

AHA! MEASURING PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' LEARNING OF CONTENT-BASED INSTRUCTION

Kate Mastruserio Reynolds and Jingjing Jiao

ABSTRACT

This research study investigated the effect of Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and its influence on pre-service teachers' (PSTs) perceptions of their existing knowledge and capabilities for teaching English language learners (ELs). Our goal was to examine the PSTs' development in content-based instruction during a 16-week CBI course and their insights and changes resulting from the experience. The researchers hoped to determine what aspects of CBI methodology were new, noteworthy and important for PSTs in order to identify what they were not receiving in their general education teacher preparation courses. Over the course of three semesters, 49 participants took pre- and post-course surveys comprised of open-ended questions and five Likert scale close-ended questions to measure their insights and changes. Findings revealed substantial changes to pedagogical philosophy, instructional practices, curricular and materials development, awareness of ELs' needs, and stance toward advocacy.

With the benefits of learning a language in a meaningful context and developing language and content knowledge and skills simultaneously so as to remain on grade level while being integrated into the mainstream classes, Content-Based Instruction (CBI) is becoming more commonly applied in academic language learning in U.S. public K-12 schools (Platt, Harper & Mendoza, 2003; Harper et al., 2007). This results in ever more English learners (ELs) in general education classes all day where teachers need to have the skills to work effectively with them (Berube, 2000). Furthermore, educators are required to demonstrate adequate yearly progress in content knowledge and English language acquisition according to No Child Left Behind (2002). Many researchers and teacher educators in the field have called for appropriate preparation for general educators (Ballantyne, Sanderman & Levy, 2008; Batt, 2008; Gándara & Baca, 2008; Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly & Driscoll, 2005; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Asato, 2000; Li & Protacio, 2010; Lucas, 2011; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Lucas, Villegas, Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; National Center for Education Statistics, 2002; Reeves, 2006; Verplaetse, 1998), but only 17 states require general educators to have any preparation to include ELs effectively into their courses (Ballantyne et al., 2008). However, general education teacher preparation programs are full with myriad state-mandated requirements which exclude those needed to teach ELs. Some pre-service teacher preparation personnel view preparation for EL inclusion as either literacy development similar to that of first-language literacy or multicultural education/ diversity (Gibson, 2009; Gutiérrez et al., 2000). Eight states view EL instruction as an issue of linguistic diversity (e.g., Arkansas, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, West Virginia, Wyoming) according to Ballantyne et al. (2008). The question is then how does content-based ESL instructional preparation

compare to general education preparation in literacy and multicultural education and culturally-responsive instruction. Are pre-service general education programs, without explicit CBI preparation, adequately preparing future educators for inclusion in their mainstream, content courses?

Our research took place in a public Midwestern regional university with 10,500 students enrolled annually. At this university, there are teacher preparation programs for elementary, secondary and k-12 programs in a variety of core and specialty content areas, which are widely respected in the region. At this university there is no course requirement for EL inclusion or CBI instruction preparation for general educators/PSTs. Instead, PSTs are taught in 18 credits hours of coursework diversity sensitivity, inclusiveness, and culturally-congruent pedagogy. The pre-service teachers who enrolled in the CBI course did so as part of the ESL licensure requirements, supplemental to their general teacher education preparation. Our research questions were: 1) How did pre-service teachers view their role as “teacher” in respect to their expectations and duties? 2) What were the most important revelations, or “aha” moments, for PSTs that resulted from their learning in CBI methodology? 3) How did PSTs’ understanding of teaching general education courses change after learning about CBI instruction?

Our objectives were to determine whether, after taking the CBI course, 1) PSTs were more knowledgeable of ELs’ needs in the classroom; 2) PSTs felt more competent in teaching; 3) PSTs felt more confident to teach in multi-level and diverse classrooms. It was hypothesized that this research would reveal the impact of CBI in teacher education as compared to the teacher preparation received in general teacher preparation courses. Our research inspected the PSTs’ development through taking a CBI course and the noticeable changes of pedagogical philosophy and awareness of English Language Learners’ needs.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Content-based instruction (CBI), the teaching of language using academic subjects such as history, science, and math, has been promoted for its ability to integrate English language learners (ELs) into mainstream grade level classrooms, to provide subject matter instruction from an expert content-area teacher, to connect ELs with their native speaking peers, to develop ELs’ critical thinking skills (Chamot, 2009), and to increase learners’ academic language abilities, along with other benefits (Echevarria and Vogt, 2010; Echevarria, Vogt, and Short, 2004; Short and Fitzsimmons, 2007; Vogt, 2000). Furthermore, the population of ELs in public K-12 schools is currently outpacing the number of adequately-prepared teachers of English as a Second Language (ESL); thus, teaching

content outside the ESL realm has become necessary (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Committee on Multicultural Education, 2002; Echevarria, Vogt and Short, 2004; National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2005). Due to these recent trends, pre-service teachers (PSTs) must now more than ever think critically and have knowledge in not only professional development but also content-based learning and language learning methods as a means to accommodate the particular needs of ELs (Menken and Antunez, 2001; Willet, et al., 2007).

The transition from isolated language-preparation courses for ELs to content-based instruction has transformed the language teaching discipline (Colombo and Furbush, 2009; Kaufman and Crandall, 2005; Snow & Brinton, 1997, Vogt, 2000), as well as the preparation of ESL and mainstream, content-area teachers (Lucas, 2011; Lucas and Villegas, 2011; Lucas, Villegas and Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; McGraner and Saenz, 2009; Telléz and Waxman, 2006). Various approaches have been taken to help in-service teachers meet the academic and linguistic needs of ELs (Reynolds, 2011), to meet adequate yearly progress requirements (NCLB, 2001), and to change the way pre-service teachers are prepared, so they have the range of knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to include ELs into their classes in effective ways.

Across the U.S., an increasing recognition of the need for modifications to teacher education is occurring. Short and Fitzsimmons note the need for “Setting a national teacher education policy to ensure all teacher candidates learn about second language and literacy acquisition, reading across the content areas, and sheltered instruction and ESL methods.” (2007, p.2) In spite of this increased awareness, in our particular context, at a Midwestern regional university, general education teacher educators were resistant to modifying the current preparation programs to include coursework, adjunct instruction, or other attempts at preparing general educators to include ELs effectively into their mainstream courses while educating ELs on their content area academics and language. One repeated claim from university teacher educators was, “we already teach them how to work with ELs.” Their belief was that if they raise general educators’ awareness of cultural and linguistic diversity and culturally-congruent pedagogy in their courses, they were preparing their PSTs sufficiently. Essentially, they likened a positive orientation on the part of the PSTs toward diversity in mainstream classes as being enough to educate the ELs in content areas and second language acquisition. In order to disprove this assertion, we undertook to investigate how and in which area general educators changed as a result of one content-based ESL instructional methods course (see appendix A for an outline of course topics).

Culturally-congruent pedagogy (Lucas & Villegas, 2011) is one way teacher educators have attempted to prepare PSTs to work with diverse learners. Culturally-congruent pedagogy is teaching in ways that work for learners based on their home culture patterns. For example, Au & Mason (1983) researched native-Hawaiian populations in the 1980s and noted the culturally incongruent practices of white teachers when working with native-Hawaiian learners, such as mandating only independent work as opposed to cooperative learning, which was a pervasive pattern in the culture. “Tellez & Waxman, 2006 report that the major teacher organizations have been largely absent from conversations about teaching English language learners but have focused attention on preparing teachers for culturally diverse classrooms (as opposed to culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms;) likely contributing to the lack of required coursework” (from Arens et al, 2008). This research study sought to determine if PSTs were being sufficiently prepared to include ELs effectively into content-area courses and meet ELs language acquisition needs.

At this time, there is no research present in the published literature on effective general educator preparation in EL inclusion and content-based instruction with the exception of opinion articles. Discussions have been primarily focused on what general educators need to know in order to work with ELs: 1) Knowledge of language (Murray & Christison 2011a, 2011b; Schleppegrell, 2004; Wong-Fillmore & Snow, 2002), second language acquisition processes, ELs' backgrounds; 2) Performance of creating welcoming learning environments, scaffolding and modifying instruction to meet ELs' needs, providing interactional opportunities in oral and written language (Echevarria & Graves, 2003; Echevarria & Short, 2003, 2004, 2005; Echevarria, Vogt, and Short, 2004; Short, 1993, 1994, 2002), explicit instruction of learning strategies (Chamot, 2009), and culturally-responsive pedagogy (Lucas and Villegas, 2011) and 3) Which models are the most effective, such as additional pre-service coursework, “infusion” of competencies and knowledge into previously existing courses, in-service teacher preparation in workshops, learning communities and continuing professional development/coursework (Reynolds, in press).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Population

This qualitative study gauged the perspectives of 49 general education PSTs, and their learning on working effectively with ELs. These 49 PSTs were pre-service teachers entering general education fields ranging from

elementary education to foreign languages (e.g., Spanish, French and German), history/social studies, English/language arts/literature, sciences, special education, music, and art who were adding on a state TESOL license. The vast majority were Caucasian females (87%). The group had limited ethnic diversity, which was typical of the university's population. Four participants were Chinese, Hmong (2) or Malaysian (8%). With only two exceptions, the participants were all in their early 20s.

Surveys

The future educators opting to participate answered a series of open-ended qualitative questions and quantitative, Likert-scale, close-ended questions based on the objectives of the course prior to participating in a 16-week, three-credit content-based ESL methods course at regional public university in the Fall terms of 2006, 2009 or 2010. Over these three years, the 49 participants enrolled in a university-required (for the state ESL license) content-based ESL instruction course and took electronic pre and post course surveys consisting of 37 questions in the pre-course survey (the initial 37 questions listed in Appendix B) and 61 questions in the post-survey which were open and close-ended questions (see Appendix B). The electronic survey was web-based and utilized Qualtrics survey software. The close-ended questions employed choices on a Likert scale. Open-ended questions allowed participants a maximum of 10 sentences of space in which to respond. During the final week of the term, these students took a complementary survey of 61 questions (see appendix B).

The research questions focused on the participants' views of course objectives prior to and after the CBI course. In particular, the focus was the PSTs' views of the expectations and responsibilities of a teacher when working with ELs in the mainstream classroom. We also sought to determine if these future educators changed their instructional stance or philosophy as a result of content-based ESL instruction coursework and whether the coursework impacted their future instruction.

Course Objectives

The course consisted of the following objectives and topics. Upon completion of the CBI course, pre and in-service teachers would be able to:

1. Describe and implement various affective, instructional, materials development, and curricular strategies to make course content meaningful to the English language learner;
2. Integrate four skills and instructions into content courses (core and specials) through interactive, authentic and hands-on ESL techniques;

3. Utilize linguistic modifications in oral presentations of material to make auditory input for ELs more comprehensible;
4. Analyze and describe the linguistic features of oral and written discourse so as to be able to bridge the gap between ELs and a wide variety of genres, subject areas, and academic discourse communities and texts.
5. Address varying ESL competency levels by differentiating instruction and utilizing a variety of instructional techniques within a single lesson and single content topic;
6. Design a content-based unit for English language learners (EL);
 - a. Utilize Backward Design in course planning to develop sheltered, adjunct, Push-In and Pull-Out CBI units.
 - b. Outline and explain steps involved in content-based curriculum design for EL.
 - c. Write measurable and intertwined language and content objectives.
 - d. Obtain, create and/or modify materials to enhance comprehensibility of content lessons.
 - e. Integrate TESOL's new K-12 ESL, WIDA and/or content-area State/core standards into curriculum design.
 - f. Create and/or modify subject-area assessments to gauge ELs true comprehension, knowledge and skills in the content areas.
7. Discuss laws pertinent to ELs' K-12 education;
8. Advocate for the needs and rights of their ELs;
9. Collaborate productively with colleagues, administrators and parents to enhance ELs learning and create EL-friendly schools and communities.

Not written into the course objectives, but topics read about and discussed were various models of content-based instruction and programs for CBI training (e.g., SIOP and SDAIE) (see Appendix A).

Survey Process

Using the Qualtrics survey software, all data were collected online and stored electronically until they were analyzed. The software provided compiled data by question, provided basic descriptive statistics for close-ended questions and compilations of responses to all open-ended questions as well as summarizing individual participant perspectives anonymously. Researchers were thus able to see all the data holistically and view individual perspectives.

Data Coding and Analysis

During the data coding and analysis, pre- and post- surveys were assigned pseudonyms and matched to be able to evaluate change over time. Following Grounded Theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), the open-ended responses were read in light of identifying patterns that were present in the data. In other words the findings were *grounded* in the data itself. In order to do this, codes were developed from the qualitative data using open techniques by two coders. Then axial coding techniques were employed by two coders (Strauss and Corbin, 1990) to identify relationships in the data (Borgatti, n.d.). This content analysis allowed us to study, sort, and categorize concepts and

themes common among participants as well as the major patterns of change between pre- and post- surveys across all three data sets. Both coders read and discussed the codes and coding and provided feedback in order to norm codes. Data sets were revisited three different times to validate the emerging trends in the data. Examples of codes were ROLES, CI (i.e., changes in instruction), CP (i.e., changes in planning), CA (i.e., change in awareness), NEEDS, COLL (i.e., collaboration), LAWS, MULT/DIFF (i.e., multiple proficiency levels in one class/differentiation of instruction), and OBJ (i.e., focus on both language and content objectives). Simultaneously, we ran descriptive statistics on the five Likert scale questions using the McNamara formula to determine significant changes over time of the 49 pre- and post-tests.

FINDINGS

Through analyzing the data, we discovered three major trends that encompassed PSTs' transformation during the CBI course: philosophical shifts in roles and responsibilities, changes in awareness of ELs' needs and rights, and changes in instructional practices and planning. According to the PST's responses from the pre- and post-course survey, no other education course in their general teaching preparation program adequately provided information on serving ELs that had significant impact on their future instruction.

Finding 1. Philosophical Shifts in Roles and Responsibilities

Roles and Responsibilities to Teach All Learners

This finding answers the first research question – “How did pre-service teachers view their role as ‘teacher’ in respect to their expectations and duties?” Many PSTs learning CBI practices experienced deep philosophical shifts in how to approach instruction. These shifts in philosophy dealt with more than making instructional courses about the technical aspects of writing objectives or sequencing activities; rather, PSTs noted profound changes in the way they viewed their teaching roles, responsibilities, and approaches to instruction. For example, one PST explained the philosophical shift she experienced in this manner:

I can remember having to fill out this survey at the beginning of the semester and it took me forever because I had no idea what to say. I feel as though *my outlook on teaching in general has completely changed*. Before, it seemed impossible to be able to teach students from many different backgrounds at many different levels. Now, I feel as though I have the tools necessary to reach all of my students. I also feel as though the way I go about lesson planning has changed too. I now am aware of the benefits of scaffolding instruction and I put that into my lesson plans. I also now know that I cannot completely rely on any teacher's edition or textbook when creating lessons or units. – *Heather, 2009, Elementary Education*

Heather explained the transition in her professional development from not knowing how to deal with diverse a student population to feeling confident in her abilities to reach out to all students. She acknowledges this as an important improvement for a future educator; this change was a significant “aha” moment for Heather. It also illustrated her changed stance to that of a teacher responsible for all students from all backgrounds and at all levels.

One participant described his role as an educator being greatly influenced by a specific philosophy introduced by this CBI course. He noted:

B. Kumaravadivelu’s Postmethod Pedagogy and the ‘3Ps’ Particularity, Practicality, and Possibility. With particularity, I must find a holistic way toward understanding my place as a teacher situated within the specific time, place, culture, and so on in which I am teaching. In terms of practicality, I refuse to become an unthinking practitioner, relying solely on the cult of expertise. My teaching must be an active dialogue between both professional and personal theories that develop along with other practitioners in order that education continues to transform to meet the needs of an evolving student body. As far as possibility, I need to work with what my students bring me and help them realize that they are the ones who will ultimately determine what is possible in the future in terms of their position in society and the shape of society as a whole. – *Wilson, 2010, English Language Arts*

Like Heather, Wilson’s “aha” moment related to his shift in viewpoint as a result of his learning in this course, which highlights his change in role and expectations as a teacher for all children in the changing U.S. demographic environment. of K-12. A thread uniting these excerpts is that the future educators realized they needed to play a different instructional role than they had hitherto anticipated, one in which the ELs’ cultures and the educational context play an important part in teaching English language learners. This was a definitive shift from their understandings of their role in teaching general classes, in which they had previously viewed the learners as having relatively similar background experiences, culture, and needs.

One other interesting area in which these PSTs, who had been previously trained in culturally-congruent pedagogy and creating culturally welcoming classes, noted deep philosophical change was on whether or not English language learners should be included in regular content courses. In response to a Likert prompt, “22. I think diverse language learners should be included in regular content courses,” a statistically significant (Chi Square=14.73, p=.004) change occurred during the course. Originally, significantly fewer of these future educators thought that ELs should be included in regular content courses. Without specific discussions on this issue, a profound shift from non-inclusivity in the pre-course survey to an inclusive stance was noted in the post-course surveys, in which the vast majority of participants reported that ELs should be included in regular content courses.

Role and Responsibility Shifts to Needs-Based, Learner-Centered Instructional Environments

Even though the general teacher preparation program methods courses taught PSTs to have learner-centered courses as well as to employ inquiry learning and hands-on activities, these objectives do not seem to have permeated the PSTs vision of how to teach. Most participants reported significant changes on their view of the teacher's role in comparison to their pre-survey responses. One PST stated the strong shift he felt:

I want to move away from the traditional teacher-centered classrooms that I have experienced to a more hands-on classroom. I want to give students the chance to explore the language and learn by doing. -- *Mark, 2010, Spanish*

Mark continued to describe his changed instructional responsibility upon realizing that he could address all learners' specific needs and abilities.

I hope to integrate many different area/subjects into my instruction to help students with many different learning styles and intelligences to have equal opportunities to learn. It's hard to know what methods I will use without knowing who my students will be and what the environment will be like. I will obviously modify my instruction and methods as these factors change. -- *Mark, 2010, Spanish*

One PST noted this in the need to scaffold and differentiate instruction for learners' proficiency levels, while another saw her teaching role changing to a needs-based curriculum. Also present is a shift from reliance on textbooks and others' curricula to the modification and development of materials for their specific populations in order to reach out to learners where they need assistance. The qualitative evidence and the quantitative data are congruent on this finding.

Role and Responsibility Shifts to Serving as an EL Advocate

Findings show that PSTs' perspectives toward their role as advocates for ELs changed considerably between the pre- and post-course surveys. Most students reported in post-course surveys that they needed to play an active role as an advocate for ELs so that learners had what they needed to learn the language and the grade-level academics. PSTs commonly said:

I think that I am much more prepared as well to advocate for my ELs. I know much more about the legal side of ELL education and more about different models, and I feel as though I will be able to help students get a good English education. This of course, will go along with the idea of collaboration, which I've learned is so important. I will try to work with the other professionals at school to make sure they ELs are getting a fair chance at learning. -- *Cadence, 2010, French Education*

I want others to know about these things we learned because they will not only benefit their ELs, but their other students as well. -- *Salena, 2006, Elementary Education*

I am now ready to be an advocate for including modifications in mainstream classrooms, and getting all mainstream classroom teachers aware of how they can help ELs. -- *Bridget, 2010, MCEA and TESOL*

Intuitively, the course instructor knew these changes were occurring. She had witnessed the learners' shifts in their philosophy of instruction/ roles and responsibilities, during the terms she taught, but had a difficult time explaining and justifying how the course offered PSTs more than just a series of instructional strategies.

Finding 2. Changes in Awareness of ELs' Needs and Rights

This finding directly addresses the second research question – “What were the most important revelations, or ‘aha’ moments?” All PSTs indicated a significant shift from the pre to post-course surveys in their awareness of ELs learning, challenges/needs, strengths and perspectives. In pre-course surveys, all PSTs noted a high degree of comfort and confidence to work with ELs, but in the post-course surveys, they expressed a surprise at their previous limited knowledge.

Before I took this class, I had never thought of how ELL students might find a mainstream classroom difficult. I knew it may be hard for them, but I didn't know what areas or concepts would be challenging. I never realized how idioms and other parts of speech could be so confusing. I also never understood how important it was to have visuals...I think all future teachers or even current teachers NEED to take this course. It is our job to help every student and we can't do that unless we know ways of helping them learn.
– *Harley, 2006, Elementary Education and Science*

One student said, “I have become more aware of how to create a classroom that caters to the specific needs of my students, even ELs, but not having to water-down content in doing so.” – *Stella, 2010, ESL*

I became much more aware of the ELs' personal variables, the ESL teacher's uphill battles, and found that ESL is not as similar to speech and language therapy as I thought it would be. – *Cindy, 2006, Speech/Language therapy*

Mainly, I think that I am just much more aware of the difficulties ELL students face. I didn't realize how much extra effort they need on behalf of the teacher. And a lot I don't think requires that much extra work for the teacher, just thought. – *Elaine, 2006, Elementary Education*

One specific area in which participants' awareness was raised was the Federal and State laws pertinent to ELs in public K-12 schools. There was a statistically significant change (Chi Square .003, $p = .000$) in PSTs' awareness of laws pertinent to ELs' education and public schools' responsibilities and obligations to educate ELs fairly and equitably.

Finding 3. Changes in Instructional Practices and Planning

Finding three addresses the third research question – “How did the understanding of teaching general education courses of PSTs change after learning about CBI instruction?” This finding has two parts: changes in 1)

daily instructional practices and 2) curricular/lesson planning.

Daily Instructional Practices

A trend shown by the comparison of the pre/post survey results is the change in the day-to-day instructional practices of how to go about teaching the content/subject. PSTs reported dramatic development in their mastery of instructional strategies and practices; for example, 41% of PSTs noted that they must make modifications to the way they speak when delivering a lesson (i.e., linguistic modifications).

Three students' comments revealed the varying ways they described their changes in daily instructional practices:

No matter what I do, it is vital that the learning is authentic to the students' experiences in real life. I also would like to weave the instruction and use of learning strategies within my lessons. – *Lenny, 2009, Elementary Education and ESL*

I feel as though I actually know now what I can do in my classroom to help my students learn English! I have learned many great strategies and know that there are more TESOL people out there who have my back when I become a teacher. – *Kitty, 2010, Math*

I have grown more in this semester as a teacher than any other so far...I also have a much deeper understanding of the challenges that arise in CBI and how to deal with them...I will be able to use all of this knowledge to inform and improve my future teaching and will apply what I can to my content area... -- *Maggie, 2010, Spanish*

Another PST underwent a significant change on his methods and approaches. He expressed his excitement of learning the CBI methodology:

I will definitely be using a large variety of different methods and, of course, I will be adding, removing, or modifying the methods in my repertoire as I gain experience. I have learned about so many new methods in CBI and I'm excited to try them out. I really like the idea of using thematic units throughout the whole year. I find it enjoyable to plan these and I also think it's an effective way to connect the material for students. I am a believer in communicative methods; I believe that both input and output are important factors in building proficiency and will give ample opportunities for both. My class, even if it is not a content class, will be very context/content focused.. – *Mark, 2010, Spanish*

This finding is simultaneously unsurprising and surprising. It should not come as a shock that this course would offer the pre-service teachers instructional, materials development and linguistic modification strategies. The surprise is that these students thought that they already knew how to work with ELs from their learning in general teacher education methods courses. Kitty's statement that, "I actually know now what I can do...", confirms this belief.

Another unexpected twist was that the course not only opened PSTs' minds to new approaches to making meanings with ELs through new instructional strategies, but also that it gave them a deeper understanding of the

need for a variety of different strategies and increased frequency of their use in order to make meanings. In other words, making one modification to a lesson for native English speakers is not enough to bridge the language barrier for ELs. Skilled content-based ESL teachers employ a wide variety and a tremendous frequency of strategies in lesson planning and delivery in order to connect with ELs and convey meanings. This understanding can be seen in this quote:

I have learned that teaching ESL students is more than just making a few adaptations or making things easier. It is about scaffolding, creating meanings, and giving students the support they need to succeed in the K-12 setting. -- Nancy, 2009, *Spanish Education*.

Curricular and Lesson Planning Changes

This part of the findings also addresses the third research question – “How did the understanding of teaching general education courses of PSTs change after learning about CBI instruction?” However, it relates more to the planning rather than the implementation of instruction.

PSTs noted growth in their abilities to construct effective curricula and lessons after taking the CBI course. They developed various skills in designing thematic curricula and lesson plans, including objective writing of intertwined content and language standards and objectives; developing and/or modifying instructional materials; sequencing lessons so that pre-teaching techniques are employed prior to readings, etc.; and scaffolding instruction/differentiate instruction for various levels of proficiency in multilevel classes. For example, one student reported her learning in these words:

I have learned many new ways of modifying texts for my learners and how to create appropriate objectives and lesson plans. I have learned that working with my colleagues is imperative for myself and my students. – Calleigh, 2009, *Elementary Education*

Another student could not wait to apply thematic instruction in ESL classes:

I have learned about so many new methods in CBI and I'm excited to try them out. I really like the idea of using thematic units throughout the whole year. I find it enjoyable to plan these and I also think it's an effective way to connect the material for students. – Mark, 2010, *Spanish*

This CBI course opened a new window for all the participants to reexamine the possible materials in classroom and also taught modifications to render textual information more accessible to ELs:

Posters, pictures, transparencies, maps, charts, vocabulary cards, stories on CDs, guided reading, videos, math manipulatives, educational games, graphic organizers are all possible materials in my ESL classroom. I will make sure to find visuals that narrow down the concept to what I am teaching, chunk info verbally and visually to help with comprehension, and search for and use materials that will help to organize the info into a more meaningful assignment. -- Drew, 2006, SPED

At the beginning of the course, not all participants felt that teachers should make extra modifications for ELs in their courses. After taking the CBI course, all participants agreed or agreed strongly that teachers should make extra modifications for ELL students. A statistically significant (Chi Square=0.72, $p=.02$) change occurred for these PSTs on the need for teachers to make extra modifications for ELs.

DISCUSSION

The most important notation on finding one, *Philosophical Shifts in Roles and Responsibilities*, is that the course brought about profound changes in the PSTs' pedagogical philosophy. In attempts by researchers, teacher educators, and consultants nationwide to prepare general educators to include ELs into their grade-level content classes, the complexities of content-based instruction have been reduced at times to instructional "sound bites" or easily remembered strategies/ideas. Four to five instructional strategies, such as cooperative learning have been proposed to "solve the problem" and to provide ELs everything they need for content and language learning. This oversimplification is a weighty disservice to ELs. Effective inclusion of ELs in a general education classroom means that teachers need more than just a handful of instructional strategies (de Jong & Harper, 2005, Menken & Antunez, 2001; Willet, et. al., 2007).

Most notably, based on the general education courses, all PSTs recorded a high degree of comfort and confidence working with diverse learners, such as ELs, prior to class, but at the end of the course expressed a degree of shock at their lack of prior knowledge. Finding two, *Changes in Awareness of ELs' Needs and Rights*, lifts the veil between general education and ESL preparation in a powerful way by demonstrating that general educators and teacher educators feel that a linguistically and culturally welcoming environment and general education methodologies are sufficient for the instruction of ELs as well as the PSTs realization that diversity training is not alone sufficient in preparation for their future teaching. This finding is congruent with assertions from many other students that mainstream educators hold strongly to the belief that ELs do not need anything different in terms of *instruction* from native-English speaking students (de Jong and Harper, 2004, 2005; Harper and de Jong, 2004; Harper, de Jong and Platt, 2008; Lucas, Villegas and Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Mohan et al., 2001; Yoon, 2008). It seems that discussions in general teacher preparation courses are occurring about the changing demographics of K-12, because all students knew they would have ELs in their courses. However, all PSTs mentioned a dramatic increase in their awareness of ELs' academic and linguistic needs and the need to productively include ELs into

their courses (de Jong & Harper, 2005, Wong-Fillmore and Snow, 2000). Finally, PSTs became aware of Federal laws relevant to ELs in U.S. public K-12 schools, that discuss State and Federal educational laws to which they had not been previously exposed in their required Foundations of Education courses.

Lastly, finding three reveals the types of information PSTs are not receiving in their preparation programs and general education methods courses in daily instructional delivery and curriculum/lesson planning. They have not learned about language structures, language use/typical discourse patterns in their content area, or linguistic modifications they can make to their own speech to increase EL's comprehension (Hite & Evans, 2006; Wong-Fillmore and Snow 2000). Although knowledge of SIOP objectives are common and pervasive in K-12, PSTs have not learned about how to write combined content and language objectives, nor about providing, adapting or designing materials to support ELs in their content studies (Hite & Evans, 2006). There seemed to be recognition of the need for a wide variety and frequency of instructional strategy usage on the part of the teacher (Reynolds, 2009) in the PST's post-survey responses. They came to understand that non-native speakers need extra modifications to make meanings (Hite & Evans, 2006; Wong-Fillmore and Snow, 2000), so the use of one instructional strategy per 50 minute class, such as predicting topics of a reading passage, would not be sufficient for full comprehension of a reading passage. Interestingly, this summary reads like a need-to-know laundry list from a content-based instruction textbook's table of contents or the topics of discussions among ESL teacher educators.

These findings offer insights into the differences in preparation of general and ESL educators. Previous to this study, TESOL teacher educators have strongly encouraged teacher education programs to include more preparation of all teachers in the areas of 1) Knowledge of language (Murray & Christison 2011a, 2011b; Schleppegrell, 2004; Wong-Fillmore & Snow, 2002), second language acquisition processes, ELs' backgrounds; 2) Performance of creating welcoming learning environments, scaffolding and modifying instruction to meet ELs' needs, and providing interactional opportunities in oral and written language (Echevarria & Graves, 2003; Echevarria & Short, 2003, 2004, 2005; Echevarria, Vogt, and Short, 2004; Short, 1993, 1994, 2002), explicit instruction of learning strategies (Chamot, 2009), and culturally-responsive pedagogy (Lucas and Villegas, 2011). This research suggests that other areas should also be included in PSTs' teacher preparation programs, such as advocacy for ELs (Wilcox Peterson, 1997), study of ELs' abilities and challenges at various proficiency levels/differentiated language learning, meaning construction through the use of a wide variety and higher frequency of instructional, linguistic and materials modifications, and learner-centered instruction, as these were significant

areas of change for the PSTs in the content-based instruction course.

CONCLUSION

EL teacher educators and researchers need not oversimplify the processes of working with ELs; rather, we need to scaffold this instruction for PSTs. We need to alter the way general educators view their daily practices in an approachable and reasonable manner and collaborate with colleagues to promote philosophical shifts in PSTs' understandings of the teaching role and responsibilities to work with all learners. Better communication with our general educator peers resulting in shared understandings and goals needs to occur. We must share with them the disservice of reducing CBI for ELs to exclusively a paradigm of culturally and linguistically sensitive, multicultural education, which is insufficient for ELs' learning. As the third finding illustrates, productively working with ELs is more than sensitivity; it is the modification of daily instructional practices and planning for learners' diverse needs. Creating a welcoming environment *is* an important first step in including ELs into the mainstream, but it is not the last step.

An important oversight illuminated by finding two is that even in "high quality" teacher education programs in which diversity, inclusiveness, and culturally-congruent pedagogy is encouraged, PSTs are not developing their awareness of ELs' backgrounds, perspectives, learning strengths, challenges, and needs, or their rights according to U.S. Federal laws.

This study suggests that PSTs are not being prepared, as general teacher educators believe, in the ways to include ELs effectively into their general education courses. Finding three strongly suggests that PSTs should have intensive coursework in EL content-based instruction and inclusion to better prepare them for meeting the content and language needs of their ELs, or that the PSTs need some other powerful equivalent to a course that will profoundly change their perspectives (finding one), since effective EL inclusion is more than just good teaching or a series of instructional strategies.

REFERENCES

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Committee on Multicultural Education. (2002, March). *Educators' Preparation for Cultural and Linguistic Diversity: A Call to Action*. Retrieved Feb. 18, 2011, from <http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED477737.pdf>.
- Au, K.H., & Mason, J.M. (1983). Cultural congruence in classroom participation structures: Achieving a balance of rights. *Discourse Processes*, 6, 145-167.
- Ballantyne, K.G., Sanderman, A.R., & Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity. Volume III: State requirements for pre-service teachers of ELs*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Available at http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/practice/mainstream_teachers.htm.
- Batt, E.G. (2008, Spring). Teachers' perceptions of ELL education: Potential solutions to overcome the greatest challenges. *Multicultural Education*, 5(3): 39-43.
- Berube, B. (2000). *Managing ESL programs in rural and small urban schools*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Borgatti, S. (n.d.). *Introduction to grounded theory*. Retrieved on 8/2/2012 from <http://www.analytictech.com/mb870/introtoGT.htm>.
- Chamot, A. U. (2009). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*, 2nd ed. Pearson.
- Colombo, M., & Furbush, D. (2009). *Teaching English Language Learners: Content and Language in Middle and Secondary Mainstream Classrooms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- De Jong, E.J. & Harper, C.A. (2004). "Is ESL Just Good Teaching?" Proceedings of Third International Conference on Language Teacher Education (CARLA Working Paper #24). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. Retrieved from <http://www.carla.umn.edu/resources/working-papers/>.
- De Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). "Preparing Mainstream Teachers for English Language Learners: Is Being a Good Teacher Good Enough?" Retrieved Feb. 18, 2011, from http://www.teqjournal.org/bacakovols/2005/32_2/13dejong%26harper.pdf.

- Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (2003). *Sheltered Content Instruction: Teaching English Language Learners with Diverse Abilities* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Longman.
- Echevarria, J., & Short, D. (2004). "Using Multiple Perspectives in Observations of Diverse Classrooms: The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)." In H. Waxman, R. Tharp, & R. S. Hilberg (Eds.), *Observational Research in U.S. Classrooms: New Approaches for Understanding Cultural and Linguistic Diversity* (pp. 21–47). Boston: Cambridge University Press.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. (2000). *Making Content Comprehensible for English Language Learners: The SIOP Model*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. (2004). *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP Model* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson Allyn & Bacon.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E. (2010). *Using the SIOP Model to Improve Literacy for English Learners*. The NERA Journal, 46(1): 8-15.
- Gándara, P., & Baca, G. (2008). NCLB and California's English language learners: The perfect storm. *Language Policy*, 7: 201-216.
- Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Listening to teachers of English learners*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English Language Learners: A Synthesis of Research Evidence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibson, P. (2009). *English learners, academic literacy, and thinking: Learning in the challenge zone*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-Lopez, P., & Asato, J. (2000). English for the children: The new literacy of the old world order, language policy and educational reform. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24 (1-2): 87-112.
- Harper, C., & De Jong, E. (2004, October). "Misconceptions about Teaching English-Language Learners." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48 (2), 152-162.
- Harper, C., Platt, E., Naranjo, C., Boynton, S., Ramanathan, V., & Morgan, B. (2007). Marching in unison: Florida ESL teachers and No Child Left Behind. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(3): 642-651.

- Hite, C. E., & Evans, L. S. (2006). "Mainstream First-Grade Teachers' Understanding of Strategies for Accommodating the Needs of English Language Learners." Retrieved Feb. 18, 2011, from http://www.teqjournal.org/backvols/2006/33_2/15hiteetal.pdf.
- Kaufman, D. & Crandall, J. A. (Eds.). (2005). *Content-Based Instruction in Primary and Secondary Settings*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Li, G. & Protacio, M.S. (2010). Best practices in professional development for teachers of ELLs. In Li, G. & Edwards, P. A. (Eds.), *Best practices in ELL instruction*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Lucas, T. (Ed.). (2011). *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A Resource for Teacher Educators*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lucas, T. & Villegas, A. M. (2011). "A Framework for Preparing Linguistically Responsive Teachers." In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A Resource for Teacher Educators* (pp. 55-72). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). "Linguistically Responsive Teacher Education: Preparing Classroom Teachers to Teach English Language Learners." *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59 (4): 361-373.
- McGraner, K.L. & Saenz, L. (September, 2009). "Preparing Teachers of English Language Learners." Washington, D.C.: National Comprehensive Center for Teaching Quality.
- Menken, K., & Antunez, B. (2001). *An Overview of the Preparation and Certification of Teachers Working with Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Murray, D. E., Christison, M. A. (2011a). *What English language teachers need to know (Vol. I): Understanding learning*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Murray, D. E., Christison, M. A. (2011b). *What English language teachers need to know, (Vol. II): Facilitating learning*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2005). *The Growing Numbers of Limited English Proficient Students: 1992/93–2002/03*. Retrieved June, 20, 2011, from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/policy/states/reports/statedata/2002LEP/Growing_LEP0203.pdf

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

Platt, E., Harper, C., & Mendoza, M.B. (2003, Spring). Dueling philosophies: Inclusion or separation for Florida's English language learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(1): 105-133.

Reeves, J.R. (2006, Jan/Feb.). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research*, 99(3): 131-142.

Reynolds, K. M. (March 23, 2009). *Perfecting Practices in Content-Based ESL Instruction*. Presentation at the 43rd Annual Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages Conference, Denver, CO.

Reynolds, K.M. (in press). *Models and Approach in Mainstream Teacher Development for ELL Inclusion*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Short, D., Fidelman, C., & Louguit, M. (2009). *The Effects of SIOP Model Instruction on the Academic Language Development of English Language Learners*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the Work: Challenges and Solutions to Acquiring Language and Academic Literacy for Adolescent English Language Learners – A Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Snow, M.A. & Brinton, D. T. (Eds.). (1997). *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content*. New York: Longman.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Téllez, K. & Waxman, H.C. (Eds.). (2006). *Preparing Quality Educators for English Language Learners: Research, Policies, and Practices*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Vogt, M. E. (2000). "Content Learning for Students Needing Modifications: An Issue of Access." In M. McLaughlin & M. E. Vogt (Eds.), *Creativity and Innovation in Content Area Teaching* (pp. 329–351). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Waxman, R. Tharp, & R. S. Hilberg (Eds.), *Observational Research in U.S. Classrooms: New Approaches for Understanding Cultural and Linguistic Diversity* (pp. 21–47). Boston: Cambridge University Press.

- Wilcox Peterson, P. (1997). Knowledge, skills, and attitudes in teacher preparation for content-based instruction. In T.A. Snow & D. T. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp. 158-174). New York: Longman.
- Willet, J., Harman, R., Hogan, A., Lozano, M. E., & Rubeck, J. (2007). "Transforming Standard Practice to Serve the Social and Academic Learning of English Language Learners." In L. S. Verplaetse & N. Migliacci (Eds.), *Inclusive Pedagogy for English Language Learners: A Handbook of Research-Informed Practices* (pp. 33-53). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wong-Fillmore, L., & Snow, C. (2005). "What Teachers Need to Know about Language." In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (eds.), *What Teachers Need to Know about Language* (pp. 7-54). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Yoon, B. (June 2008). "Uninvited Guests: The Influence of Teachers' Roles and Pedagogies on the Positioning of English Language Learners in the Regular Classroom." *American Educational Research Journal*, 45 (2): 495-522.

Appendix A Outline of CBI Course Topics

Discussion Topics
Introduction to course, course goals and each other. Discuss the “Atlas” Complex: Roles and Responsibilities in the Classroom. Check out Heinemann Raintree Content/ELL set.
Discussion of CBI methodology (i.e., integrating content and language), learners’ considerations, theoretical framework and CALLA. Discussion of research and theory supporting CBI. Laws pertinent to ELs.
Discussion of the sheltered content, adjunct, and a priori approaches to CBI. Modifying content; Issues of “dumbing down” or slowing down the curriculum.
Discussion of affect issues and learning strategy instruction. Discuss Comprehensible Input.
Consideration of academic language/discourse. Adjusting the Classroom Discourse for ELs. Linguistic modifications. Considering multicultural classrooms.
Curriculum Development and Adaptations. Syllabus Design. Functional Notional Syllabus. Thematic Units. TESOL Standards PK-12. Discuss lesson framework (goals and objectives). PK-12 differentiated Instruction by Proficiency Level.
Teaching of CBI math.
Teaching of CBI whole language, language arts, composition, and literature.
Teaching of CBI social studies and history. Samples of content-based instruction in practice. Vocabulary instruction.
Teaching of science(s). Analysis of a science content-based lesson presented in a foreign language.
Discussion of CBI Arts, Music, PE, etc.
Discussion of CBI assessments, evaluation of learner progress. Remainder of class time: Work on instructional units. Bring all necessary materials.
Discussion of practical issues surrounding enacting CBI and collaboration with others.

Appendix B Survey Instrument

CBI Post-Course Survey

1. Imagine yourself teaching. Please describe your (future or current) students. Who are they? Where are they from? What are their strengths/weaknesses? In terms of their abilities, what do you anticipate they will be like?
2. Will you/do you have any students who are? Please check all that apply.
 - At risk
 - Learning disabled
 - Gifted
 - Have experienced interrupted schooling (changing schools often or missing some schooling)
 - Born outside of the United States
 - Have non-native speaking parents
 - Are non-native speakers of English
 - Bilingual
 - Illegal immigrants
 - Refugees
3. Will you/Do you regularly have English language learners in the courses you teach?
 - Yes
 - Maybe
 - No
4. Which program model will you/do you teach in?
 - Mainstream/general education courses
 - Sheltered content courses
 - Push-in ESL
 - Pull-out ESL
 - English as a Second Language (ESL) courses
 - Other:
5. Please describe with details, but be concise and use any appropriate field-related vocabulary, what your methodology will look like when you teach.
6. How has your methodology and approach to teaching changed as a result of the ES 408 Content-based ESL Instruction course?
7. When you are teaching your primary content (i.e. major area subject), what kinds of strategies, techniques and activities will you/do you employ for learners who are “at-risk”?
8. How have your strategies, techniques and activities for working with learners who are “at-risk” changed as a result of the Content-Based ESL Instruction course?
9. Considering your future classes, what will your role be? What is the role of your students? What will be your learners' responsibilities?
10. How have your perspectives of students' and teachers' roles changed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course?
11. When you have multi-level classes, what groups of learners should you target during instruction? How would you do differentiate instruction?
12. How has your approach to differentiation changed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course?
13. What is the importance of a safe learning environment for English Language Learners (ELs)?
14. How has your understanding of the importance of a safe learning environment for English Language Learners (ELs) changed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course?
15. When presenting lessons to your (future or current) classes, how should you speak?
16. How has your understanding and speaking while presenting lessons to your (future or current) classes changed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course?
17. Please describe what a lesson objective should look like.
18. Have you encountered any other standards than your content area? If so, which?
19. Has your approach and understanding of curriculum design changed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course? If so, how? If not, why?
20. What materials, aside from text books, do you think you need regularly when teaching?
21. Has your approach and knowledge of materials available, material usage and materials development changed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course? If so, how? If not, why?
22. I think diverse language learners should be included in regular content courses.
 - Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree

23. In reference to the statement above, has your attitude or opinion changed or morphed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course? If so, how? If not, why?
24. I think non-English speakers should have extra modifications made for them.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
25. In reference to the statement above, has your attitude or opinion changed or morphed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course? If so, how? If not, why?
26. Teaching a general education course does not require any knowledge of language structures.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
27. In reference to the statement above, has your attitude or opinion changed or morphed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course? If so, how? If not, why?
28. I am aware of the legal responsibilities of school districts for the education of English languages learners.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
- In reference to the statement above, has your attitude or opinion changed or morphed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course? If so, how? If not, why?
29. I am open to new ideas.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
30. In reference to the statement above, has your attitude or opinion changed or morphed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course? If so, how? If not, why?
31. I think teachers have too many responsibilities or too little time worry about English languages learners.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
32. In reference to the statement above, has your attitude or opinion changed or morphed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course? If so, how? If not, why?
33. I think including English language learners into content area/general education classes is easy.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
34. In reference to the statement above, has your attitude or opinion changed or morphed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course? If so, how? If not, why?
35. To teach English language learners you don't have to do anything special; It's just good teaching.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
36. In reference to the statement above, has your attitude or opinion changed or morphed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course? If so, how? If not, why?
37. I am willing to take extra steps in planning, instruction, and assessment if it means my students will really learn.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
38. In reference to the statement above, has your attitude or opinion changed or morphed as a result of the Content-based ESL Instruction course? If so, how? If not, why?
39. Please rate how much you feel that you have LEARNED in this course OVERALL:

Woe is me: No Learning	Vague Learning: I recognize terms/concepts, but I couldn't explain them.	Moderate Learning: Understand a lot, but still cloudy on some stuff.	Above Average Learning: I'm fairly conversant. I can recognize terms/concepts & I could explain them fairly well.	Ultimate Learning: Detailed and Deep

Please indicate your degree of LEARNING on the following course objectives: Scale:

Woe is me: No Learning	Vague Learning: I recognize terms/concepts, but I couldn't explain them.	Moderate Learning: Understand a lot, but still cloudy on some stuff.	Above Average Learning: I'm fairly conversant. I can recognize terms/concepts & I could explain them fairly well.	Ultimate Learning: Detailed and Deep

40. Describe and implement various affective strategies to make course content meaningful to the English language learner;
41. Describe and implement various instructional strategies to make course content meaningful to the English language learner;
42. Describe and implement various materials, material usage and material development strategies to make course content meaningful to the English language learner;
43. Describe and implement various curricular strategies to make course content meaningful to the English language learner;
44. Integrate 4 skills + instruction into content courses through interactive, authentic and hands-on ESL techniques;
45. Utilize linguistic modifications in oral presentations of material to make auditory input for ELLs more comprehensible;
46. Analyze and describe the linguistic features of oral and written discourse so as to be able to bridge the gap between ELLs and a wide variety of genres, subject area, and academic discourse communities and texts.
47. Address varying ESL competency levels by differentiating instruction and utilizing a variety of instructional techniques within a single lesson and single content topic;
48. Design a content-based unit for English language learners (ELL);
49. Utilize Backward Design in course planning to develop sheltered, adjunct, push-in, pull-out, mainstream inclusive CBI units.
50. Outline and explain steps involved in content-based curriculum design for ELL.
51. Write measurable and intertwined language and content objectives.
52. Obtain, create and/or modify materials to enhance comprehensibility of content lessons.
53. Integrate TESOL's new K-12 ESL, WIDA and/or content-area State/core standards into curriculum design.
54. Create and/or modify subject-area assessments to gauge ELs true comprehension, knowledge and skills in the content areas.
55. Discuss laws pertinent to ELLs k-12 education;
56. Advocate for the needs and rights of their ELLs;
57. Collaborate productively with colleagues, administrators and parents to enhance ELLs learning and create ELL-friendly schools and communities.

58. What advice would you give someone else entering this course?

59. Would you recommend this course to other educators?

No

Yes, with reservations

Yes, wholeheartedly

If you answered "No", why?

If you answered "Yes, with reservations", why?

If you answered "Yes, wholeheartedly", why?

60. Should this course be required for general educators. Why or why not?

61. Is there any other information you wish to tell us in this survey?