for test design, administration, scoring, and reporting—that gives students, parents, teachers, administrators, and communities with current and relevant information they need to best support every student as they work toward achieving English language proficiency at the competence level of college- and career-ready (CCR) standards in English language arts and mathematics by the Common Core State Standards. (p.40)

Kansas announced the state’s new English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards, which was formally adopted on December 10, 2013.

The ELP standards that the State of Kansas adopted correspond to the College and Career Ready standards, based on the Common Core, of English Language Arts and Literacy, Math, and Science. The ELP standards (2013) consisted of 10 standards for each grade level of K, 1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-8 and 9-12 grades. These standards focus on a set of language functions (What students do with language) and language forms (grammar, vocabulary, content-specific speech) (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2014). Each of the 10 ELP standards contains five levels of target proficiencies with their accompanying descriptors. “The levels 1-5 descriptors for each of the 10 ELP standards describe targets for ELL performance by the end of each ELP level at a particular point in time (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2014, p.3)” The organization of the ELP standards is presented in *Table 1* and an example (standard 9 for grade 6-9) is presented in *Table 2*.

Table 1 Organization of the ELP Standards in Relation to Participation in Content-Area Practices

1	construct meaning from oral presentations and literary and informational text through grade-appropriate listening, reading, and viewing	Standards 1 through 7 involve the language necessary for ELLs to engage in the central content-
---	---	---

2	participate in grade-appropriate oral and written exchanges of information, ideas, and analyses, responding to peer, audience, or reader comments and questions	specific practices associated with ELA & Literacy, mathematics, and science. They begin with a focus on extraction of meaning and then progress to engagement in these practices.
3	speak and write about grade-appropriate complex literary and informational texts and topics	
4	construct grade-appropriate oral and written claims and support them with reasoning and evidence	
5	conduct research and evaluate and communicate findings to answer questions or solve problems	
6	analyze and critique the arguments of others orally and in writing	
7	adapt language choices to purpose, task, and audience when speaking and writing	
8	determine the meaning of words and phrases in oral presentations and literary and informational text	
9	create clear and coherent grade-appropriate speech and text	
10	make accurate use of standard English to communicate in grade appropriate speech and writing	

Source: English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards from

http://www.elpa21.org/sites/default/files/Final%204_30%20ELPA21%20Standards_1.pdf

Table 2 An Example of the ELP Standards

Standard 9.

ELP.6-8.9	By the end of each English language proficiency level, an ELL can...				
	1	2	3	4	5
An ELL can . . . create clear and coherent grade-appropriate speech and text ...	communicate simple information about an event or topic, with support (including context and visual aids) using non-verbal communication and, with limited control, a narrow range of vocabulary and syntactically simple sentences .	recount a brief sequence of events in order, and introduce an informational topic, present one or two facts about it, and provide a concluding statement, with support (including sentences), using, with emerging control, some commonly occurring linking words (e.g., next, because, and, also) .	recount a short sequence of events, with a beginning, middle, and an end, and introduce and develop an informational topic with a few facts and details, and provide a conclusion, using, with developing control, common transitional words and phrases to connect events, ideas, and opinions (e.g., after a while, for example, in order to, as a result)	recount a more detailed sequence of events or steps in a process, with a beginning, middle, and an end, and introduce and develop an informational topic with facts and details, and provide a concluding section or statement, using, with increasingly independent control, a variety of transitional words and phrases to connect events, ideas, and opinions (e.g., however, on the other hand, from that moment on)	recount a complex sequence of events or steps in a process, with a beginning, middle, and an end, and introduce and effectively develop an informational topic with facts and details, and provide a concluding section or statement, using a wide variety of transitional words and phrases to show logical relationships between events and ideas.

Source: English Language Proficiency Standards. Grades 6-8, pg. 11 from
http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/CSAS/Content%20Area%20%28A-E%29/English_Language_Proficiency/Standards/ELPStandards_Gr6-8__ELAGr7.pdf

In developing the ELP standards, an effort was made to ensure that the 10 ELP standards contain language forms and functions that ELLs need to acquire to meet the academic content standards of English Language Arts/ Literacy, Mathematics, and Science (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2014). To ensure easy alignment to content standards, the ELP standards documents provided the Council of Chief State School Officers includes alignment guiding charts. Those charts list corresponding content standards of English Language Arts/ Literacy, Mathematics, and Science to each ELP standard. By exploring the ELP standards, content-area teachers can find and match the corresponding ELP standards to their instruction.

The ELP standards are guidelines to inform all teachers the academic language proficiency that ELLs need to meet the content standards. Implementing the ELP standards in instruction is important because all students including ELLs must achieve a passing score on state standardized tests in content area subjects (Shorts, 2000). Teachers need to implement activities associated with the ELP standards to equip ELLs with academic language proficiency to meet the students' grade level content standards. The ELP standards are currently in effect in Kansas K-12 public schools. In-service and pre-service teachers are thus expected to use the standards in planning and implementing their lessons with ELLs.

2. Teacher Training for Pre-service and In-service Teachers of English Language Learners

According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), 8.1 percent of students in Kansas public schools participated in programs for ELLs in 2010-2011 (NCES, 2012). The actual percentage of ELLs will increase if students who are counted include those who

passed English proficiency tests, but still have difficulty in academic English (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2013). ELLs spend most of their time in content area, or “regular,” classes along with their peers who are native speakers of English except a few periods of times for small group English instruction. They have the burden of meeting many academic standards and passing the state mandatory exams despite the lack of academic language skills (Dong, 2004). Thus, ELLs tend to fall behind the expected grade level achievement. According to the report from NCES, the achievement gap between ELLs and non-ELLs in NAEP reading assessment was 36 points at the 4th grade, and 44 points at the 8th grade (The National Center for Educational Statistics, 2013). Although significant academic performing differences appear between ELLs and non-ELLs, research shows that U.S. pre-service Teachers for English language learners are not prepared to fill this gap.

Durgunoglu and Hughes (2010) conducted a study to investigate U.S. pre-service teachers’ preparedness to instruct English language learners as well as the teachers’ self-efficacy. Participants of this study were 62 pre-service teachers in a U.S. university who had completed the required hours of classroom experiences and courses. Data were collected from a survey of their attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge of ELL issues such as definitions of TESOL terms, demography of ELLs in the U.S., assessments, teaching, and learning strategies. Afterwards, researchers observed the participants’ lessons. The results of the study show that pre-service teachers of ELLs do not think they are adequately prepared to teach and support ELLs in their content area classes. Vacca-Rizopoulos and Nicoletti (2009) conducted a study to investigate instruction of teaching Latino students in urban areas whose first language is not English. Classroom observations of pre-service teachers’ lessons and conversations with them were

analyzed, and illustrate, again, that pre-service teachers need more knowledge and experiences to instruct and prepare ELLs in mainstream classrooms.

Dong (2004) presents qualitative reflections of pre-service teachers who enrolled in TESOL related courses in a U.S. university. The pre-service teachers were required to engage in field observations in secondary ESL/ bilingual classes in addition to course readings. One of the implications from the pre-service teachers' reflections is that three instructional practices are essential for promoting academic learning of ELLs in content area classes: "setting up language objectives along with content curricular objectives, anticipating ESL-related difficulties, and providing cultural background information" (Dong, 2004, p. 204). Similarly, in a study conducted by Baecher (2012), pre-service teachers stated that ability to plan content and language integrated lessons is one of the most valuable tools to have as teachers of ELLs.

Considering the lack of knowledge and practice that pre-service teachers experienced, a study conducted by University faculty in a TESOL program in the U.S. Midwest region presents that well-prepared and organized University ESOL program benefits teachers to be better language teachers. Peter, Markham, and Frey (2012) conducted a study to explore the changes of in-service teachers after they completed a university-based ESOL endorsement program. The ESOL endorsement program consisted of 18 credit hours highlighted in five areas:

- (a) methods of ESOL and bilingual education with a focus on content-based language instruction;
- (b) developing intercultural awareness of the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students;
- (c) second language acquisition theory and practice;
- (d) diagnosis and remediation for English language learners' linguistic and academic progress; and
- (e) introductory applied linguistics and language analysis. (p.308)

The study finding indicates that the participating teachers showed changes in various aspects such as “a number of attitudes, beliefs, and practices” (p.320). Upon the completion of 18 hours of TESOL courses, in addition to viewing themselves as content teachers, they identified themselves as language teachers, more than the initial stage of the program. Many of the teachers recognized the importance of writing good objectives that include language functions and forms for their ELLs to focus on and use. All of the teachers responded that they had made attempts to modify their instruction to better meet the language needs of ELLs, such as setting language objectives and including more opportunities for language learning and practice in class. This study’s finding affirms that university level ESOL courses are worthwhile in educating teachers of ELLs even to in-service teachers, and this conclusion indicates the importance and impact of well-prepared and organized university ESOL program to both pre-service and in-service teachers.

In sum, current literature on ESOL teacher training presents that the pre-service teachers’ lack knowledge and abilities to create and implement effective lessons to promote ELLs’ academic success. It also presents the benefits and impacts of well-prepared university level ESOL courses in preparing teachers of ELLs.

3. SDAIE: Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English

The cognitive foundation of Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) is to make content comprehensible. Krashen (1994) and Cummins (1994) emphasized providing students with understandable messages through comprehensible input. The premise is that language acquisition happens when learners are given instruction through graspable input (Krashen, 1988). Not only comprehensible input, but also learners’ output contributes to

language acquisition. The “output hypothesis” is that second language learners are able to notice the language problems that they are having even without feedback from other people who were engaged in the conversation (Swain & Lapkin, 1995). Pica, Holliday, Lewis, and Morgenthaler (1989) state that second language learners actively revise their output when they are requested to clarify or confirm what they said. They are not just revising their output; they adopt the new forms that they reproduce. This process of revising and modifying their output helps the learners acquire the target language.

SDAIE is an instructional approach that gives teachers tools to merge subject content and language learning through comprehensible input and output so that ELLs can successfully learn grade-level content and academic language concurrently (Sobul, 1995). Originally, SDAIE was implemented in the State of California, and was intended to provide effective instruction for ELLs who achieved intermediate level of English proficiency, but were not ready to move into mainstream classes. The California Department of Education defined SDAIE as “an approach utilized to teach academic courses to English learner (EL) students in English. (from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/sr/cs/hiperfelmglossary.asp>). Most recently, due to the increasing number of non-English speaking students in Kansas, and other states as well, teachers throughout the country are more likely to have ELLs in their regular classes. As a consequence, SDAIE has become a widespread instructional approach for teachers to make content classes comprehensible for their ELLs who learn academic subjects in content area classes (Cline & Necochea, 2003).

Cline and Necochea (2003) presented the eight primary components of SDAIE to be effectively implemented as follows: “connect to previous learning, visuals and manipulatives, low-risk and safe environment, multiple access points, cooperative and interactive, chunking and webbing, respectful of learner, and primary language support” (p. 19).

3.1 Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)

One of the most popular and widely acknowledged models of SDAIE is Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). SIOP was developed to help teachers create effective lessons for ELLs being taught in the regular classroom. SIOP Model integrates subject content and language instruction in lessons for ELLs to comprehend the academic content. The major components of SIOP Model are “the inclusion of language objectives in every content lesson, the development of background knowledge, the acquisition of content-related vocabulary and the emphasis on academic literacy practice” (Echevarria et al., 2013, p. 18). The first draft of SIOP Model came out in the early 1990s, and evolved through multiple tests and refining processes (Echevarria et al., 2013). SIOP was developed first as an observation or evaluative tool for teacher educators or researchers to use in the classroom while supporting regular teachers of ELLs. When SIOP was initially implemented, teachers found that the model was very helpful for planning lessons, as well. As a result, SIOP is now used as a tool to train and support teachers to plan and implement SIOP lessons (Honigsfeld & Cohan, 2006; Short & Echevarria, 1999). Research showing successful and effective implementation of SIOP model in K-12 schools has led to recognition nationwide of the SIOP model as an effective strategy to make content achievable for ELLs. In alignment with SDAIE principles, one feature of SIOP is the inclusion of both content objectives and language objectives, ideally driven by state content and language standards. Lesson activities, assessments, and materials should be planned to help meet those standards (Echevarria et al., 2013). As the most widely known SDAIE model in use in Kansas schools today, most teacher ESOL endorsement programs in the state teach students both the principles of SDAIE and the particulars of SIOP.

Chapter Summary

This chapter reviewed the three components of the study's conceptual framework, which includes literature on academic and language standards, research on teacher education for ELLs, and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English. We cannot fully understand how pre-service teachers in this Midwestern University plan instruction for ELLs without considering the effect of teacher training on pre-service teachers' practice and thinking about ELP standards and language learning as well as how they understand the relationship between language learning and academic standards. The three components of the study's conceptual framework listed in this chapter provide the researcher and ELL educators with basic but essential background of knowledge directly linked to the research questions of the study to explore or understand.

CHAPTER 3: METHOD

The purpose of this study was to explore to what extent Kansas pre-service ESOL endorsement seekers implement SDAIE principles in their lesson planning, which includes a consideration of Kansas ESOL standards. This study also examined how well these pre-service teachers were prepared to create ESOL standard-driven lesson plans and what challenges they faced creating the lesson plans. In addition, this study examined to what extent pre-service ESOL endorsement seekers aligned Kansas Common Core Standards to Kansas ESOL standards in their thinking, planning, and practice as well as their preparedness and challenges in aligning those two sets of standards. In order to explore those questions, I applied both quantitative and qualitative research methods for gathering and analyzing data.

Participants

The participants of this study were 17 pre-service ESOL endorsement seekers who were enrolled in the School of Education at the University of Kansas. They were undergraduate students pursuing teacher licenses in a general area while seeking the ESOL endorsement concurrently by participating in the ESOL Endorsement program. The students who sought ESOL Endorsement were required to take certain courses in the areas of TESOL methods, second language acquisition, and language teaching in order to enroll in the ESOL practicum course. After students complete the required courses, they were qualified to take the practicum course. The ESOL practicum course is coordinated “to provide intense and direct teaching experiences with learners of English in accredited K-12 educational contexts at an age and language level suited to the practicum student’s initial license and professional interests” (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages Practicum Handbook, 2014, p2). The

students who enrolled in the ESOL practicum course in the semesters of spring 2014 and spring 2015 received an informative email from the researcher about the study as well as a request for their voluntary participation. Those who agreed to participate in the study were provided the informed consent statement that had been approved by Human Subject Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL). The informed consent form included detailed information of types of data gathering tools and procedures used of this study. The students signed the consent form if they understood all the requirements and risks of the study and were willing to participate. Nine students were willing to participate in the semester of spring 2014 and eight students were willing to participate in the semester of spring 2015. 17 students participated in this study in total. 16 participants were female and one participant was male. Among the 17, 15 participants (88.2%) did their student teaching of ELLs in elementary schools, and two participants did their student teaching in secondary schools. Ten participants were mainly placed in content area classes such as Math, Science, Language Arts, and Social Studies with both ELLs and non-ELLs, and seven participants were placed in ELL pull-out groups, groups of ELLs pulled out of mainstream classes, to teach ELLs only. Participants are identified with pseudonyms in this study. *Table 3* and *Table 4* describe the participants' information as below.

Table 3 Frequency by Gender and School type

Gender	School Type		Total
	Elementary	Secondary	
Female	15(88.2%)	1(5.9%)	16(94.2%)
Male	0(0%)	1(5.9%)	1(5.9%)
Total	15(88.2%)	2(11.8%)	17(100%)

Table 4 Frequency by class type

Type	n
content area class	10
ELL Pull-Out	7

Techniques for Data Gathering and Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures were implemented to investigate the research questions of this study. There are three main sources of data: lesson plans, questionnaires, and interviews. These data gathering tools are approved by Human Subject Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL).

Lesson plan (see Appendix A)

Teacher educators frequently use pre-service teachers' lesson plans to grasp their belief and rationale about teaching (Schmidt, 2005), and planning is vital for pre-service teachers to implement successful teaching actions. (Byra & Coulon, 1992). This study took preservice teachers' lesson plans as one of main data sources to explore its' research questions. As one of the practicum course requirements, participants of this study wrote two to three lesson plans and implemented them in class during their practicum periods for the purpose of formal observations. The types of classes they taught varied depending on their placements, but included ESL pull-out, small group instruction mixed with non-English language learners, and large regular classes comprised of both native English speakers and English language learners. Regardless of the given class environment, the same lesson plan format was required to be submitted by all practicum students to the faculty supervisor following each formal observation. All of the 17

participants from the semesters of spring 2014 and 2015 agreed to allow the researcher to use their submitted lesson plans. Among nine participants in the semester of spring 2014, six participants submitted two lesson plans. However, two participants submitted only one lesson plan, and the remaining one participant submitted two separate lesson plans, but only one lesson plan included ELP standards. In the end, 15 lesson plans were qualified to be used for this study. All of eight participants in the semester of spring 2015 submitted two lesson plans, and all 16 lesson plans submitted were qualified to be used for this study. In sum, from 17 participants, 31 lesson plans were collected and used for this study. All of the 17 participants signed the consent form approved by HSCL to give the researcher approval to use their lesson plans for this study.

Since there was no existing analytic tool for exploring the research questions particular to this study, the collected lesson plans were analyzed using a researcher-developed lesson plan analysis protocol and evaluative rubric based on SDAIE principles (see Appendix A). The protocol contained six variables including (a) language functions, (b) language forms, (c) vocabulary, (d) instruction, (e) assessments, and (f) materials in order to compare with the ELP standards.

The evaluative rubric contained four ratings ranging from 0 to 3 with worded descriptions of each rating. This tool was designed to answer Research Question One, and had been revised multiple times throughout pilot analyses. Three raters who are directly related to the field of TESOL and the ESOL practicum analyzed the collected lesson plans. One of the raters was a professor in the TESOL program at the university, who designed the ESOL practicum course and had been serving as a faculty advisor. The two other raters (including the researcher) were doctoral candidates in the TESOL program at the University and had been supervising the students of the ESOL practicum course. The raters looked at the ELP standards in the lesson

plans and evaluated how well the participants implemented the ESOL standards stated in their lesson plans within each lesson plan component such as: language objectives (forms, functions, and vocabulary), instruction, assessment, and materials.

Multiple training sessions were held with the raters. The initial training session was held in early spring 2014 to familiarize raters with the protocol and rubric. After the initial training session, each rater scored four of the lesson plans independently. At a second meeting, the raters compared and discussed their ratings on the four lesson plans. The pilot ratings revealed some gaps presented among the three raters. The raters discussed to identify what generated the gaps and found that they had disagreements on some of the descriptors of the rubric. Once more, the raters reviewed the rating protocol and rubric together in order to reach agreement. Based on the discussion, the protocol and rubric were calibrated and modified to ensure the three raters share similar understanding on the protocol and rubric. Once the lesson plan analysis protocol and rubric were finalized, the raters scored each lesson collected from participants in 2014 independently and submitted the scores to the researcher. Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS, version 22) was used to calculate a Correlation among the scores from the raters. Average score Intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) is an index of inter-rater reliability of quantitative data. As a rule of thumb, ICC above 0.8 is considered excellent, those in the range of 0.7-0.8 are considered good and those in the 0.5-0.7 range are considered fair (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). Pilot analysis indicated a sufficient inter-rater reliability (0.85 of average measures of intra-class correlation) shared among the three raters.

After each rater completed the first set of lesson plans collected from participants in spring 2014, all three raters had a third meeting. At the meeting, raters discussed two of the lesson plans that showed the biggest rating gap among them. The raters re-visited the rating

rubric and re-rated the two lesson plans and discussed the rationale of each rating, and discussed any ambiguity and uncertainty on the rubric so that all three raters have agreed understanding of the grading rubric. After the third meeting, the lesson plans from participants in spring 2015 were distributed to each rater. Each rater rated the lesson plans independently and returned their rating results to the researcher.

The numerical data from the lesson plan analysis protocol was analyzed using descriptive statistics from EXCEL. Descriptive statistics showed means and standard deviations.

Questionnaire (see Appendix B)

The questionnaire for this study was developed by another researcher, Dr. Laura Baecher, at Hunter College in New York, with input from Dr. Lizette Peter of the University of Kansas and the researcher of the present study. Dr. Baecher had used the questionnaire for her own study. The questionnaire included items related to the research questions of this study and was thus adequate to answer the research questions 1, 1b, 2a, and 2b of this study.

The questionnaire combined Likert scale and open-ended questions requesting the respondents' background information, course experiences, and instructional planning. Questions asking for background information had participants check the best descriptor. The questions regarding course experiences provided five choices (No opportunity, Touched on briefly, Spent some time discussing, Explored in some depth with related assigned reading, Extensive opportunities with field/ clinical assignment). The questions regarding instructional planning provided three choices (Not at all true for me, occasionally true for me, usually true for me). The last three questions regarding the pre-service teachers' knowledge and perception included various multiple choices and opportunities for open-ended response.

Among 17 participants, 10 participants completed the questionnaire. They were informed about completing this questionnaire through the informed consent form approved by Human Subject Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL) and verbally by the researcher, and gave their permission through emails and by reading and clicking on the consent on the first page of the questionnaire. The participants completed the questionnaire at the end of the semester to ensure that their knowledge and experiences acquired from the practicum course were included. The questionnaire was distributed through an online survey tool and emailed to each participant with a link to the survey. Each participant was also asked their willingness to participate in interviews for the study, and interviews were scheduled and conducted with only voluntary participants during the practicum period or afterwards.

Structured Interviews (see Appendix C)

Qualitative interviews were conducted to answer research questions 1, 1a, 1b, 2, 2a, and 2b of this study. Qualitative interviews enable researchers to “understand experiences and reconstruct events” that they are not directly involved in. Moreover, the qualitative interviewing process works well when describing social situations (Rubin & Rubin, 2005, p.3). Interview questions were developed to explore the research questions and refined based on the conversations with the participants and findings after some of initial interviews, as recommended in *Qualitative Interviewing* (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Interview questions were semi-structured. The initial pre-structured questions explored the main topics of the study, but also opened up opportunities to explore more in depth.

For this study, the researcher sent each of 17 participants of this study emails asking for their voluntarily participation in interviews. All of them were already aware of this interview

process as they were informed by the informed consent form approved by HSCL in the beginning of their practicum semester. 12 voluntary participants were willing to conduct interviews with the researcher. All interviews were conducted at the end of the semester to ensure that their knowledge and experiences acquired from the practicum course were included. Interviews were scheduled through emails and the researcher met each of the interviewees separately at their most convenient time. The interviewees gave the researcher their consent to use and record the interview data through emails and by reading aloud the consent statement in the beginning of the interview process. Each interview lasted between 25 minutes to 40 minutes. All interviews were recorded by a digital voice recorder at the site of the interviews. After a couple of interviews were completed, the researcher modified some of the questions based on the two interview experiences to better explore the research questions. After all interviews were completed, the researcher transcribed the interviews. The transcribing process was completed manually. The researcher listened to each digital file of interviews and transcribed using Microsoft Word (version 2010). The researcher listened to each interview about four times or more to make sure that the content of the interviews was dictated as accurate as possible. The transcribed interview scripts were categorized and coded manually in order to find themes and theoretical categories, using a process recommended by Maxwell (2005). 13 themes were identified from interview transcripts as presented in *Table 5*.

Table 5 Identified themes from interviews Transcripts

No.	Identified themes from interviews Transcripts
1	Approach to Lesson Planning
2	Appreciation of Lesson Plans as a Guideline
3	Frequency of Using ELP Standards
4	Frequency of using the CCSS
5	Confidence
6	Lack of Confidence

7	Challenges/Struggles
8	Sufficient Practice or Exposure
9	Lack of Practice or Exposure
10	Clinical Supervisors
11	Practice or resources that might have helped to utilize ELP Standards
12	Helpful resources in the past
13	Appreciation of ESOL Endorsement

The interview data was triangulated—in other words, “collecting information from a diverse range of individuals and settings, using a variety of methods” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 112) with other sources such as lesson analysis protocol and questionnaire to increase the validity of the findings. *Table 6* summarizes the data collection and analysis techniques with reference to the specific research questions.

Table 6 Data collection and analysis techniques

Research Questions	Techniques	Analysis
Q1	Lesson plan analysis; Interviews; Questionnaire	Lesson plan analysis protocol and rubric ; Transcribing and thematic coding; Descriptive statistics
1a	Interviews	Transcribing and thematic coding
1b	Interviews; Questionnaire	Transcribing and Thematic coding; Descriptive statistics
Q2	Interviews	Transcribing and Thematic coding
2a	Interviews; Questionnaire	Transcribing and thematic coding; Descriptive statistics
2b	Interviews; Questionnaire	Transcribing and Thematic coding; Descriptive statistics

Chapter Summary

This chapter explained the method of the study. The participants of the study were Kansas pre-service ESOL endorsement seekers in the School of Education at the University of Kansas. Lesson plan analysis, semi-structured interviews and questionnaire were conducted to answer the research questions of this study. To analyze the collected data, a lesson plan evaluation protocol, descriptive statistics, and thematic coding were implemented.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

This chapter reports the results and the findings of the study. The purpose of this study is to explore Kansas' pre-service teachers', seeking ESOL endorsement, understanding of the principles and practices of the SDAIE model. In particular, it illuminates the following: the extent to which they consider Kansas ELP standards in their lessons; perceptions of level of preparation to create ELP standard-driven lesson plans; and the challenges pre-service ESOL teachers face in planning for SDAIE. In addition, this study examines to what extent pre-service teachers align Kansas Common Core Standards to Kansas ELP standards in their thinking, planning, and practice, as well as their preparedness and challenges in aligning two sets of standards. Research questions addressed in this study, as defined in chapters I and IV, are answered using both quantitative and qualitative data.

Research Question 1: To what extent do the Kansas state English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards inform pre-service teachers' lesson plans in terms of language objectives (functions/forms/ vocab) and lesson activities (strategy/materials/ assessments)? The lesson plan analysis generated the primary source of information to address this question. Other data and supporting evidence came from interviews and a questionnaire.

To answer research question 1, lesson plan analysis, interviews, and questionnaire were used.

Lesson plan analysis

The lesson plan analysis showed the rate of the ELP standard implementation. The average component score ranged from 1.27 to 1.67 of a possible range of 0 to 3 (*Table 7*). The mean score of ELP standard implementation within the six lesson plan components was 1.46 (48.67%). Language function had the highest score (1.67) for ELP standard implementation,

followed by instruction (1.56), materials (1.54), vocabulary (1.39) and assessment (1.31).

Language form (1.27), on the other hand, was the lowest implemented of the ESOL standards.

Table 7 Descriptive Statistics

Lesson Plan ID	Component Scores						mean	sum
	Assessments	Form	Function	Instruction	Materials	Vocabulary		
1a	0.44	0.44	1.11	0.67	0.22	0.78	0.61	3.67
1b	1.44	1.44	1.11	1.67	1.44	1.44	1.43	8.56
2a	1.33	2.33	2	2	1	0	1.44	8.67
2b	1.33	1.5	2.67	1.67	1.67	1.5	1.72	10.33
3a	1.33	1.33	1.83	1	2.33	1.33	1.53	9.17
4a	1.67	3	2.67	2	2	2.67	2.33	14
4b	0.33	0.67	0.33	0.33	0	0.33	0.33	2
5a	0.83	0.67	0.83	0.83	1.17	0.83	0.86	5.17
5b	2.5	2.33	2.33	2.67	2.5	2	2.39	14.33
6a	2.67	1	2.67	2.67	3	2	2.33	14
7a	1.67	2.33	2.67	2.33	2.67	2.33	2.33	14
8a	2.17	1.5	2.5	2.67	2.33	2	2.19	13.17
8b	1.22	0.11	0.89	1.44	0.78	0.89	0.89	5.33
9a	0.67	0	0.33	1.33	1.33	1	0.78	4.67
9b	2	1.17	1.83	1.83	2.33	1	1.69	10.17
10a	1.67	2.67	2.67	2.33	2.67	2.33	2.39	14.33
10b	2.33	2	2.67	2.33	3	2.33	2.44	14.67
11a	0.5	0	0	0.67	0.5	0.33	0.33	2
11b	1.33	1.5	1.5	1.33	2	1.67	1.56	9.33
12a	0.67	2	2	0.33	0.67	0.67	1.06	6.33
12b	0.33	1	1	1	0.33	1.33	0.83	5
13a	0.67	0.44	1.33	1.67	1.33	0.33	0.96	5.78
13b	0.58	0.67	1.67	1.08	1.17	1.25	1.07	6.42
14a	1.17	2.33	2.67	1.5	1.5	2	1.86	11.17
14b	1	0.44	1	0.89	1.11	0.89	0.89	5.33
15a	1.5	0.83	0.83	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.28	7.67
15b	1.33	1.5	1.5	1.33	1.17	1	1.31	7.83
16a	2.33	3	3	3	2.5	3	2.81	16.83
16b	2.33	3	3	2.33	2.33	2.67	2.61	15.67
17a	2	1.67	2.67	2.33	2.67	2.67	2.33	14
17b	2.33	2.67	2.67	2.67	2.33	3	2.61	15.67
Mean (μ)	1.31	1.27	1.67	1.56	1.54	1.39	1.46	9.52
S.D. (σ)	0.7	0.93	0.88	0.75	0.86	0.84	0.74	4.42

Table 8 Standards in Lesson Plan and Implementation

ESOL Std.	Lesson Plans (%)	Implementation						Overall Component Mean
		Assessments	Form	Function	Instruction	Materials	Vocabulary	
Lesson Plan Analysis								
1	13(42%)	1.54	1.87	2.1	1.85	1.85	1.79	1.83
2	12(39%)	1.53	1.47	1.79	1.67	1.79	1.51	1.63
3	5(16%)	0.96	0.58	1.09	1.27	0.98	0.87	0.96
4	1(3%)	0.58	0.67	1.67	1.08	1.17	1.25	1.07

The majority of lesson plans had one or two ELP standards (*Table 9*); 13 (42%) and 12 (39%) consecutively. The results from lesson plan analysis also indicated that participants showed proportionally lower scores of the ELP standard implementation as the number of standards in their lesson plans increased. The lesson plan analysis also produced very similar results between participants of spring 2014 and 2015 (*Table 9*). The mean score of ELP standards implementation into lesson plans showed only .01 difference.

Table 9 Mean Component Scores by Year

Year	Subjects	Assessments	Form	Function	Instruction	Materials	Vocabulary	Overall Mean
Comparison by year								
2014	9	1.41	1.20	1.63	1.60	1.56	1.30	1.45
2015	8	1.22	1.33	1.70	1.52	1.53	1.47	1.46
		1.31	1.27	1.67	1.56	1.54	1.39	1.46

Interviews

The results from semi-structured interviews were used to ascertain to what extent the Kansas State ELP standards inform pre-service teachers' lesson plans. 8 of 12 (67%) respondents had not considered or used the ELP standards prior to taking the practicum course. At the practicum sites (K-12 schools), 7 of 12 (58%) respondents used the ELP standards only when they had to create two formal lesson plans as a requirement of the ESOL practicum course. These respondents stated that they did not consider or use the ELP standards when planning lessons any other times.

For example, Nancy addressed how often she incorporated the ELP standards in her lesson plans as stated below. She taught ELL pull-out groups.

If I am being completely honest...the two lessons that were required for this class were all I used them [the ELP standards] for this year. Obviously, I am thinking about how to do differentiate between all learners because I feel like more strategies used for ESL could benefit all learners. I think there is a huge correlation between the strategies that we teach for ELLs, but those also would benefit regular or typical learners. So I am thinking about differentiation and modification but not necessarily specifically for ELLs, and I definitely do not look at the ELP standards when I am planning general lessons.

Similarly, Lily stated, "I only did [used the ELP standards] for the lesson that I did with you, but I think I did pretty good job of it, and I want to use that."

Jenny stated, "I do not usually incorporate those standards in my planning, but now I am working with a first grade classroom. I will start incorporating more of the standards."

Not all of the respondents indicated the same. Five respondents stated that they used the ELP standards throughout the practicum time. Among the five, four taught ELL pull-out groups

and the remaining one taught content area classes with both ELLs and non-ELLs. These results indicated that most of the interview respondents who were assigned to teach content area classes with both ELLs and non-ELLs did not implement the ELP standards in their lesson plans in general. The two required lesson plans were the only ones where they implemented the ELP standards.

Questionnaire

Item #15 of a questionnaire, administered to 10 participants, was also related to research question 1. In this item, respondents were asked to rate how true given statements were for them (*Table 10*). Rating options included: “Not at all true for me,” “Occasionally true for me,” and “Usually true for me.”

One of the statements included in item #15 was: “I start my lesson planning by consulting the state standards for ELLs.” Similar to the findings from interviews, the questionnaire indicated that majority of respondents did not consider or use the ELP standards when planning lessons; only 2 (20%) respondents indicated that the statement was usually true for them.

Table 10 Questionnaire Item #15

<i>In terms of instructional planning for integrated content and language lessons, please rate which statements are true for you.</i>				
Statements	Not at all true for me	Occasionally true for me	Usually true for me	N
I have a lot of trouble developing language objectives.	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	10
I have a lot of trouble developing content objectives.	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	10
I am familiar with the state standards for ELLs.	1 (10%)	6 (6%)	3 (30%)	10
I start my lesson planning by consulting the state standards for ELLs.	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	10

My cooperating teacher is/was effective in helping me to address state ELL standards in my lesson planning.	5 (50%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	10
I feel confident in my ability to address state ELL standards in my lesson planning.	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	10

Research Question 1a: What factors do pre-service teachers cite most often as challenges for creating lesson plans that derive from the ELP standards?

To answer research question #1a, data from interviews was used. Research question #1 revealed the participants' low rate of the ELP standard implementation into lesson plans and research question #1a aimed to reveal the background factors for the low usage of the ELP standards.

Interviews

Data from interviews supports two most frequently cited challenges to creating lesson plans that derived from the ELP standards: (a) understanding ELP standards and (b) meeting unique language needs of ELLs with wide range of English language proficiency levels.

(a) Understanding the ELP standards:

The factor that the students cited most as a challenge for creating lesson plans that derived from the ELP standards was understanding the ELP standards. The respondents were not familiar with the ELP standards and that block them to incorporate ELP standards when planning lessons. The respondents also expressed difficulty in writing language objectives.

Heidi stated,

Sometimes I would find it difficult to do it [incorporate the ELP standards] because I know more about Common Core standards than I do about the ELP standard. So it was easier for me to go and pick the Common Core standards I need, but I had to definitely think a lot harder about the ELP standards and how to incorporate them with the Common Core Standards. Does this make sense?

Respondents also mentioned why they think certain challenges exist. The common reasons were unfamiliarity to the ELP standards, lack of exposure to the ELP standards, and little or no practice using the ELP standards. The ELP standards were not well-known to them, and they had very limited opportunities to be exposed to and practice the ELP standards before they begin the ESOL practicum.

Heidi continued,

I think they are a lot vaguer than I am used to. I think I do not know, I think that served some difficulty. And I am not as familiar with them as I am with the Common Core Standards. I think that is where I find my lack of confidence.

Nancy described the challenges as,

I definitely think that the English language proficiency standards are kind of hard for me to implement as well, because I just do not have the experiences with them as I do with implementing typical or non-ESL standards. So I think that is probably one of the areas that I struggle with most. Up until practicum, I have not had a lot of experiences with them.

(b) Wide range of ELLs' English language proficiency levels:

Interview respondents also stated that meeting language and academic needs of ELLs with diverse English language proficiency is challenging and difficult. The respondents mentioned that it was very challenging to write or implement language objectives to meet each ELL's unique language needs. When the respondents taught ELL pull-out groups, in general, they had students grouped according to their English proficiency levels. However, respondents who taught content area classes with both ELLs, and non-ELLs were more likely had ELLs with different English proficiency levels. It made hard for them to pick certain standards and write language objectives out of the standards.

Lily described the experience as,

The class I had this semester, all of my students were at level 4. But I want to be teaching younger kids. So I know that I am going to have or I suspect that I am going to have a much wider variety of learners, and you still have same objectives... I do not feel confident that I will be able to write away, do all of these different actives for all of my different language learners.

Anna also mentioned the similar challenge.

In the pull-out setting, the students were basically grouped according to their proficient levels, so it was easier for me to conceptualize, "These are the things that I am doing specifically for this level of English language acquisition". But in inclusive classroom, there are varying levels of English language acquisition. So I think that the challenge is to know the difference than the challenges that teacher faces every day.

Research Question 1b: How prepared do pre-service teachers feel they are to create lesson plans that derive from the ELP standards?

The research question #1b was addressed using data from the interviews and a questionnaire.

Interviews

The data from interviews suggest that many of the participants feel underprepared to create lesson plans that are developed using the ELP standards. Throughout the interview process, eight of twelve (67%) interviewees, expressed low confidence in their ability to use the ELP standards, and this is evidenced in excerpts from the transcripts, such as:

Before this class, I did not know that we had English language proficiency standards. So I have used them to make lesson plans for this class, and they make sense to me, but I guess, I just don't feel comfortable answering this question about ELP standards because I am just not familiar enough with this. (Lily)

Heidi also expressed low efficacy in using ELP standards. She stated,

I think basically it was a lot more work, because I was not familiar with it. I do not particularly feel confident in my ability to use the ELP standards. I think that definitely drove my lack of use within subjects other than English language arts for sure.

The two most common self-reported rationales for the respondents' feeling of underpreparedness were (a) lack of exposure and (b) lack of practice with the ELP standards and language objectives. Interviewees indicated that they did not think about the ELP standards and were not sufficiently trained (exposed and practice) to use the standards and language aspects before their practicum course.

(a) Lack of exposure to the ELP standards during ESOL endorsement process

Many of the respondents (75%) think that they did not have sufficient exposure to the ELP standards during their ESOL endorsement process.

Zoe simply stated, “We really were not exposed to the ELP standards.”

Lily admitted that, “Before this class, I did not know that we had English Language proficiency standards.”

John stated, “This semester was the first time I was even introduced to the standards which is surprising.”

Not only from courses from the university, endorsement seekers also receive support and guidance from in-service teachers from their practicum sites to be effective teachers of ELLs. Most of the respondents agreed that their clinical supervisors on practicum sites were effective helpers and models of good teachers of ELLs. However, with respect to the ELP standards, their responses were quite different:

Aubrey stated,

If I get to be honest, I do not think we did a lot looking at them prior to the lesson plans we had to write out this semester. Um...my cooperating teacher did not have hardly any idea how to use them, so it was basically those standards and just me.

Other participants also indicated that they did not have opportunities to learn or talk about the ELP standards with their clinical supervisors during the practicum. However, Hannah made mention of receiving help and information from the clinical supervisor on how to use the ELP standards. The said clinical supervisor is credited for playing a critical role in understanding and utilizing the ELP standards.

The first lesson I did... I had no idea what I was doing. I looked at them before and we talked about them before in classes, but when I really opened them up, I was like; "I did not know what I am doing." So my teacher, my cooperating teacher, really helped a lot with that. Because I went up to him and said "I do not know what I am doing" and he showed me where things connect to whatever. So after that, the second lesson plan that did, I felt a lot more confident using those...but once I talked to him, my supervisor, he showed me how to build a lesson off of the standards themselves and that made it a lot easier to build them in and a lot easier to incorporate them in the lesson. (Hannah)

Hannah's clinical supervisor was a full-time teacher, and also a TESOL doctoral student at the same time. It seems that the knowledge that the teacher possessed as a TESOL graduate student helped Hannah to increase proficiency in understanding and implementing the ELP standards. In addition to having a sensitive clinical supervisor, Hannah also took the initiative to ask for help from the clinical supervisor and in doing so, she received the support needed to comprehend and implement the ELP standards.

(b) Lack of Practice

Most (92%) of interviewees expressed the lack of sufficient opportunities to practice use or implementation of the ELP standards and language objectives in creating lesson plans. 3 interview respondents stated that they were introduced and learned about the ELP standards and language objectives from a basic TESOL class. Every ESOL endorsement seeker was required to take a basic TESOL course in the beginning semester of the ESOL endorsement process.

Lily stated, “I know it is important to use them although we learned about them very late this semester. I just did not feel like I got a lot of practice. So right now, I am definitely like novice using them.”

Likewise, Hannah stated,

Up until my practicum, I had been exposed to them, but we had not really used them a lot in classes. But once I got into the practicum, I was kind of thrown into, like – use them every time you talk about this.

Nancy expressed uncertainty about implementing the ELP standards.

I feel like implementing the standards has been difficult for me in general, but then I definitely think that the English language proficiency standards are kind of hard for me to implement as well because I just do not have the experiences with them as I do with implementing typical or non-ESL standards. And so I think that is probably one of the areas that I struggle with most. Up until practicum I have not had a lot of experiences with them, and practicum has helped with the standards. I wouldn't say that I am highly capable of doing that. I still need to learn a lot about those and how to implement them.

Not all, but some respondents, who mentioned that they were introduced to the ELP standards and language objectives from the course, expressed the desire to learn more about the ESOL standards earlier before the practicum course. The notion is that given current practice they lack efficacy and confidence, but increased opportunities to practice would be beneficial so they could implement the knowledge into actual practice during their practicum.

Zoe stated,

Um... supposedly it would have been nicer to learn about the standards maybe in module 1 [of the practicum course] or something and be really pushed to use them more. We learned about them but probably did not use them especially if they do not have ELLs in their classes or very few ELLs. So I think it would've been nice to know close to beginning of the placement, so we could have utilized more often.

Lily also wished to have another semester to practice.

With this endorsement, I feel like I did not have enough time to really put into practice a lot of things I learned. I think within this practicum, I learned the most, but again, a lot of it was really late. Because we learned conceptual stuff in the beginning, which makes sense I need that before we start doing more. But again, I wish I have another semester of practicing with this.

Not all of the interviewees expressed a sense of under-preparedness to create lesson plans driven by the ELP standards. Four articulated higher levels of confidence in their ability to create lesson plans that utilize the ELP standards. Three of such interviewees majored in foreign language education, in particular, Spanish. Their responses indicated that the similarity and common language aspects between foreign language standards and the ELP standards helped them better understand and implement the ELP standards into their lesson plans. Throughout their coursework over the past years in the School of Education, they had opportunities to understand and incorporate the foreign language standards within their lesson plans and lesson implementations. Presumably, this experience contributed to the transfer of knowledge or skill that was applicable to the utilization of the ELP standards. Therefore, these particular

interviewees expressed fewer struggles than others who were majoring in other subjects such as Math, Science, Social Studies and Language Arts.

John brought up the similarity between the content standards of teaching Spanish and the ELP standards.

I think a lot of that comes from their similarity with foreign language standard. I already had practice with that doing cross content standards and foreign language. I am very comfortable, and I am used to foreign language standards. The ELP standards were totally... those are fine, and I did not have hard time with those at all. I understood those immediately.

Hannah also indicated higher efficacy for using the ELP standards. Hannah is also in the program to teach foreign languages. Hannah's experiences and practice with the foreign language standards increased her understanding and utilization of the ELP standards.

French language has its own standards from ACTFL. So they focus on the five Cs. It is like: Communication, Cultures, Connection, and whatever the other two are. Those are close to ELP standards, and the Common Core standards are more based on content of Language Arts, whatever. So I have been focusing on ELP standards. So I do not know a lot about the Common Core one.

Questionnaire

Data from the questionnaire item #15 also illuminates the unfamiliarity that participants feel about the ELP standards. On the statement, "*I am familiar with the state standards for ELLs*", six respondents (60%) stated, "Occasionally true for me" three (30%) respondents stated

“Usually true for me”. In relation to the statement, “*I feel confident in my ability to address state ELL standards in my lesson planning,*” likewise, six (60%) respondents stated “Occasionally true for me”, and three (30%) respondents also stated “Usually true for me.” This suggests that the respondents had low familiarity with the ELP standards and low confidence in the ability to create lesson plans that utilizing the ELP standards.

The questionnaire results also indicated that most of the respondents (80%) were not sufficiently helped or guided by their clinical supervisor at the practicum site in terms of utilizing the ELP standards. On the statement, “My cooperating teacher is/was effective in helping me to address state ELL standards in my lesson planning,” five respondents (50%) stated, “Not at all true for me,” three respondents (30%) stated, “Occasionally true for me,” and two (20%) respondents stated, “Usually true for me.” *Table 11* presents the related three statements to research question 1b.

Table 11 Survey Question 15

In terms of instructional planning for integrated content and language lessons, please rate which statements are true for you.				
Statements	Answer option			N
	Not at all true for me	Occasionally true for me	Usually true for me	10
I am familiar with the state standards for ELLs.	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	10
I feel confident in my ability to address state ELL standards in my lesson planning.	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	10
My cooperating teacher is/was effective in helping me to address state ELL standards in my lesson planning.	5 (50%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	10

Research question 2: To what extent do pre-service ELP endorsement seekers align Kansas Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to Kansas ELP standards in their thinking, planning, and practice?

Interviews

Data from interviews were used to address the research question #2. With the exception of one, the interviewees (11 of 12) did not align Kansas Common Core Standards to Kansas ELP standards in their conceptual understanding, planning, and practice. Most interviewees were already familiar with incorporating the common core standards in their lesson plans as opposed to the ELP standards, especially those who were assigned to teach academic content classes in mainstream classrooms with both ELLs and non-ELLs at their practicum sites. In the School of Education, the CCSS are addressed throughout the program. The students are trained and required to design every lesson based on content objectives derived from the CCSS. However, all except one, of the interviewees who taught the regular content classes responded that they had not included the ELP standards in their lesson planning in general. The only lesson plans that they implemented the ELP standards into their lesson plans were the two formal SDAIE lesson plans required by the ESOL practicum course. Only one respondent who taught regular academic classes responded that she aligned the Common Core and the ELP Standards into her lesson during the practicum time.

Research Question 2a: What factors do pre-service teachers cite most often as challenges to creating lesson plans that align content and language objectives?

Research question 2a was also addressed using data from interviews and a questionnaire. Participants found aligning content and language objectives challenging. Conceptually, all

respondents expressed strong confidence in understanding, creating, and utilizing content objectives in lesson plans.

Interviews

Joe stated, “I definitely feel more confident writing the content objectives, but again I think that is because I had more practice doing that.” Similarly, Heidi and Stephanie said, “I think content objectives come extremely easily to me at this point in my career, and I am able to do it very efficiently and very effectively” and “I feel very comfortable writing content objectives.

On the other hand, 8 out of 12 respondents (67%) showed low confidence for implementing language objectives. Their sentiments were similar to responses expressed about implementing the ELP standards – incompetence and difficulties in their ability to incorporate language objectives into their lesson planning. The limited (only in the two required formal lesson plans) use and incorporation of language objectives during practicum are most likely attributable to low confidence and perceptions of incompetence and difficulties with the language objectives.

Much the same as with the ELP Standards, the primary challenging factors to align content and language objectives were: a) lack of knowledge about language objectives and the ELP standards and b) lack of practice in writing and using language objectives.

a) Lack of knowledge about language objectives and the ELP standards

Interviewees indicated that language objectives are not sufficiently clear for them to understand and implement with confidence. Nancy suggested that, “... the form and function

part of it (language objective) was and still is fairly difficult for me to understand.” On the other hand, Heidi compared her feeling about language objectives to content objectives:

I think content objectives come extremely easily to me at this point in my career, and I am able to do it very efficiently and very effectively. I do not feel that way about language objectives, so I think that they have not...I think that the way that is put on to content objectives has not been put on to language objectives. So I feel less confidence in creating language objectives, and it makes me more hesitant to make language objectives for lesson plans.

Mila also added,

I am semi-confident. My content objective confidence is totally fine, and I am great with that. It is the whole form and function part of the language objectives that I think I am struggle with a little bit. I am just not 100%...I have a packet of paper. It says forms here and functions right here, and they match up. But I am not sure if they are supposed to match up. I am not sure how the forms and functions work that well.

Although respondents expressed the difficulties to understand and use language objectives, some of the respondents commented that particular subjects were easier to implement language objectives and align them to content objectives. For example, Aubrey noted that aligning content and language objectives was relatively easier in reading classes:

I think it is little bit harder to think about aligning two of them [language objectives and content objectives]. One is not focused on language specifically, but I feel like the two that I did write in reading...I felt like it was pretty easy to align them.

Lily also described her experiences in aligning content and language objectives in different subject classes. She found a particular subject class was easier over others:

In my first lesson that I did, I found language objectives that fit really well with the content. That one was easy. That was very easy to align my content and my language objectives. I found my content standards and language standards that were very similar that matched well together. But in a second one, it was more difficult. And I had to kind of really work with it.

b) Lack of practice in writing and using language objectives

Interviewees also faulted their training schema with insufficient guided opportunities to practice to utilize language objectives. Nancy stated, “I have never written a lesson plan specifically designed for English language learners.”

Similarly, Lily stated,

I just feel I did not have enough practice. I think that is only...They (language objectives) are easy to use. They are not hard to use, but I just do not think that I am familiar enough with them. I just need more practice.

Nora, “We did not really work with that (writing language objectives) a lot, so it was definitely a difficult task to come up with something.”

In sum, data from interviews indicated most of respondents felt challenging in aligning content and language objectives in planning their lesson plans because they had insufficient knowledge and practice on language objectives. However, not all of respondents felt the same. A couple of respondents expressed that aligning both objectives was an easy task. They did not

express strong confidence in writing language objectives but felt easy in aligning those to content objectives as stated,

I think once you have the objectives, it is easy to align them [content and language objectives]. Say, ‘Okay, well, I am doing this activity for this content objectives and that would work really nicely with this language objective’ because it is focusing on what I want them to produce. So I think it is easier to align them and write them once you have the objectives. I feel confident in aligning them. I do. (Zoe)

Much the same, Stephanie alleged,

I guess, pretty good (aligning content and language objectives). I noticed when I was creating lesson plans for this practicum, I always wanted to use the language objectives that were along with the content related skills so like.

Questionnaire

The data from the questionnaire also support the results from interviews. Questionnaire items #15 and #19 were pertinent for research question #2a. The outcomes for items #15 and #19 of the questionnaire were same as were illuminated in the interviews. As mentioned earlier, item #15 asked the respondents to rate how much true the given statements to them. For the statement “I have a lot of trouble developing language objectives” of item #15, 50 % respondents stated, “Occasionally true for me.” 20 % respondents stated, “Usually True for me.” This trend supports the notion that the respondents experience significant challenges to develop language objectives, but they experience much less difficulty to develop content-specific objectives. On the other hand, 70% of respondents indicated “Not at all true for me,” on the statement, “I have a lot of trouble developing content objectives.”

For item #19, participants were asked to rate the quality of the English language objectives they write for ELLs. The results suggest that respondents experience low confidence in developing quality language objectives; 30% of respondents indicated “Consistently good” and 60% respondents indicated, “Inconsistent.” Although 30 percent of the respondents consider the language objectives they wrote as “Consistently Good”, the qualitative explanations they provided regarding their answers indicated much lower confidence (*Table 12*). Based on the qualitative data, 9 of 10 respondents expressed low confidence in their ability to create language objectives.

Table 12 Qualitative Explanation

#	Explanation
1	In my classroom, language is a primary focus. Once I am able to determine the function and form that is to be focus of my lesson, I am able to structure my instruction so it can address my specific language objectives.
2	This is harder for my in higher language classes.
3	I make an effort to incorporate related and needed language objectives into my lesson plans, however they are sometimes less focused on than the content.
4	With support, I feel comfortable with this process. However, I struggled with writing language objectives on occasion.
5	Again, I am still developing this skill and I wouldn't say I have mastered it yet. I've had practice but I think I need more in order to be considered "Consistently High."
6	I have not learned enough in my TESOL classes to feel confident in writing EL objectives.
7	I need more experience and instruction in writing these objectives.
8	I have not had much practice writing language objectives. These are difficult to write, and there was no clear formula to write them until my ESOL practicum class.
9	Language objectives were not always emphasized in my practicum.

Items #15 and #19 also indicated that writing quality language objectives is a challenging task to the respondents. In sum, the respondents of both the interviews and a questionnaire proffered two factors most often as challenges to creating lesson plans that align content and language objectives: a) lack of knowledge about language objectives and the ELP standards and b) lack of practice in writing and using language objectives. Aligning both sets of objectives was seemingly easier in language-oriented subject classes such as Language Arts.

Research question 2b: What are pre-service teachers' perceptions of their preparedness to write content objectives for English language learners (ELLs)?

Data from interviews and a questionnaire also illuminated research question #2b.

Interviews

Participants showed strong confidence in their ability to creating and applying content objectives and they indicated that they had continuous training to use content standards and for writing content objectives throughout their programs in the school of education. Participants also indicated that they had opportunity to practice those skills during their practicum. All of the students indicated that they felt prepared to use and write content objectives for ELLs effectively as participant stated.

It is a lot more natural. I shouldn't say I do not ever have difficulty, but it become a routine. So, it is something that I am just more comfortable with. I guess I do not second guess myself when I am creating content objectives, but when I am doing my ELP objectives, I am more hesitant because I am not as much as confident in my ability to create them. (Jenny)

Questionnaire

The questionnaire data also illuminated the respondents' confidence in their preparedness to write content objectives for ELLs (*Table 13*). Item #18 asked the respondents to rate *the quality of the content objectives they write for ELLs* and 80% respondents self-reported that they wrote "Consistently Good" and No respondent self-reported as writing "Poor" content objectives. An open-ended option associated with #18 encouraged the respondents to explain their responses. Nine of ten respondents (90%) provided qualitative explanations on their responses (*Table 14*). On a whole positive responses were selected for the ratings – 80% reporting that they wrote consistently good objectives for ELL. However, 40% of the qualitative responses did resonate such a confident note (*Table 14*).

Table 13 Questionnaire #18

Question	Options				N
How would you rate the quality of the content objectives you write for ESL learners?	Consistently High	Consistently Good	Inconsistent	Poor	10
	1(10%)	8(80%)	1(10%)	0(0%)	

Table 14 Qualitative Explanation of #18

#	Explanation
1	I would like to address the material that ESL learners cover in other areas outside of the ESL environment. Due to the variability of grade level of my students in my ESL classrooms, this is not always easy to achieve as different grade levels cover different material.
2	I'm still learning about how to make them appropriately concise.
3	I start with content objectives and then find ways to work in language objectives. This means that I am making sure I am helping students learn the content, before I am selecting a language objective.

4 I would say that most of my content objectives are written with the whole class in mind. However, I taught in an inclusive setting, and some of the objectives needed to be differentiated (significantly) for some of my students. For example, while a native speaker of English would master a writing objective with no problem, I would have to incorporate additional supports and factor in a more time for a student who is at the beginning level of English language acquisition.

5 **I'm still sharpening the skill of creating content objectives for ESL learners.** I had a lot of experience during student teaching but I think I need more practice in order to consider myself. "Consistently High."

6 I feel that I have not learned enough about writing language objectives for my ELLs, but I am very good at writing content objectives. Therefore, I put myself between both of those.

7 **I need more experience and instruction** in writing these objectives.

8 I have had the most practice writing content objectives through my schooling at KU. Having this practice and consistent feedback about my content objectives throughout my schooling, has made me confident in creating content objectives.

9 I am consistent in creating and following through with my content objectives that are written for my ELL students.

Considering the interview and questionnaire data, it is possible that the respondents were confused with the terms “content objectives” and “content objectives for ELLs.” Therefore, their responses to the questions asking about their preparedness and quality regarding writing language presented both positive and negative responses.

Chapter Summary

First, participants of this study, pre-service teachers of ELLs, used the ELP standards limitedly in their lesson plan components: language objectives (function, form, and vocabulary), instruction, and materials during their ESOL practicum time. Most of the participants who taught ELL pull-out groups incorporate the ELP standards in their lesson planning, but the majority of the participants who taught content area classes did not incorporate the ELP standards in their

lesson planning in general. The majority of the participants did not consider and use ELP standards before beginning the practicum.

Second, as the number of identified ELP standards increases, the mean score of ELP standards implementation decreases.

Third, the participants cited understanding the ELP standards as a challenge to creating lesson plans that derive from the ELP standards. Also, choosing the appropriate and effective ELP standards when they have ELLs with a wide range of English language proficiencies was another most cited challenge.

Fourth, many of the participants feel under-prepared to create lesson plans that derive from the ELP standards. The two most cited factors were lack of exposure to the ELP standards and lack of practice to the ELP standards and language objectives.

Fifth, majority of the participants were not exposed to the ELP standards at their practicum sites and did not receive help or support from their clinical supervisor.

Sixth, participants whose major was foreign language education showed confidence in understanding and implementing the ELP standards due to the similarity between the foreign language standards and the ELP standards.

Seventh, the majority of participants did not align Kansas Common Core Standards to the ELP standards in their thinking and planning. In general, they did not write or use the ELP standards into their lesson planning.

Eight, the participants had challenges to creating lesson plans that align content and language objectives due to a) lack of knowledge about language objectives and the ELP

standards, and b) lack of practice in writing and using language objectives. Also, the participants presented low confidence in their ability to write quality language objectives for ELLs.

Ninth, the participants showed strong confidence in their ability to creating and applying content objectives for ELLs in lesson planning. However, the data showed some discrepancy. On a similar question regarding content objectives for ELLs, data from interviews and a questionnaire item presented positive responses, but qualitative responses from the questionnaire item presented negative responses. It is likely that the participants did not always think of the difference between content objectives and content objectives for ELLs.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to explore Kansas pre-service English as a Second or Other Language (ESOL) endorsement seekers' understanding of the principles and practices of the SDAIE model. In particular, this study answered five research questions as follows:

- 1) To what extent do the Kansas state - English Language Proficiency (KS-ELP) standards inform pre-service teachers' lesson plans in terms of language objectives (functions/forms/vocab) and lesson activities (strategy/materials/ assessments)?
 - a. What factors do pre-service teachers cite most often as challenges to creating lesson plans that derive from the ELP standards?
 - b. How prepared do pre-service teachers feel they are to create lesson plans that derive from the ELP standards?
- 2) To what extent do pre-service ELP endorsement seekers align Kansas Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to Kansas ELP standards in their thinking, planning, and practice?
 - a. What factors do pre-service teachers cite most often as challenges for creating lesson plans that align content and language objectives?
 - b. What are pre-service teachers' perceptions of their preparedness to write content objectives for English Language Learners (ELLs)?

In this chapter, findings of this study are discussed in light of the five research questions and subsequent conclusions. This chapter also includes implications, limitations and suggestions for practice and future study.

Discussion

Research Question 1

To what extent do the KS state ELP standards inform pre-service teachers' lesson plans in terms of language objectives (functions/forms/ vocab) and lesson activities (strategy/materials/ assessments)?

Data from the lesson plan analysis illuminated an average score (1.46/3) for the ELP standard implementation on lesson plans in terms of language objectives (functions/forms/vocabulary) and lesson activities. Language function had the highest score (1.67) for ELP standard implementation, followed by instruction (1.56), materials (1.54), vocabulary (1.39) and assessment (1.31). On the other hand, Language form (1.27) was the lowest implemented of the teachers' lesson plan. A possible explanation is that the content standards of language-related subjects are often very similar to the ELP standards in terms of focusing on language use and functions; therefore, it is a familiar process or aspect of planning and delivery of the lesson. For example, one of 2nd grade literacy standards is, "Use knowledge of language and its conventions when writing, speaking, reading, or listening." The 2nd grade ELP standards that can be aligned to the content standard is "Standard 10: An ELL can make accurate use of standard English to communicate in grade-appropriate speech and writing." Out of 31 lesson plans analyzed, 17 lesson plans were created for language-related subjects or classes such as *ESL Pull-Out*, *Language Arts*, *Literacy*, and *English*. Given that more than half of the analyzed lesson plans were related to language teaching, the higher score on the 'function' component is understandable.

Based on the researcher's experience as an ESOL practicum supervisor for a number of years, one possible explanation offered is that the lower assessment scores are possibly the result

of pre-service teachers overlooking the assessment component in lesson planning. It has been the researcher's observation that for assessment plans, pre-service teachers only tend to write teachers' behaviors or actions checking on students' achievement such as '*checking on students' worksheets*' or '*walking around the classroom and see how they are doing.*' Verifying specific evidences of students' achievement of content and language objectives is typically neglected.

Lesson plan analysis results also indicated that the average score of the ELP standard implementation was lower when the participants incorporated a larger number of standards in a lesson plan. Although using more standards generates lower scores on that analysis, it might not mean that a lower number of standards are better than having a higher number of standards for a certain lesson. It is understandable that the participants could not apply all the aspects of the ELP standards within each lesson plan component when they had multiple standards in a lesson plan. Although the mean score for plans with a lesser number of standards was low, the participants did implement part of each standard, and ELLs might benefit from various ELP standards implemented in lessons.

From two separate semesters, the results from lesson plan analysis showed very similar mean scores for implementation of the ELP standards into lesson plans between participants. Participants from the semester of spring 2014 and spring 2015 showed only .01 difference on the mean score. This might indicate that the ESOL endorsement program of the university provides consistent education and training to ESOL endorsement seekers in terms of utilizing the ESOL standards.

Data from interviews revealed that many of the pre-service teachers (67%) do not consider the ELP standards in their thinking and lesson planning. Most of them taught content

subjects in mainstream classrooms to both ELLs and non-ELLs. One possible explanation for this observation is that incorporating the ELP standards is not emphasized and taught explicitly in the ESOL endorsement courses. In fact, further findings from interviews and questionnaire noted lack of exposure to and practice combining ELP standards and language objectives as a challenge or problem. Another possible explanation is that pre-service teachers consider the ELP standards unnecessary when they teach other content subjects in mainstream classes. The results indicated that most of the participants who taught English language to ELL pull-out groups incorporated the ELP standards in their lessons, but most of the participants who taught content subject did not. This suggests that pre-service teachers tend to consider that the ELP standards are only designed to teach ELLs, in particular, for ELL pull-out groups.

Question 1a

What factors do pre-service teachers cite most often as challenges to creating lesson plans that derive from the ELP standards?

Data from interviews presented two most frequently cited challenges: (a) understanding the ELP standards and (b) meeting unique language needs of ELLs with wide range of English language proficiency levels. The results indicate that pre-service teachers at the very last stage of ESOL endorsement process still lacked knowledge of the ELP standards. In addition, pre-service teachers experience challenges to plan lessons that meet various language and academic needs of ELLs. This finding is similar to the findings from survey conducted by Gandara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll (2005). In their study, one of most cited challenges that California teachers of ELLs stated was, “frustration with the wide range of English language and academic levels often found in their classrooms” (Gandara et al, 2005, p 8).

In every classroom, in-service and pre-service teachers have ELLs to teach content subjects whose English proficiencies are at different levels. It is understandable that choosing ELP standards and writing language objectives that effectively support learning of all ELLs in the classrooms is challenging. In particular, it would be more challenging to pre-service teachers considering the short period of practice time that they generally have during their training time.

Question 1b

Research question 1b: How prepared do pre-service teachers feel they are to create lesson plans that derive from the ELP standards?

The findings of this study revealed that pre-service teachers are not sufficiently prepared to create lesson plan based on the ELP standards. They cited lack of exposure to the standards as one of the main reasons for their lack of confidence. The source of such frustration was attributed to both the university program and practicum placement sites. These pre-service teachers received limited exposure to the standards and help to be able to effectively utilize ELP standards.

One possible explanation is that the clinical supervisors (in-service teachers) themselves might not actively incorporate the ELP standards in their lesson planning. Although the participants stated that their clinical supervisors were helpful in learning about ESOL teaching strategies in general, their opinions regarding the ELP standards were different. Among 12 interviewees, only one respondent stated her clinical supervisor provided practical knowledge and support in utilizing the ELP standards. The clinical supervisor of the respondent was a full-time teacher, but also a doctoral student in TESOL program in the university at the same time. It seems that the knowledge which that particular teacher gleaned while pursuing a graduate degree

in TESOL enabled the clinical supervisor to guide and help the pre-service teacher to become more adept in understanding and using the ELP standards. On the other hand, data from the questionnaire indicated that 20% of respondents felt that their clinical supervisor was effective in helping them to address the ELP standards in their lesson planning.

Pre-service teachers also cited lack of practice during the ESOL endorsement as the other primary reason for feeling under-prepared. They strongly expressed their desire for more practice opportunities within in-class coursework before they entered the practicum sites. This phenomenon was also seen in other studies, for example, Byrnes, Gary, and Manning (1998) also noted that teachers who did not have sufficient practice and trainings from their teacher preparation program felt under-prepared in teaching English language learners. Similar findings were also addressed in Durgunoglu and Huges (2010), Vacca-Rizopoulos and Nicoletti (2009), and Peter et al (2012).

Although the research question 1b explored primarily on the ELP standards, the results also have implications on language objectives. Considering that language objectives should be derived from the ELP standards (Echevarria et al, 2013), low competency in understanding and utilizing the ELP standards means low competency in creating and implementing language objectives as well. Results of this study support that position.

Question 2

To what extent do pre-service ELP endorsement seekers align Kansas Common Core Standards (CCSS) to Kansas ELP standards in their thinking, planning, and practice?

The results of this study revealed that pre-service teachers do not align the CCSS and the ELP standards in their lesson planning. In fact, pre-service teachers hardly use the ELP standards

in lesson planning when they teach academic subjects to mainstream classes. Not surprisingly, pre-service teachers show strong confidence in their ability to create lesson plans that derived from the CCSS. Throughout the interview process, pre-service teachers stated that CCSS were emphasized and highlighted throughout the courses of their main teaching areas and were trained to use the CCSS. Considering that the ability to plan content and language integrated lessons is one of the most valuable tools for ELL teachers to have in their repertoire (Baecher, 2012), the findings of the study suggest that these pre-service teachers lack a vital tool.

Question 2a

What factors do pre-service teachers cite most often as challenges to creating lesson plans that align content and language objectives?

The findings of this study indicated that pre-service teachers mostly cited two factors as challenges to creating lesson plans that align content and language objectives: a) lack of knowledge about language objectives and the ELP standards and b) lack of practice in writing and using language objectives.

Pre-service teachers expressed strong confidence in understanding and utilizing content objectives as they did in the CCSS. On the contrary, for language objectives, pre-service teachers expressed uncertainty and lack of confidence due to lack of knowledge and practice. Pre-service teachers experienced difficulties in understanding what each element of language objectives, such as language functions, forms, and vocabulary meant, and how to create them for a particular lesson. A study conducted by Kim (2007) also indicated that high school teachers possessed a lower level of knowledge and significance for language objectives as opposed to their level of knowledge and significance for content objectives.

Question 2b

What are their perceptions of their preparedness to write content objectives for ELLs?

The findings of this study indicated that pre-service teachers presented discrepancy in their confidence in writing content objectives for ELLs. The participants were asked very the similar question through both interviews and questionnaire, and the results from the two data sources were very similar; pre-service teachers felt prepared to write content objectives for ELLs. However, the open-ended question on the questionnaire asking the respondents to provide qualitative explanation on their responses generated different results. Unlike the results from the other data sources, results from the open-ended question indicated that more than half of respondents (5 of 9) showed lack of confidence in creating content objectives for ELLs. A possible explanation of this discrepancy could be that the open-ended question drew deeper reflection on the question, and enable the respondents to think more critically on that issue.

Recommendations for Practice

The findings of the study suggest a number of recommendations for practice.

Recommendation 1. The findings of this study suggest that university preparatory programs for TESOL place more emphasis on familiarizing pre-service teachers with the state ELP standards and language objectives in the TESOL related courses and the ESOL Endorsement program. The ELP standards are developed for both ESL teachers and content area teachers to collaborate in support of ELLs' English language development and academic content learning (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2014). Not only ESL teachers but also every content area teacher should have knowledge about the ELP standards and recognize the importance of the standards. Research shows the importance of setting good language objectives

to promote ELLs' academic language proficiency (Dong, 2004; Echevarria et al, 2013; Herrea & Murry, 2005; Show, Met, & Genesee, 1989). Language objectives enable students to systematically practice vocabulary, speaking, reading, and writing skills (Herrera & Marry, 2005). Echevarria et al. (2013) stated, "A focus on function and form is necessary to move students to advanced levels of academic English and full proficiency, which also set students up to be college and career ready" (p.30). Language objectives should be derived from the ELP standards and content subject curricula (Echevarria et al, 2013). Low competency in understanding and utilizing the ELP standards means low competency in creating and implementing language objectives appropriately as well.

Implementing the ELP standards in instruction is also important because ELLs must achieve a passing score on state-standardized tests in content area subjects. Implementing the ELP standard activities will effectively help ELLs develop academic language proficiency to meet the grade level content area standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2014). The findings of this study call for updates to current ESOL endorsement program. Many of the pre-service teachers of this study stated that they did not learn enough about the ELP standards and did not practice adequately before the practicum began. They expressed a strong desire for more practice opportunities with the ELP standards and language objectives within their coursework. Pre-service teachers should acquire essential knowledge and tools through guided exercises with meaningful feedback as a part of their coursework so that they are more confident and competent in their delivery to actual ELLs at the practicum sites. Equally importantly, pre-service teachers should be provided with research-based evidence of the importance of setting good language objectives. If pre-service teachers do not recognize the value of language objectives and the ELP

standards, they would not actually focus on the objectives and standards even though they possess knowledge and skills to utilize them.

Recommendation 2. The findings of this study suggest university teacher educators of TESOL should teach pre-service teachers how to write appropriate content objectives for ELLs. Content objectives and state standards are often difficult for ELLs to comprehend due to its complexity. Thus, content objectives for ELLs should be less than two per lesson to simplify learning tasks and should be written in a simple way (Echevarria et al, 2013). Teacher educators need to include more content focus for teaching pre-service teachers how to make content objectives accessible and comprehensible to ELLs. Pre-service teachers should be able to use simple statements, visuals, students' background knowledge, and supplementary materials to create effective content objectives for ELLs (Echevarria et al, 2013).

Recommendation 3. The findings of this study suggest that university teacher educators should carefully review pre-service teachers' each component (language function, form, vocabulary, instruction, and materials etc.) of lesson plan formats such as SDAIE and SIOP to ensure that pre-service teachers are designing the best instruction in all lesson components. The findings of the lesson plan analysis reveal overall low implementation of the ELP standards in lesson planning format such as SDAIE, and the lower components were assessments and language forms. As a result, ESOL endorsement programs should also concentrate on helping pre-service teachers to understand and utilize the ELP standards. Additionally, endorsement program educators should carefully review each component of pre-service teachers' lesson planning to ensure that pre-service teachers are designing the best instruction in all lesson components.

Recommendation 4. The findings of this study suggest university teacher educators of TESOL should educate pre-service teachers how to align the ELP standards to CCSS. In order to successfully integrate subject content and language learning, pre-service teachers need confidence in incorporating language standards and aligning them with CCSS eventually.

Recommendation 5. The findings of this study suggest university educators of TESOL should educate pre-service teachers about the features of each element of language objectives (language form, language function, vocabulary, assessment, and materials etc.) and provide practice opportunities in creating and implementing the objectives into actual lessons. The findings of this study revealed that pre-service teachers do not understand what some of elements of language objectives mean, in particular, language forms and function. This might be a possible explanation why pre-service teachers felt underprepared to write and implement language objectives effectively in content area classes. Setting good language objectives are important to promote ELLs' academic English proficiency as discussed. Placing greater emphasis on language objectives will prepare pre-service teachers to become effective teachers who help ELLs develop academic language proficiency, which is critical to successfully learn academic content.

Recommendation 6. An effort to secure maximum period of one-site training is necessary and important to better equip pre-service teachers with more practice and experiences directly working toward ELLs. In general, pre-service teachers are placed in their placements for a short period of time. In the ESOL practicum course of the university, the practicum period is ideally suggested to be an entire semester. However, depending on the circumstances of placement sites, professional and personal schedules of clinical supervisors (in-service teachers), and schedule conflicts between regular student teaching for their main subjects and the ESOL practicum, the

actual practicum periods at K-12 schools vary. Some pre-service teachers only spent less than four weeks as student teachers of ELLs at their placement site. It is understandable that the various circumstances need to be taken into account when deciding actual practice period at the practicum site. However, pre-service teachers are likely to lack time and opportunities to sufficiently learn about each of their ELL's English language proficiency, academic achievement progress, backgrounds, experiences and unique needs. In planning instruction, determining students' backgrounds and needs is a first stage (Gottlieb, Katz, & Ernst-Slavit, 2009). That might give pre-service teachers more challenges to consider certain ELP standards and apply to lessons for ELLs with various backgrounds and needs. Teachers who teach content area subjects need not only to have knowledge about their ELLs academic language development process, but also particular language and vocabulary used in their subject to successfully implement their instruction (Echevarria et al, 2013 & Dong, 2004). That will allow teachers to design their instruction to fit the students' language development. Longer period of time at the practicum site working directly toward ELLs will provide pre-service teachers with more opportunities and chances to plan and implement instruction that better meet the students' unique needs.

Recommendation 7. The findings of this study suggest the Kansas State Department of Education to redesign the current qualification to certify teachers of ELLs. In the state of Kansas, in-service and pre-service teachers are able to be ESOL endorsed simply by taking a State ESOL subject assessment if they earn a minimum passing score. During the interview process, all of pre-service teachers stated that the ESOL endorsement program they had been pursuing greatly helped them acquire the tools to be a good teacher of ELLs. In particular, they stated that the ESOL practicum course was the most helpful and useful resources among all ESL endorsement courses. It was not asked, but four interviewees emphasized the benefits of taking the ESOL

endorsement program through the university coursework. Stephanie stated, “I really think that it is worth it rather than just taking the praxis and getting a passing score.” Similarly, John stated,

Especially, I am thinking if you are one of the people who does not take this course and just take the Praxis to get the Licensure, and you would just have no idea what a SDAIE lesson looks like or how to write the standards.

The findings of the study show that even pre-service teachers who have been taking multiple university-based courses still want more knowledge and practice to become effective teachers of ELLs. Then, a question should be raised: Achieving a passing score of the State ESOL assessment is really enough qualification to become an effective teacher of ELLs?

Limitations of the Study

First. The participants of this study are limited to pre-service teachers in a specific university in the State of Kansas where a large population of ELLs is reported. Thus, the results of this study should be generalized in limited way.

Second. The number of participants of this study is small.

Suggestions for Future Research

To extent that this study to explore the extent to which the State ELP standards inform pre-service teachers’ lesson implementation in actual classrooms, this study can be extended to a larger population and also go beyond teachers’ lesson planning and assess actual lesson implementation in classrooms with ELLs. Data on the implementation or actual usage of the ELP standards and other topics discussed in this study would be very useful to inform practice as well as program improvement.

This study only explored the situation with pre-service teachers. Extending the research to assess in-service teachers' knowledge and usage of the State ELP standards and language objectives could also be worthwhile. Research with in-service teachers could evaluate actual practice and illuminate pragmatic information (observed, expressed, and perceived) pertaining to teachers' knowledge and usage of the ELP standards and language objectives.

Finally, a more in-depth study of aligning CCSS and the ELP standards would also be of practical value. This study explored the alignment of the two sets of standards mostly through interviews. Various research methods including statistical research methods will provide richer findings in that area.

Conclusion

This study provided an understanding of Kansas pre-service teachers' knowledge and usage of the ELP standards when planning lesson plans in the SDAIE lesson plan format. Inferences based on data collected lead to several conclusions: 1) The state ELP standards limitedly inform pre-service teachers' lesson plans; 2) Pre-service teachers experienced difficulty to understand the ELP standards and to meet unique language needs of ELLs with wide range of English language proficiency levels. Those factors contribute to the limited usage of the ELP standards. 3) Pre-service teachers are not sufficiently prepared to create lesson plan that derive from the ELP standards due to lack of exposure to the standards and lack of practice on the standards. 4) Pre-service teachers do not align the CCSS to the ELP standards in their lesson planning. On the contrary, pre-service teachers show strong confidence in their abilities to create lesson plans that derived from the CCSS. 5) Pre-service teachers mostly cited two factors as primary challenges when creating lesson plans that align content and language objectives: a) lack

of knowledge about language objectives and the ELP standards and b) lack of practice in writing and using language objectives. 6) Pre-service teachers need to learn about and practice on creating effective and supportive content objectives to promote ELLs' academic success.

The findings of this study suggest that more emphasis should be placed on the ELP standards and language objectives during the preparation of pre-service teachers seeking ESOL endorsement. TESOL program educators in pre-service teacher programs need to reflect on the consistency and quality of both content and training opportunities available to pre-service teachers, in particular, ascertaining adequate knowledge and practice relevant to the ELP standards and language objectives; the alignment between the ELP standards and CCSS; and supportive and effective content objectives for ELLs.

Although areas to be improved are identified, the results of this study revealed that pre-service teachers seeking ESOL endorsement through the university perceived the program as a worthwhile investment to become an effective teacher of ELLs. Policy makers of Kansas State Department of Education might need to consider restructuring its current policy for in-service and pre-service teachers to be ESOL endorsed. The current policy, being able to be ESOL endorsed by only earning a minimum passing score on the state ESOL assessment, seems to be questionable. Given that large and growing number of ELL population nationwide, all teachers are teachers of ELLs (Dong, 2004). Knowledge and practice in teaching ELLs will increase competency of content area teachers to teach diverse classes that may include ELLs and to better collaborate with language teachers and ESL specialist.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the discussion of results of this study and relevant literature. Inferences based on findings led to conclusions and recommendations for practice and policy. Four limitations of this study were identified and further extensions to the study were suggested.

REFERENCES

- Baecher, L. (2012). Feedback from the field: What novice PreK-12 ESL teachers want to tell TESOL teacher educators. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(3), 578-588.
- Byra, M., & Coulon, S. C. (1992, April). Preservice Teachers' Inclass Behaviors: The Effect of Planning and Not Planning. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Associate, San Francisco, CA.
- Byrnes, D., Gary, K., & Manning, M. L. (1998). *Classroom teachers and language-minority students. Educational Research Quarterly*, 22(1), 26-31.
- California State Department of Education. (2014). *Glossary of Terms*. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/sr/cs/hiperfelmglossary.asp>
- Center for Public Education (2013). *Understanding the Common Core Standards: What they are-What they are not*. Retrieved from http://community.ksde.org/Portals/50/Documents/Home/NSBA_CommonCoreFAQ_v1.pdf
- Cline, Z., & Nicochea, J. (2003). Specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE): More than just good instruction. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 5(1). 18-24.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (2014). *English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards*.

Retrieved from <http://www.ksde.org/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services/Career-Standards-and-Assessment-Services/Content-Area-A-E/English-Language-Proficiency/Standards>

Cummins, J. (1994). Primary language instruction and the education of language minority students. In C.F. Leyba (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp.3-46). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

Dong, Y.R. (2004). Preparing secondary subject area teachers to teach linguistically and culturally diverse students. *The Clearing House*, 77(5), 202-206.

Durgunoglu, A. Y., & Hughes, T. (2010). How prepared are the U.S. pre-service teachers to teach English language learners? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22(1), 32-41.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D.J. (2013). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (4th Ed.). Boston, Massachusetts : Pearson

Educational Testing Service. (2013). *Coming together to raise achievement: New assessment for the Common Core State Standards*. Retrieved from http://www.k12center.org/rsc/pdf/Coming_Together_June_2013.pdf

Gandara,p., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Discoll , A. (2005). *Listening to Teachers of English*

- Language Learners: A Survey of California Teachers' Challenges, Experiences, and Professional Development Needs*. UC Berkeley: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute. Retrieved from: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/6430628z>
- Gottlieb, M., Katz, A., & Ernst-Slavit, G. (2009). *Paper to Practice: Using the TESOL English Language Proficiency Standards in PreK-12 classrooms*. Alexandria, VA:TESOL.
- Herrera, S. G., & Murry, K.G. (2005). *Mastering ESL and bilingual methods: differentiated instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse students*. Boston: Allyn& Bacon
- Honigsfeld, A., & Cohan, A. (2006, April). *Lesson study meets SIOP: Linking two successful professional development models*. Paper presented at the AERA conference, San Francisco, CA.
- Hoover, J., & Patton, J. (2004). Differentiating standards-based education for students with diverse needs. *Remedial and special education*, 25(2). 74-78.
- Kansas PTA Advocacy Leadership. (2013). *Issue brief: Common Core & Kansas College and Career Ready Standards*. Retrieved from http://www.kansas-pta-legislative.org/sites/default/files/IssueBriefCCSS_KSCCRS.pdf
- Kansas State Department of Education. (2013). *English language proficiency standards committee*. Retried from <http://www.ksde.org/Agency/DivisionofLearningServices/CareerStandardsandAssessmentServices/ContentAreaA-E/EnglishLanguageProficiency/Standards.aspx>.

- Kim, S. (2007). *Exploring the self-reported knowledge and value of implementation of content and language objectives of high school content-area teachers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.
- Krashen, S.D. (1985). *Inquiries and insight: Essays on second language teaching, bilingual education literacy*. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.
- Krashen, S.D. (1988). Comprehensible output? *System* 26, 175-182.
- Krashen, S.D. (1994). The input hypothesis and its revals. In N. Ellis (Ed.) *Implicit and explicit learning of language*. London: Academic Press. 45-77
- Maxwell, J.A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2012). *Digestion of education statistic*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_047.asp.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *English learners*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Peter, L., Markham, P., & Frey, B. B. (2012). *Preparing Teachers for Success with English*

- Language Learners: Challenges and Opportunities for University TESOL Educators. *The Teacher Educator*, 47(4), 302-327.
- Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewisa, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner.' *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11(1), 63-90.
- Porter, A., McMaken, J., Hwang, J., & Yang, R. (2011). Common Core Standards: New U.S. intended curriculum. *Educational Researchers*, 40(3), 103-116.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication.
- Sailor, W., Stowe, M.J., Turnbull, R., & Kleinhammer-Tramill, J. (2007). A case for adding a social-behavioral standard to standard-based education with schoolwide positive behavior as its basis. *Remedial and Special Education*, 28(6), 366-376.
- Schmidt, M. (2005). Pre-service string teachers' lesson-planning processes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 53(1), 6-25.
- Short, D.J. (2000). The ESL Standards: Bridging the Academic Gap for English Language Learners. *ERIC Clearning house on Languages and Linguistics*. ERIC doi:ED447728
- Short, D.J., & Echevarria, J. (1999). The sheltered instruction observation protocol: A tool for

- teacher-researcher collaboration and professional development. *ERIC Clearing house on Languages and Linguistics*.1-9. ERIC doi: ED436981
- Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 2, 420-428
- Snow, M.A., Met, M., & Genesee, E. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 37-53.
- Snow, M. A., & Katz, A. M. (2009). Standards and second language teacher education. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 66-76). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sobul, D. (1995). *Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED391357). Retrieved February 15, 2014 from ERIC database.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(3), 371-391.
- Swanson, C, B., & Stevenson, D.L. (2002). Standards-based reform in practice: Evidence on state policy and classroom instruction from the NAEP state assessments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(1). 1-27.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2013). *Language use in the United States: 2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.Census.gov>.

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (2006). *PreK-12 English Language Proficiency Standards*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages Practicum Handbook. (2014). Lawrence, KS: The University of Kansas.

TESOL. (1997). *ESL standards for pre-K-12 students*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

The Department of Curriculum and Teaching. (2014). *Undergraduate practicum for Kansas state endorsement 2014 Handbook*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.

Vacca-Rizopoulos, L.A., & Nicoletti, A. (2009). Pre-service teachers' reflections on effective strategies of teaching Latino ESL students. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 8(1), 67-76.

Appendix (B): Questionnaire

Questionnaire developed by Dr. Laura Baecher at Hunter College in New York with input from Dr. Lizette Peter of the University of Kansas and the researcher of the present study

Dear Practicum Students,

Thank you so much for your participation in this survey! Your responses will help our department improve the quality of ESOL Endorsement program to serve our future students better. Below is the introductory statement and the first question of the questionnaire starts at the next page. Thank you again.

Internet Information Statement

The Department of Curriculum and Teaching at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

We are conducting a research project to gather your views on your knowledge of the language and culture needs of ELs (English Learners), your knowledge of the principles and practices of SDAIE, and your skills in preparing and implementing lessons designed to ensure the full and equal participation of ELs in the regular classroom. This will entail your completion of this online questionnaire. The questionnaire is expected to take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

The content of the questionnaires should cause no more discomfort than you would experience in your everyday life. Although participation may not benefit you directly, we believe that the information obtained from this study will help us gain a better understanding of the ways in which students in our TESOL program develop knowledge about and skills in Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English. Your participation is solicited, although strictly voluntary.

We will ask you to provide your name or KUID as part of this questionnaire to enable us to match individual questionnaires to lesson plans, interviews, and lesson observation reports. In that sense, the questionnaire is not “anonymous.” However, once we have collected the data, we will assign your responses a numerical code and your name will not be associated in any way

with the research findings. We will make every effort to ensure that no one knows what your responses were on the survey. Survey Monkey is a well-known company that collects data for online survey research; however, it is possible with any internet communication that through intent or accident someone other than the intended recipient may see your response.

Printouts of the surveys will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's office. The data will be kept for three years, and the information will only be used for professional purposes. The results of this study may be written for various professional journals and presented at national conferences.

Completion of the questionnaire indicates your willingness to participate in this project and that you are at least age eighteen. If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it is completed, please feel free to contact us by phone or mail. If you have any additional questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call (785) 864-7429, write the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL), University of Kansas, 2385 Irving Hill Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7563, or email irb@ku.edu.

Sincerely,

Lizette Peter, PhD. Department of Curriculum & Teaching, Joseph R. Pearson Hall, University of Kansas. Lawrence, KS 66045/ (785) 864-9625/ lpeter@ku.edu

Jihyun Song, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Curriculum & Teaching, Joseph R. Pearson Hall, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045/(785) 218-0705/ esther79@ku.edu

1. I am currently a:

- a. recent graduate-job seeking
- b. Full-time Teacher
- c. Student Teacher
- d. Other (please specify)

2. I am currently enrolled in teacher education to obtain the following credential:

- a. TESOL K-12 stand alone license
- b. ESOL Endorsement/Extension
- c. Bilingual Endorsement/Extension
- d. Special Education
- e. Elementary Generalist
- f. Secondary Subject Specialist: Social Studies

- g. Secondary Subject Specialist: Mathematics
- h. Secondary Subject Specialist: Science
- i. Secondary Subject Specialist: English
- j. Early Childhood
- k. Literacy Coach
- l. Administration/Supervision
- m. Other (Please specify)

3. If currently full-time or student teaching, how much of the time are you instructing English language learners?

- a. All of the time
- b. Most of the time
- c. Less than half of the time
- d. Little to none of the time

4. How many years in total of ESL or EFL teaching have you completed, in any setting (overseas, adults, PreK-12)?

- a. Less than 1
- b. 1-2
- c. 3-4
- d. 5 or more

5. With which type of ESL program do you have the most familiarity?

- a. Bilingual
- b. Dual Language
- c. ESL Pull-out
- d. ESL Push-In
- e. ESL Self-Contained
- f. ESL Sheltered Content

6. With which grade band of ESL learners do you have the most familiarity?

- a. PreK-K
- b. 1-2
- c. 3-5
- d. 6-8
- e. 9-12
- f. Adult

7. Which best represents your knowledge of English structure (grammar & sentence structure)?

- a. Very knowledgeable
- b. Somewhat knowledgeable
- c. Some, but don't know enough
- d. I know very little about the structure of English

8. Which best describes your experience with learning English yourself?
- I grew up in an English dominant household.
 - I grew up in a bilingual household and mainly learned English at home.
 - I grew up in a non-English speaking household and learned English mainly in school as a child.
 - I learned English as an adult.

9. Have you studied a language other than your home language(s)? If yes, please indicate all that apply.

- No
- Bilingual program at an elementary school
- English as a second language (ESL) classes
- Foreign language classes (2 years or less)
- Foreign language classes (more than 2 years)
- High school study outside of the U.S.
- College study outside of the U.S., e.g., university study abroad program
- Service abroad, e.g., Peace Corps, religious services, etc

10. Which best describes your proficiency level in your most proficient language other than English?

- native or nativelylike
- advanced / very proficient
- intermediate
- high beginner
- total beginner

What language is it?

11. Have you had any of the following experiences? Check all that apply.

- Completed a course in multicultural education
- Completed one or more years of foreign language education in college
- Completed at least one course in anthropology
- Traveled outside the USA
- Lived outside the USA for a month or longer
- Taught outside the USA
- Hosted a foreign exchange student

12. Have you taken any previous university courses on topics including the instruction of English Learners or bilingual education? If yes, check all course content or topics that apply.

- No
- Historical & legal foundations of bilingual education
- Second language acquisition
- Educational linguistics
- Methods of teaching English as a second language

- f. Psychology, sociology, or ethnic studies courses about groups who speak a language other than English
- g. Multicultural education focused on ELLs
- h. Language assessment

13. Check any of the following which you believe to be accurate:

- a. I think good teaching for ELLs is something more than good teaching for all learners.
- b. Childrens' use of two languages within one sentence is a sign of confusion.
- c. Students in ESL-only programs, with no first language support, could take as many as seven years to reach grade level norms.
- d. Regular content teachers of ELLs as well as ESL specialists should be well-versed in the state standards for ELLs.
- e. Once students can speak English, they are ready to undertake the academic tasks of the regular classroom.
- f. Second language learners will learn English faster if their parents speak English at home.
- g. I look forward to having English language learners in my classroom.
- h. English language learners should be allowed to use their first language in the classroom.
- i. Connecting language objectives to specific state standards for ELLs is a priority for effective content-language integrated instruction.

14. In the education courses you have taken, how much opportunity have you had to do the following?

	No opportunity	Touched on it briefly	Spent some time discussing	Explored in some depth, with related assigned reading	Extensive opportunity, with reading and field/clinical assignment
Review the identification, placement, and instructional programs for ELLs.					
Consider the nature of both conversational and academic English in relation to ELLs.					
Discuss formal and informal assessment of ELLs.					
Address differentiated instruction specifically for ELLs.					
Discuss strategies for teaching content (e.g., reading/language arts, math, science, history/social science) to students with BEGINNING proficiency in English.					
Discuss strategies for teaching content (e.g., reading/language arts, math, science, history/social science) to students with INTERMEDIATE/ADVANCED proficiency in English.					
Discuss strategies for helping ELLs comprehend a text in English that is beyond their current reading level.					
Discuss strategies for helping ELLs compose written texts in different content areas.					
Discuss lesson design that considers content as well as language objectives.					
Review models of collaboration with ESL teachers, such as push-in, pull-out, co-teaching.					
Discuss strategies for organizing patterns of interaction in the classroom that promote ELLs' verbal participation and access to content.					
Discuss strategies for planning and carrying out instruction that supports the acquisition of academic English.					
Discuss classroom strategies for addressing issues of discrimination against immigrants and people who speak English as a second language.					
Consider the instructional needs of ELLs with varying experiences in formal schooling in their country of origin, e.g., from few to many years of formal schooling.					
Consider the instructional needs of ELLs who were either born in the U.S. or have been in the U.S. for at least 6-7 years, but are still not fully English proficient.					
Consider the instructional needs of ELLs who are also receiving special education services.					
Discuss strategies to communicate with ELLs' families.					

15. In terms of instructional planning for integrated content and language lessons, please rate which statements are true for you.

	Not at all true for me	Occasionally true for me	Usually true for me
I start with the content learning goals and then plan language goals.			
I start with language learning goals and then fit those to content learning goals.			
I do not use formal lesson plans when planning instruction.			
I have a lot of trouble developing language objectives.			
I have a lot of trouble developing content objectives.			
I use students' language errors (in writing or speech) to determine language learning goals.			
I write my lessons thinking of the least proficient learners in the class.			
I write my lessons thinking of the most proficient learners in the class.			
I write my lessons thinking of the average learner in the class.			
I purposefully differentiate my student activities.			
I am familiar with the state standards for ELLs.			
I start my lesson planning by consulting the state standards for ELLs.			
My university supervisor is/was effective in helping me to address state ELL standards in my lesson planning.			
My cooperating teacher is/was effective in helping me to address state ELL standards in my lesson planning.			
I feel confident in my ability to address state ELL standards in my lesson planning.			

16. The majority of the language objectives I craft address:

- a. academic vocabulary
- b. reading skills
- c. writing skills
- d. speaking skills
- e. listening skills
- f. social language
- g. functional language
- h. grammatical structures
- i. Other (Please specify)

17. I would say the difference between sheltering content and language teaching is:

18. How would you rate the quality of the content objectives you write for ESL learners?

- a. Consistently High

- b. Consistently Good
- c. Inconsistent
- d. Poor

Please explain your answer.

19. How would you rate the quality of the English language objectives you write for ESL learners?

- a. Consistently High
- b. Consistently Good
- c. Inconsistent
- d. Poor

Please explain your answer.

20. I am entering my name in the box below, with the understanding that it will be removed and replacing with a numerical code that will be matched to my lesson plans from Spring 2014. My name will not appear on any documents that the researchers will review.

Appendix (C): Interview Questions

Research question 1a

What factors do pre-service teachers cite most often as challenges to creating lesson plans that derive from ELP standards?

1. What does lesson planning mean to you?
2. Can you tell me about what roles do you think lesson planning has?
3. When planning lessons, where do you start?
4. When planning lessons, what are the important elements to consider?
5. What do you think the differences are in planning lessons for ELL and non-ELLs?
6. What do Kansas CCSS and ELP standards mean in planning and implementing your lessons?
7. Do you feel confident in using ELP standards when creating your lesson plans?
8. If not, what are the challenges to incorporating ELP standards into your lesson plans and lesson implementation?

Research question 1b

How prepared do pre-service teachers feel they are to create lesson plans that derive from the ELP standards?

1. How often do you use ELP standards when planning lessons?
2. Do you think you have been given sufficient opportunities to learn how to utilize ELP standards to create ELP standard-driven lessons?

3. What do you think you need to learn in order to confidently and effectively use ELP standards in planning your lessons?

Research question 2

To what extent do pre-service ELP endorsement seekers align Kansas Common Core State Standards to Kansas ELP standards in their thinking, planning, and practice?

1. How often do you incorporate CCSS and ELP standards in the planning and implementing of your lessons?

Research question 2a

What factors do pre-service teachers cite most often as challenges to creating lesson plans that align content and language objectives?

1. Do you feel confident in your ability to create lessons that include both content and language objectives?
2. What does aligning content and language objectives mean to you?
3. How confident are you in your ability to align content and language objectives?
4. Do you feel confident creating lessons that align content and language objectives?
5. If not, what makes you feel not confident in creating lessons that align both objectives?
6. What do you think will be helpful for you to become more confident and effective in planning lessons that align both objectives?

Research question 2b

What are their perceptions of their preparedness to write content objectives for ELLs? In what classes did they learn this?

1. Do you have difficulties when writing content objectives for your lessons?
2. Were you provided with learning opportunities on how to write content objectives for your lessons with ELLs?
3. If you were provided with these learning opportunities, in what classes did you learn this knowledge?
4. What was the most useful resource for you in learning how to plan instruction for ELLs?

Appendix (D): Examples of Kansas College and Career Ready Standards

From Kansas History, Government, and Social Studies Standards, pp.10-11

[http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/CSAS/Content%20Area%20\(F-L\)/History,%20Government,%20and%20Social%20Studies/2013%20Kansas%20History%20Government%20Social%20Studies%20Standards.pdf](http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/CSAS/Content%20Area%20(F-L)/History,%20Government,%20and%20Social%20Studies/2013%20Kansas%20History%20Government%20Social%20Studies%20Standards.pdf)

Kansas History, Government, and Social Studies Standards

Standard # 1: Choices have consequences.

Benchmark:

1.1 The student will recognize and evaluate significant choices made by individuals, communities, states, and nations that have impacted our lives and futures.

1.2 The student will analyze the context under which choices are made and draw conclusions about the motivations and goals of the decision-makers.

1.3 The student will investigate examples of causes and consequences of particular choices and connect those choices with contemporary issues.

1.4 The student will use his/her understanding of choices and consequences to construct a decision-making process and to justify a decision.

Standard # 2: Individuals have rights and responsibilities.

Benchmark:

2.1 The student will recognize and evaluate the rights and responsibilities of people living in societies.

2.2 The student will analyze the context under which significant rights and responsibilities are defined and demonstrated, their various interpretations, and draw conclusions about those interpretations.

2.3 The student will investigate specific rights and responsibilities of individuals and connect those rights and responsibilities with contemporary issues.

2.4 The student will use his/her understanding of rights and responsibilities to address contemporary issues.

3.1 The student will recognize and evaluate significant beliefs, contributions, and ideas of the many diverse peoples and groups and their impact on individuals, communities, states, and nations.

Standard # 3: Societies are shaped by beliefs, ideas, and diversity.

Benchmark:

3.2 The student will draw conclusions about significant beliefs, contributions, and ideas, analyzing the origins and context under which these competing ideals were reached and the multiple perspectives from which they come.

3.3 The student will investigate specific beliefs, contributions, ideas, and/or diverse populations and connect those beliefs, contributions, ideas and/or diversity to contemporary issues.

3.4 The student will use his/her understanding of those beliefs, contributions, ideas, and diversity to justify or define how community, state, national, and international ideals shape contemporary society.

Appendix (E): Examples of English Language Proficiency Standards

From: Grades 6-8 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards, pg. 11

<http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/CSAS/Content%20Area%20%28A->

[E%29/English_Language_Proficiency/Standards/ELPStandards_Gr6-8__ELAGr7.pdf](http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/CSAS/Content%20Area%20%28A-E%29/English_Language_Proficiency/Standards/ELPStandards_Gr6-8__ELAGr7.pdf)

Standard 9.

ELP.6-8.9	By the end of each English language proficiency level, an ELL can...				
	1	2	3	4	5
An ELL can . . . create clear and coherent grade-appropriate speech and text ...	communicate simple information about an event or topic, with support (including context and visual aids) using non-verbal communication and, with limited control, a narrow range of vocabulary and syntactically simple sentences .	recount a brief sequence of events in order, and introduce an informational topic, present one or two facts about it, and provide a concluding statement, with support (including sentences), using, with emerging control, some commonly occurring linking words (e.g., next, because, and, also) .	recount a short sequence of events, with a beginning, middle, and an end, and introduce and develop an informational topic with a few facts and details, and provide a conclusion, using, with developing control, common transitional words and phrases to connect events, ideas, and opinions (e.g., after a while, for example, in order to, as a result)	recount a more detailed sequence of events or steps in a process, with a beginning, middle, and an end, and introduce and develop an informational topic with facts and details, and provide a concluding section or statement, using, with increasingly independent control, a variety of transitional words and phrases to connect events, ideas, and opinions (e.g., however, on the other hand, from that moment on)	recount a complex sequence of events or steps in a process, with a beginning, middle, and an end, and introduce and effectively develop an informational topic with facts and details, and provide a concluding section or statement, using a wide variety of transitional words and phrases to show logical relationships between events and ideas.

Appendix (F): Informed Content Statement

Preparing Teachers for specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)

Lizette Peter and Jihyun Song, Researchers

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Curriculum and Teaching at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You may refuse to sign this form and not participate in this study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time. If you do withdraw from this study, it will not affect your relationship with this unit, the services it may provide to you, or the University of Kansas.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to investigate the experiences of pre-service (unlicensed) and in-service (licensed) teachers in the TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Language) program at KU. In particular, we are interested in exploring the ways in which they develop knowledge about and skills in SDAIE (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English), including: knowledge of the language and culture needs of ELs (English Learners), knowledge of the principles and practices of SDAIE, and skills in preparing and implementing lessons designed to ensure the full and equal participation of ELs in the regular classroom.

PROCEDURES

There are four sources of information that we would like to collect from all students enrolled in C&T 820 and C&T 825. You may consent to allowing us to use all of these sources or just some of them, described as follows:

- 1) Analysis of lesson plans. With your consent indicated on this form, we will analyze lesson plans that you create as part of the regular requirements for C&T 820 and/or C&T 825. The analysis will be based on a set of criteria that will examine the explicitness of your content and language objectives, the extent to which those objectives align with broader performance standards, your attempts to include teacher techniques aimed to train ELs in language learning strategies, and the quality of your assessment design.
- 2) Analysis of classroom observation forms. A requirement of C&T 825: TESOL Practicum is that students must implement a minimum of three lessons to ELs for the purpose of formal observation by a university supervisor or the classroom cooperating teacher. With your consent indicated on this form, we will analyze the observation forms provided by your supervisor or cooperating teacher toward gauging the extent to which they achieved the stated lesson plan objectives and used the techniques of SDAIE.
- 3) Review of homework assignments. During the practicum semester, students are required to submit ten written assignments comprising reflections on various components of the practicum experience. With your consent indicated on this form, we will collect these reflections for the purpose of better understanding the experiences of ESOL endorsement seekers using the SDAIE approach.



4) Questionnaire. We will provide you with a link to an online questionnaire that asks you to rate your preparedness to implement SDAIE in three categories: Lesson Planning, Lesson Implementation, and Student Assessment. The questionnaire will provide information about confidentiality and you will have the opportunity to grant your consent for us to use your responses to the questionnaire at that time.

5) Interview. You will be contacted by email inviting you to participate in an interview designed to give us an even deeper understanding of your knowledge and skills pertaining to SDAIE. If you agree to the interview, you will be provided further information about confidentiality you will have the opportunity to grant your consent for us to use your responses to the interview questions at that time.

RISKS

The analysis of your lesson plans and observation reports is already a part of our regular practice for grading purposes; however, the analysis of these documents as part of the study will have no bearing on your course grade and therefore should pose no risk to you. Participation in the questionnaire and interview should present only minimal risk, including the stress and discomfort of responding to a questionnaire and interview questions related to your teaching practice.

BENEFITS

The study presents no immediate benefits to you; however, the results of our study may serve university educators who prepare teachers for work with English learners in K-12 schools.

PAYMENT TO PARTICIPANTS

Insert a statement regarding whether or not participants will be paid and if so, how much and on what schedule. Insert the following statement if participants are being paid:

Investigators may ask for your social security number in order to comply with federal and state tax and accounting regulations.

PARTICIPANT CONFIDENTIALITY

Your name will not be associated in any publication or presentation with the information collected about you or with the research findings from this study. Instead, we will use a study number or a pseudonym and any identifiable information will not be shared unless required by law or you give written permission.

Any information collected as a part of this study will be stored as electronic files on a secure password-protected computer in the care of Jihyun Song, and will be kept indefinitely, or for as long it serves programmatic or academic purposes. The information will be used for only professional purposes; for example, the results may be reported for various professional journals and presented at national conferences. Permission granted on this date to use and disclose your information remains in effect indefinitely. By signing this form you give permission for the use and disclosure of your information for purposes of this study at any time in the future.



REFUSAL TO SIGN CONSENT AND AUTHORIZATION

You are not required to sign this Consent and Authorization form and you may refuse to do so without affecting your right to any services you are receiving or may receive from the University of Kansas or to participate in any programs or events of the University of Kansas. However, if you refuse to sign, you cannot participate in this study.

CANCELLING THIS CONSENT AND AUTHORIZATION

You may withdraw your consent to participate in this study at any time. You also have the right to cancel your permission to use and disclose further information collected about you, in writing, at any time, by sending your written request to:

Lizette Peter, PhD.
 Department of Curriculum & Teaching
 Joseph R. Pearson Hall
 University of Kansas
 Lawrence, KS 66045
lpeter@ku.edu

If you cancel permission to use your information, we will stop collecting additional information about you. However, we may use and disclose information that was gathered before we received your cancellation, as described above.

QUESTIONS ABOUT PARTICIPATION should be directed to:

Lizette Peter, PhD.
 Department of Curriculum & Teaching
 Joseph R. Pearson Hall
 University of Kansas
 Lawrence, KS 66045

lpeter@ku.edu

Jihyun Song, Doctoral Candidate
 Department of Curriculum & Teaching
 Joseph R. Pearson Hall
 University of Kansas
 Lawrence, KS 66045

esther79@ku.edu

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL) office at (785) 864-7429 or (785) 864-7385, write the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL), University of Kansas, 2385

Irving Hill Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7568, or email irb@ku.edu.

**KEEP THIS SECTION FOR YOUR RECORDS. IF YOU WISH TO PARTICIPATE
 TEAR OFF THE FOLLOWING SECTION AND RETURN IT TO THE
 RESEARCHER(S).**



Preparing Teachers for specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)

Lizette Peter and Jihyun Song, Researchers

HSCL # 20078

(Provided by HSCL office) PARTICIPANT CERTIFICATION:

If you agree to participate in this study please sign where indicated, then tear off this section and return it to the investigator(s). Keep the consent information for your records.

I have read this Consent and Authorization form. I have had the opportunity to ask, and I have received answers to, any questions I had regarding the study and the use and disclosure of information about me for the study.

I agree to take part in this study as a research participant as follows:

- I agree to allow the researchers to analyze any lesson plan that I have submitted as part of the course requirements for C&T 820 and C&T 825.
- I agree to allow the researchers to analyze the observation reports based on the lessons that I implemented as part of the requirements for C&T 825, the TESOL practicum.
- I agree to allow the researchers to use my assignments for C&T 825, the TESOL practicum as data for the study.

(Note: if you agree to complete the questionnaire and/or participate in the interview, you will have the opportunity to give your consent at that time.)

By my signature I affirm that I am at least 18 years old and that I have received a copy of this Consent and Authorization form.

Type/Print Participant's Name

Date

Participant's Signature



Preparing Teachers for specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)

Lizette Peter and Jihyun Song, Researchers

Oral Interview Consent Statement

As a professor / doctoral student in the University of Kansas's Department of Curriculum and Teaching, I am conducting a research project about the ways in which students in our TESOL program develop knowledge about and skills in Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English. I would like to interview you to obtain your views on your knowledge of the language and culture needs of ELs (English Learners), your knowledge of the principles and practices of SDAIE, and your skills in preparing and implementing lessons designed to ensure the full and equal participation of ELs in the regular classroom. You have no obligation to participate and you may discontinue your involvement at any time.

Participation in this interview indicates your willingness to take part in this study and that you are at least 18 years old. Should you have any questions about this project or your participation in it, you may ask me now or later. Here is a business card with my (Dr. Peter's) contact information. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call the Human Subjects Protection Office at KU; that contact information is provided on that back of this card.

To be sure that I quote you accurately, I would like to record you. The recording will be transcribed to make it easier to review later. Your name will not be associated with the transcription, although it will be given a numerical code so that we can match your interview with your questionnaire and other documents that you've permitted us to use for the study. The recording and the transcripts will be stored in my (Dr. Peter's) office and no one will have access to them except for the two of us. If that's okay with you, I'll ask you to indicate so once I turn the recorder on.

What the business card will look like:

FRONT	BACK