2016

A case study of how teacher preparation programs in Minnesota are preparing elementary teachers to work with English Learners

Sarah Lynn Stay
Bethel University

A case study of how teacher preparation programs in Minnesota are preparing elementary teachers to work with English Learners

Sarah Lynn Stay

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of Bethel University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education.

Saint Paul, MN
2016

Approved by,
Dr. Katie Bonawitz, Ed.D.
Dr. Cheryl Bostrom, Ed.D.
Dr. Sarah Tahtinen-Pacheco, Ph.D.

2016
Sarah Lynn Stay

This dissertation is dedicated to Lucy Lynn and Samuel Louis.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my most sincere gratitude to Dr. Katie Bonawitz, Dr. Sarah Tahtinen-Pacheco, and Dr. Cheryl Bostrom for their endless support, encouragement, knowledge, and time that they provided throughout this journey. Thank you also to Dr. Mike Lindstrom for his expert advice and willingness to take the time to provide guidance and examine my work numerous times.

Matt, thank you for supporting me in every way possible and for being my biggest cheerleader.

Lucy and Sam, you inspire me beyond words. I love you both more than you'll ever know.

Dad and mom, to say "thank you" seems so very inadequate. But thank you for always believing in me, supporting me, and helping me become the person I am today.

Scout, you are possibly the best foot warmer and homework companion I could have asked for during all of my day, night, and weekend writing sessions.

Last, but certainly not least, thank you to my friends and colleagues who were persistent (and insistent) on calling me "Dr. Stay", while constantly asking "are you done yet?" You kept me going when I wanted to quit. You were all so excited when you said it, that in the end, I just wanted you to be able to legitimately call me "Dr. Stay".

Abstract

As the population of English Learners in mainstream classrooms across the United States continue to increase, it is critical that all classroom teachers (not just English language specialists) take responsibility for and are adequately prepared for working with and educating ELs. The exponential growth of culturally and linguistically diverse students in the public school system raises important questions about teacher preparation. Since academic achievement in elementary school directly correlates to high school graduation rates, it is critical to examine current teacher education programs and the opportunities within these programs that provide an understanding of EL needs.

This study will examine K-6 teacher preparation programs at IHEs in Minnesota with the goal of determining how preservice teachers are being prepared to meet the education needs of ELs. Study results will be shared with IHEs, school districts, and all stakeholders involved in creating teacher education policy and institutions responsible for implementing teacher preparation programs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)

Culturally Linguistically Diverse (CLD)

Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT)

English Language Development (ELD)

English Language Learner (ELL)

English Learner (EL)

English as a Second Language (ESL)

General Outcomes Measurement (GOMs)

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA)

Institutes of Higher Education (IHE)

Language Minorities (LM)

Limited English Proficiency (LEP)

Long Term English Learner (LTEL)

Minnesota Department of Education (MDE)

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

No Child Left Behind Act of 2011 (NCLB)

Preservice Teacher (PST)

Professional Development (PD)

Racially, Ethnically, and Linguistically Different (RELD)

Student with Interrupted Formal Education (SIFE)

Teacher Education Program (TEP)

"No matter their race, creed, zip code, or first language, every child in this nation is entitled to a quality public education. It's the one and only way to place the promise of the American dream within reach of everyone."

-Melendez de Santa Ana, T. (Casteel & Ballantyne, 2010)

Chapter 1: Introduction

The United States is built on immigration and the notion of blending many languages, cultures, and religions to form a single national identity (U.S. Department of State, 2011). Children of immigrants are the fastest-growing student population in the United States today. One out of four children in the United States are from immigrant families and most speak a language other than English at home (Collins & Samson, 2012). Half of these children do not speak fluent English and as a result are labeled English learners (ELs). State agencies, school districts, and public schools have a legal obligation to provide ELs with a meaningful and equal education program under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI) and the Equal Education Opportunities Act of 1974 (EEOA).

History of Language Education Policy

In the early 1920s, several states introduced Americanization policies and passed pro-bilingual laws due to the greatest influx of immigrants in United States history. In 1918, Texas passed a strict English-only law making it a criminal offense for school personnel to teach in a language other than English (Gandara, 2015). In 1923, thirty-four states required English to be the primary language of instruction in schools. After the collapse of the economy in the 1930s, students whose primary language was not English were essential neglected (2015).

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the most comprehensive civil rights statute in the United States. The intent was to ensure the constitutional right to vote and to prohibit racial segregation in public accommodations and educational institutions (Education Law, 2015). The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1965. It offered new grants to districts serving low-income students, federal grants for text and library books, created special education centers, and scholarships for low-income

college students. The ESEA also provided federal grants to state educational agencies to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 (Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) piqued interest again in students who were not proficient in English and opened the door to officially instructing students bilingually; English-only movements began to take hold once again.

The 1980s brought a rise of organized intolerance for any language other than English. As the number of immigrants in the U.S. increased, so did the number of non-English languages spoken. The growing discontent with bilingual education led to an effort to make English the official language of the United States (Loos, et al., 2014). In 1983, a group called the U.S. English organization was founded and formed to lobby against bilingual education. Supporters of the English Only (EO) movement believed that bilingual education programs interfered with immigrants' ability to acquire English and that bilingualism threatened the country's unity; declaring English the official language would ensure cultural homogeneity as well as mutual linguistic intelligibility (2014). Despite the push to make English the nation's official language, California, Arizona, and Massachusetts were the only states successful in promoting EO instruction.

The 1990s and beginning of the 21st century brought anti-immigrant legislation and several states enacted policies against bilingual education (Cheung & Slavin, 2012). In 1998, the state of California nearly banned bilingual instruction with the passing of Proposition 227, by severely limiting students' access to bilingual programs, educational policy and practice (Matas and Rodriguez, 2014). In 2000, Arizona followed suit with a similar law, when they passed Proposition 203, which mandated that all public school instruction be conducted in English and required ELs to participate in an intensive one-year immersion program to teach English as

quickly as possible (Martinez-Wenzl, Perez, & Gandara, 2012). Following California and Arizona's mandates, Massachusetts passed a voter referendum that limited the use of native languages in schools in 2002. The ballot initiative was called English for the Children, or Question 2, and overthrew the thirty-year state mandate for bilingual education (Viesca, 2013). In 2001, the ESEA was reauthorized as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The NCLB requires that states provide an annual assessment of English language proficiency for all students identified as LEP, including listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension in English (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). On December 10, 2015, President Barack Obama signed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The ESSA is a bipartisan measure that reauthorized the ESEA and replaces NCLB; it upholds critical protections for disadvantaged students and ensures that states and schools will account for student progress and prescribe meaningful reforms to remedy underperformance. The goal of the ESSA is to ensure that all children have equitable access to high-quality preschool, excellent educators, and holds all students to high academic standards to prepare them for success in college and beyond.

Rationale

The need for higher-quality teachers has led to the development of teaching standards in the areas of English language arts, math, sciences, social studies, and ESL (Staehr Fenner & Kuhlman, 2012). In 1999, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) became a member of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). As a joint effort, they developed standards that represent what pre-service teacher candidates should know and be able to do in order to effectively teach ELs (2012). The standards were put into practice in 2001 and revised in 2009. They served as a starting point for teacher preparation programs and represented what candidates should know and be able to do in order to effectively

teach ELs (Valdez Pierce, 2012; Staehr Fenner & Kuhlman, 2012). Ten of the eleven standards must be met for national recognition by NCATE and teacher preparation programs must show evidence that teacher candidates meet the standards in order to obtain national recognition (Valdez Pierce, 2012, p. 5). The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education has six specific standards for accreditation of teacher preparation programs and how each standard is applied to ELs (NCATE, 2007):

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions—Teachers should acquire **pedagogical content knowledge** which addresses ELs.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation—Assessment and evaluation data should **measure** teachers' preparedness to work with ELs.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice—Field experiences should provide **practice** and opportunities to see successful teachers **model** effective techniques in working with ELs.

Standard 4: Diversity—Candidates should understand the range in **diversity among ELs.**

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development—Unit should provide **qualified faculty** and **sufficient resources** to support teachers' learning about ELs.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources—Unit should provide **qualified faculty** and **sufficient resources** to support teachers' learning about ELs.

Alamillo, Padilla, and Arenas suggested looking at teacher education programs as a whole and how to address the ways in which teacher candidates are trained in EL methods (2011).

Research Questions

This study examined K-6 teacher preparation programs at IHEs in Minnesota with the goal of determining how preservice teacher candidates are prepared to meet the education needs of ELs.

1. How do IHE elementary licensure programs approved by the Minnesota Board of Teaching prepare elementary education teacher candidates at the bachelor degree level to teach EL students in their classrooms?
2. What opportunities do IHEs provide for general elementary education teacher candidates to gain an understanding of EL needs?

Landmark court cases

There were several landmark court cases whose decisions were influential in establishing equal educational opportunities that significantly impacted the education of ELs.

Plessy v. Ferguson originated in 1892 as a challenge to Louisiana's Separate Car Act of 1890. This was the first major inquiry into the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment's equal-protection clause and gave constitutional sanction to laws designed to achieve racial segregation by means of separate and supposedly equal public facilities and services for whites and African Americans (Duignan, 2015).

In the 1950s, many schools had segregation laws that prohibited African American children and White children from attending the same school. The 1951 case of Brown v. Board of Education filed suit against the Board of Education of the City of Topeka, Kansas. The case argued that separate schools were unconstitutional because they violated equal protection guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. On May 17, 1954, the court ruled unanimously that segregation was unconstitutional and that separate is not equal.

The 1973 U.S. Supreme Court case of Keyes v. Denver had a profound effect on school desegregation litigation. It was the first Supreme Court desegregation case that did not concern a Southern school system. Parents of African American and Latino students sued the school board alleging that officials acted intentionally to create a racially segregated system by separating them from their peers. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that ELs could not be segregated from their peers who were fluent in English and that African American and Latino students may be placed in the same category in contrast to White peers for the purpose of defining segregated schools.

The Case of Lau v. Nichols (1974) was the most important court decision regarding the education of language-minority students and had significant influence on federal policy. Kinney Kinmon Lau sought for bilingual compensatory education from the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) for other non-English-speaking Chinese students claiming that their rights were violated under the Fourteenth Amendment Equal Protection Clause. The Supreme Court ruling determined that the students' rights to equal educational opportunities were violated because they could not read or speak English proficiently. After this decision, Congress enacted the Equal Educational Opportunity Act (EEOA) of 1974 and the Bilingual Education Act of 1974. The U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights created the Lau Remedies which required school districts to implement bilingual education programs for EL students.

In 1975, the state of Texas passed a law that withheld educational funds for students who were illegal immigrants and enabled public school districts to charge tuition of unauthorized school children (Olivas, 2010). School officials in Tyler, Texas admitted illegal immigrant students, but under the direction of Superintendent James Plyler, families were charged an annual tuition fee of $1000. The case, Plyer vs. Doe, went to the Supreme Court and the court

ruled that it violated the fourteenth Amendment. The court held that illegal immigrant children are people deserving of equal protection rights and that the law discriminated against an innocent class of children who have little control over their illegal status (Olivas, 2010).

The ruling in the case of Castañeda v Pickard (1978) significantly influenced language education policy and the education of English learners. The Raymondville, Texas Independent School District (RISD) was accused of segregating students based on race and ethnicity. The district failed to implement a successful bilingual education program that in which children would learn English (Zacarian, 2012). Although the ruling in this case did not require states to implement bilingual education programs, it did require that schools take appropriate action to overcome language barriers (Loos, et al., 2014). The ruling in Castañeda continues to serve as a legal platform for cases involving the education of ELs. It also led to the development of standards that serve as criteria in determining a school's compliance with the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974 (2014).

1) Theory: The school must pursue a program based on an educational theory recognized as sound or at least, as a legitimate experimental strategy.
2) Practice: The school must actually implement the program with instructional practices, resources and personnel necessary to transfer theory to reality.
3) Results: The school must not persist in a program that fails to produce results.

English Learners

According to the Office of English Language Acquisition (2016), in the school years 2004-2012, the number of ELs increased by over 100% in the states of Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Maryland, Michigan, South Carolina, and West Virginia.

There were 4,472,563 ELs in the U.S. which comprises 9% of all students nationwide in grades pre-K through 12 in the school year 2011-2012 (OELA, 2016). In the 2013-2014 school year, the five most common languages spoken by ELs were Spanish (3,770,816), Arabic (100,461), Chinese (99,943), Vietnamese (80,283), Haitian/Haitian Creole (35,467) and nine states and the District of Columbia reported that 80% or more of the ELs in the state spoke Spanish.

The U.S. Department of Education's, *A Blueprint for Recognizing Educational Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (R.E.S.P.E.C.T.)* (2013), reported that 78% of students' complete high school in four years; 66% of African Americans and 71% of Latinos graduate on time. More than 60% of U.S. jobs require some form of higher education, yet almost one out of four young adults cannot begin to compete for these jobs (2013). English Learners (ELs) are students who enter school with a first, or primary language other than English. Most were born in the U.S. and attend public schools, having been enrolled since kindergarten (NEA, 2011; Olson, 2014). Some are children of immigrants who have relocated to the U.S. for various reasons, while others are refugees who fled their native country due to political or economic stress. Some ELs are children of sojourners who have come to study or work for a specific period of time and some are migrant workers who move from place to place in search of work. In order to meet the academic demands of school, they need to increase their English proficiency (Roy-Campbell, 2013). Students are typically identified as EL if they score below a state-designated proficiency level by an English-language placement test. If identified as EL, students are eligible for English-language instruction and support. The federal definition of an English learner (U.S. Department of Education, 2015; No Child Left Behind Act, P.L. 107-20110, Title IX, Part A, Sec. 9101 (25)):

(25) LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT- The term limited English proficient, when used with respect to an individual, means an individual —

(A) who is aged 3 through 21;

(B) who is enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school;

(C)(i) who was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English;

(ii)(I) who is a Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas; and

(II) who comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on the individual's level of English language proficiency; or

(iii) who is migratory, whose native language is a language other than English, and who comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; and

(D) whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individual —

(i) the ability to meet the State's proficient level of achievement on State assessments described in section 1111(b)(3);

(ii) the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English; or

(iii) the opportunity to participate fully in society.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was founded in 1954 and is an accrediting body for institutions that prepare teachers and other professional personnel for work in preschool, elementary, and secondary schools by helping to ensure that these institutions produce competent, caring, qualified teachers and other professional school personnel (NCATE, 2008). The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), the National Education Association (NEA), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and the National School Boards Association (NSBA) were instrumental in the creation of NCATE. Their mission ensures that accredited institutions remain current, relevant, and productive while providing assurance that graduates of accredited institutions have acquired the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn (p. 1).

The NCATE standards were based on the belief that all children can and should learn. In order to attain this goal, accredited institutions should (NCATE, 2008, pgs 3-4):

- ensure that new teachers attain the necessary content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge and skills to teach both independently and collaboratively;
- ensure that all new administrators and other professional specialists attain the knowledge and skills to create a supportive environment for student learning;
- administer multiple assessments in a variety of forms, engage in follow-up studies, and use the results to determine whether candidates meet professional standards and whether graduates can teach so that students learn'
- commit to preparing teachers for a diverse community of students;

    - prepare candidates who can integrate technology into instruction to enhance student learning
    - encourage collegiality, reflective practice, continuous improvement, and collaboration among educators, learners, and families; and
    - view teacher preparation and development as a continuum, moving from preservice preparation to supervised beginning practice to continuing professional development.
- The new professional teacher who graduates from a professionally accredited institution should be able to
    - help all pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade (P-12) students learn;
    - teach to P-1 student standards set by specialized professional associations and the states;
    - explain instructional choices based on research-derived knowledge and best practice;
    - apply effective methods of teaching students who are at different developmental stages, have different learning styles, and come from diverse backgrounds;
    - reflect on practice and act on feedback; and
    - be able to integrate technology into instruction effectively
- These teachers have gained those abilities through
    - a broad liberal arts education;
    - in-depth study of the subject they plan to teach;
    - a foundation of professional and pedagogical knowledge upon which to base instructional decisions;
    - diverse, well planned, and sequenced experiences in P-12 schools; and

- ongoing assessments of competence to practice, through an array of performance measures

- Administrators and other school specialists should be able to apply professional knowledge and skills of their disciplines to create a supportive environment to help all students learn.

The NCATE revises its unit accreditation standards every seven years to ensure that the standards reflect current research and "state-of-the-art practice within the teaching profession" (p. 9). Based on a general consensus about the knowledge and skills that educators need in order to help P-12 students learn, the standards measure an institution's effectiveness for high quality teacher preparation. That consensus establishes the basis for the unit standards and specialized program standards which are an integral part of the accreditation system.

The six Unit Standards were based on significant emergent research and contains three components consisting of the language of the standard itself, the rubrics that delineate the elements of each standard and describe three proficiency levels (unacceptable, acceptable, and target) at which each element is being addressed, and a descriptive explanation of the standard. The Unit Standards apply to initial teacher preparation and advanced programs for teachers and other school professionals (p. 11).

The Unit Standards conceptual framework provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability; it is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, and consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated (p. 12). For each standard, there are supporting explanations including a rationale for the standard, an explanation of each standard's meaning, and an accompanying

rubric that addresses the critical elements and describes the different levels of performance required to meet the standard (p. 13).

Table 1: NCATE Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
Standard 4: Diversity The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools. 4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences 4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty 4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates 4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

(NCATE, 2008)

The NCATE (2008) defined diversity as the "differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area. The types of diversity necessary for addressing the elements on candidate interactions with diverse faculty, candidates, and P-12 students are stated in the rubrics for those elements" (p. 86).

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) is another organization that seeks to advance the preparation of educators through evidence-based accreditation assuring quality and supports continuous improvement to strengthen student learning (2015). The CAEP's mission is to advance educator preparation through evidence based accreditation that ensures quality and supports continuous improvement to strengthen P-12 student learning (CAEP, 2015). The strategic goals of CAEP are to raise the bar in educator preparation, promote continuous improvement, advance research and innovation, increase accreditation's value, to be a model accrediting body and a model learning organization. The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation contains five standards:

Table 2: Commission Recommendations for Standards

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college and career-readiness standards.
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity	Provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a

	program's meeting of Standard 4.
Standard 4: Program Impact	Provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.
Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement	Provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

(CAEP, 2015)

Highly Qualified Teacher Requirements. Teachers of core academic subjects must meet certain requirements to demonstrate federal "highly qualified" status. "Highly qualified" status is guided by the 2001 federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), the 2004 Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA), 2004 Minnesota Omnibus Education Statute (122.16), and the Minnesota Board of Teaching (BOT) requirements (MDE, 2012). Teachers who are fully licensed in each core academic subject they teach have met the federal "highly qualified" requirement because they have earned an academic subject major and/or successfully passed the Minnesota teacher licensure content exam in each subject (p. 2). A federal waiver granted to Minnesota in 2012 states that the basic "highly qualified" teacher requirements of NCLB remain in place and there is a requirement to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified,

or out-of-field teachers. A district must notify parents when their child is taught for four consecutive weeks by a teacher or paraprofessional who is not "highly qualified." (p. 2).

Section 1.1 Definition of a "Highly Qualified" Teacher:

> "Highly qualified" teacher is a federal requirement and designation to ensure that teachers in all states have met certain standards to teach core academic subjects. Minnesota teachers who possess a current MN teaching license in a core subject area are automatically considered "highly qualified" because they have met the standards by successfully completing a content exam, or academic major, or the HOUSSE process. Determination of "highly qualified" status is done at the school district level in Minnesota as a part of employment (p. 6).

Section 1.4 Definition of NCLB "Highly Qualified" Requirements for General Education Teachers:

> All teachers of core academic subjects must comply with the federal definition of a "highly qualified" teacher for a state to receive certain federal funds for schools. Core academic subjects defined in NCLB and in Minnesota law are English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Section 9101 (11)] (p. 6).

Section 1.17 Which teachers of English Learners (EL) must meet the federal "highly qualified" requirements?

> EL teachers who provide direct instruction in a core academic subject or reinforce instruction in core academic areas that are not already taught by "highly qualified" teachers must meet the federal requirements (p. 17).

Common Core State Standards. In 2009, the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) initiative was the start of the standards-based era in education. The goal of the CCSS initiative was to create more commonality among content-area standards for the states that agreed to adopt the standards. The initial CCSS did not include a set of English language proficiency development standards for students learning English, however since then, several related initiatives have been started. The standards define the "knowledge and skills students should gain as they progress from Kindergarten through grade 12 to ensure that they will graduate from high school with the ability to succeed in introductory-level, credit-bearing academic college courses and in the workplace" (TESOL, 2013, p. 3). Under U.S. law, the government cannot institute a national curriculum or national standards so states are given the option whether or not to adopt the standards (2013).

Beyond providing general information and suggestions, the question of how to implement the standards for the EL population was left up to each individual state (TESOL, 2013). In a brief addendum, developers of the CCSS acknowledged the needs of ELs that states should consider when implementing the standards. Teachers of ELs need to examine each shift (see table 1) in determining what it means for ELs. The table shows the continuum of expertise that teachers need to develop to ensure that ELs can achieve the CCSS with varying levels of first language literacy, background knowledge, and English language proficiency (p. 5).

Table 3. English Language Arts/Literacy CCSS Shifts and English Language Teacher Expertise

Shift	To address this shift, teachers of ELLs must be able to…
Building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction	• Assess and build ELLs' background knowledge about the content and structure of nonfiction text • Integrate ELLs' background knowledge and culture into instruction • Teach ELLs differences between structure of informational text and literacy text

	• Know and use ELLs' first-language reading literacy skills as a support as appropriate • Adapt/supplement grade-level complex texts for ELLs at lower levels of English language proficiency • Collaborate to share effective strategies for teaching ELLs using nonfiction • Scaffold and support instruction using nonfiction for ELLs • Design appropriate classroom assessments so that ELLs can demonstrate what they know and can do • Use English language proficiency standards to support instruction
Reading, writing, and speaking grounded in evidence from both literary and informational text	• Build on students' background and cultures; build background where necessary on using evidence from different types of text • Create appropriate text-dependent questions for students at different levels of English language proficiency • Teacher ELLs the academic language necessary so that they can use evidence from literary and informational text in reading, speaking, listening, and writing • Provide ELLs with linguistic structures so that they can use evidence, cite sources, avoid plagiarism, synthesize information from grade-level complex text, and create argumentative/persuasive speech and writing • Create and use scaffolding and supports so that ELLs at different levels of English language proficiency can take part in meaningful conversations and writing using complex text • design appropriate classroom assessments for ELLs at different levels of English language proficiency • Collaborate to share effective strategies for teaching ELLs to cite evidence when writing and speaking • Use English language proficiency standards to support instruction
Regular practice with complex text and its academic language	• Analyze complex texts and make ELLs aware of academic language found in complex texts • Choose and adapt supplementary texts in English and/or ELLs' first language based on reading level, English language proficiency level, background, and culture • Teach ELLs strategies to guess unknown words (e.g., cognates, prefixes, roots, suffixes) • Teach the meanings of words with multiple definitions, idiomatic expressions, and technical terms

- Explicitly teach the academic language necessary to comprehend complex texts so that ELLs can draw on these texts to speak and write across content areas
- Collaborate to share effective strategies for teaching ELLs the academic language they need to access complex text
- Use English language proficiency standards to support instruction

Adapted by Diane Staehr Fenner from Student Achievement Partners. (2012). Description of Common Core shifts; TESOL (2013).

EdTPA. The edTPA is an assessment process that provides common expectations for institutes of higher education about what teacher candidates should know about instruction, assessment, and analysis. It requires candidates to demonstrate the necessary skills needed to enter the classroom, is subject-specific, and provides a common language for teacher educator preparation programs and a common metric for program accreditation (edTPA, 2016). There are 12 states that either have or are considering adopting statewide policies requiring performance assessments for new teachers. The expectation is that IHEs across the U.S. will eventually adopt edTPA as the mandatory requirement for obtaining an education degree and for teacher licensure. Since edTPA is a new licensing program requirement, states are able to determine their own path for preparing candidates leading up to the edTPA.

As part of the required steps in teacher preparation, Minnesota enacted a law in 2011, requiring teacher preparation programs to include a Board of Teaching approved performance assessment. Minnesota's Board of Teaching (BOT) is responsible for approving institutions and licensure programs to prepare teachers (edTPA, 2016). Effective fall 2014, the BOT began using the edTPA as one measure of teacher preparation program effectiveness; however, scores are not currently used as a licensure requirement.

Statement of the Problem

The majority of English Learners born in the United States have been enrolled in U.S. schools since Kindergarten. Students entering school with a first language other than English need to increase their English proficiency in order to meet the academic demands of school (Roy-Campbell, 2013). In addition to ELs born in the U.S., English learners are heterogeneous populations who have very different experiences, linguistic, cultural, and educational needs (Roy-Campbell, 2013). Differences may depend on social class, previous education, cultural background, and familial capacity to support academics in the home setting. Some ELs have had schooling in their home country that is comparable to their age, while others may have had minimal or interrupted schooling. Factors that may impact academic progress are personality, behavior(s), limited language services and support at school, previous education experience, fluency in the first language, attitude towards school and towards learning English (Scott, Boynton Hauerwas & Brown, 2014).

Teacher education programs are responsible for preparing teachers to work with and enable all students to meet the same academic requirements (Kareva & Echevarria, 2013). Teacher Education Programs continue to search for approaches that prepare teachers to teach in increasingly diverse contexts/settings (McDonald, et al., 2011). In order to provide high-quality opportunities for all students, teachers must learn about student's diversity and connect with their family, community resources, and experiences (p. 1668).

Due to the increased inclusion of ELs in the general education classroom, there is an urgent need to examine teacher education for all teachers; not just teachers of EL and bilingual specialists (Lucas & Villegas, 2013). ELs are not receiving the educational services they need, and are more likely to have inequitable access to appropriately trained teachers. This has

resulted in the failure to demonstrate academic achievement and negatively impacts their ability to thrive within school and beyond (Daniel, 2014; Nasir & Heineke, 2014).

There is significant room for improvement in how teacher-education programs prepare teachers of ELs across college preparation programs, induction, and later stages of their careers (Lucas & Villegas, 2013; Samson & Collins, 2012). The preparation of general education teachers widely varies and teacher education faculty often do not possess the requisite knowledge, skills or dispositions needed in these areas (Roy-Campbell, 2013; Staehr Fenner & Kuhlman, 2012). In an effort to increase academic outcomes for ELs, there must be greater continuity in teacher-education programs and how teachers are certified and evaluated by local education agencies (Samson & Collins, 2012). Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) must shift their focus by examining their teaching faculty, their knowledge of EL instruction, and how they integrate effective EL practices into their courses (Alamillo, et al., 2011).

Purpose

The purpose of this case study was to examine K-6 teacher preparation programs at IHEs in Minnesota with the goal of determining how preservice teachers are being prepared to meet the education needs of ELs. Nasir and Heineke (2014) call for cultural and linguistic diversity in teacher preparation programs that encourage partnerships with the school, university, and community through field-based learning experiences. Student experiences are enhanced by infusing culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy into courses, projects, and experiences; aligning curriculum and designing course projects to the standards can improve program efficiency and course practicality (Staehr Fenner & Kuhlman, 2012).

Significance of the Study

Educational disparities continue to challenge and impact all aspects of the education system. The need for highly qualified teachers can be illustrated by standardized test scores, dropout rates, and the disproportionate numbers of youth of color and low-income youth in the justice system (McDonald, et al., 2011). Teacher education plays a critical role in preparing teachers so they possess the skills needed to improve the academic, social, and intellectual opportunities available to students of color, low-income students, and English learners (p. 1669). The expertise that teachers possess about subject matter, their knowledge about teaching and learning, and knowledge about the students they teach are critical in improving learning opportunities for students (p. 1770).

Gandara and Santibanez (2016) state that in order to narrow the achievement gaps and build on ELs strengths, teachers must possess additional skills and abilities; that "being a good teacher is not good enough". The goal of educating ELs is to prepare them to enter and participate in school with the knowledge and skills necessary to achieve at the same level as their peers (ESEA, 1965).

There are many elements that should be understood when considering educational risk factors and academic performance patterns of ELs. The impact of language background on achievement outcomes should be analyzed, as well as the social and economic characteristics in comparison with non-EL peers; characteristics of the schools they attend; and institutional history of U.S. schools (Garcia, et al., 2010). Garcia, et al. (2010) identified seven dimensions of inadequate schooling for ELs:

- Inadequate access to appropriately trained teachers

- Inadequate professional development opportunities to help teachers address instructional needs
- Inequitable access to appropriate assessment
- Inadequate instructional time to accomplish learning goals
- Inequitable access to instructional materials and curriculum
- Inequitable access to adequate facilities
- Intense segregation into schools and classrooms that place them at risk

In 2001, the ESEA made it a requirement that ELs participate in core academic classes; which designated more responsibilities to general education teachers and made them responsible for teaching both content and language. Since the reauthorization of this law, conditions have not improved and significant disparities have emerged among students of color, low-income students, migrant students, students with disabilities and ELs (Roblero, 2013). The NCLB required that schools have highly qualified teachers, however, this provision was not extended to the preparation of general education and content teachers to teach ELs (2012). As a result, teachers who lack the preparation and knowledge for teaching ELs may feel the pressure of accountability for students' academic performance.

Teachers play a critical role in meeting the academic needs of diverse learners. The strength of educator training, approach to language development, and the consistency and coherence of programming greatly impacts the long term academic outcome of ELs (Olson, 2014). Teachers cannot be assigned all of the credit or blame for student achievement and they are expected to meet the wide variety of needs at all education levels, yet many teachers lack the basic foundational knowledge and training (Samson & Collins, 2012; deJong, Harper, & Coady, 2013; Gandara et al., 2015). Teacher preparation and requirements vary across the country and

many states fail to adequately prepare teachers to educate ELs. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2009), only 33 states have English language standards and of these states, only three (Arizona, Florida, and New York) require all teachers to show competence in English language instruction (Roblero, 2013) (see Appendix B 'State policies regarding teaching of English language learner (ELL) students, by state: 2008-09').

Study Limitations and Assumptions

This case study examined how IHEs in Minnesota prepare teachers to work with students from diverse cultural backgrounds through examination of course syllabi. The study aimed to identify how these elements were incorporated into preservice teacher programming and how they were aligned with the Minnesota Administrative Rule 8710.2000 Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers (subp. 4 standard 3, diverse learners), Minnesota Administrative Rule 8710.3200 Teachers of Elementary Education (Appendix E, subp. 3, section 2a; subp. 3a. student teaching and field experiences), and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standard 4: Diversity (4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools).

There were several limitations of this study. The researcher has experiences that she gained during her undergraduate and graduate career; however, she has not previously been or is presently employed at an IHE. The researcher has not participated in or observed how teacher education programs are created and her familiarity with the standards is emerging. At the same time, the researcher's lack of experience at the collegiate level may be acknowledged as a strength in this particular study as this means that there are no preconceived ideas as to what should be included in a course syllabus. The sample size was extremely limited which makes it difficult to generalize the findings. A larger sample size would provide results that would be

applicable to the population of preservice teachers in general. The study examined elementary education teacher preparation programs in the state of Minnesota (Kindergarten through grade 6) that are NCATE accredited. A total of 15 IHEs were initially contacted for participation and overall, responses were received from 11. Of those who responded, eight agreed to participate in the study. The study did not conduct faculty interviews or surveys, which could provide additional insight into syllabus design. Interviews with faculty and teacher candidates would provide more data and increase the reliability of the study. This study obtained one syllabi from each IHE, but future research should request and analyze multiple syllabi from each department within the institution.

The scope of the study only examines course work as it related to the experiences that occur during college under the guidance and supervision of professors and supervising teachers. Another limiting factor is that course syllabi vary tremendously in detail. The purpose of a syllabus is to provide a general outline or overview of what will be covered in a course and does not provide a complete picture of the curriculum or a true representation of "real life instruction" (Baetcher, 2012).

It is assumed that the universities selected for this study are providing relevant coursework and meaningful experiences to prepare elementary teacher candidates to work with culturally, linguistically diverse and EL students based on the Minnesota statutes for teacher licensing (Minnesota Administrative Rules 8710.4150 Teachers of Bilingual/Bicultural Education, 8710.4400 Teachers of English as a Second Language).

There are many factors that influence how courses are designed, such as program and institution governance process, expectations of accreditation agencies, limits of faculty expertise. Course syllabi should be designed to prepare teachers to identify educational inequities and to

create equitable learning environments (Gorski, 2009). However, most syllabi appear to be designed to prepare teachers with cultural sensitivity, tolerance, and multicultural competence (p. 316). Syllabi reveal course structure and address what topics will be covered within a course. Analysis of the content requires interpretation, as it is difficult to know how individuals who constructed the syllabi intended and conceptualized the content to be covered. It is also important to note that syllabi do not present an accurate picture of what is explicitly or implicitly taught within a course. Specific information may be stated in the syllabus, however, that does not necessarily mean that it was actually addressed; some faculty may include content in their course that was not specified in the syllabus. All educators have occasionally deviated from the official course design. Educators bring individual strengths, limitations, and personal beliefs and philosophies into their teaching. Therefore, it is nearly impossible to determine what exactly occurred in a particular course solely through examination of the syllabus (Gorski, 2009, 2011). Another factor to take into consideration is that not all faculty have full autonomy or control over what is included in their syllabi.

Another limitation is that NCATE standards are no longer used for accreditation. In 2016, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards were fully implemented.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

Chapter 1 presented the introduction, background, history, statement of the problem, purpose, rationale, research questions, significance, list of acronyms, limitations and assumptions, and nature of this study. Chapter 2 contained a review of relevant and the most current literature that exists in relation to the problem being investigated. The methodology and procedures used in gathering information and data are presented in chapter 3. Chapter 4

presented the results and review the findings of the study. Chapter 5 presented a summary of the findings and study, draw conclusions, and make recommendations for further research and for the field.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The literature reviewed in this chapter sets the tone, provides background, and establishes the basis for this study. The chapter begins with a brief history of teacher preparation programs in the U.S. and segues into highly qualified teachers (in the state of Minnesota) and the common core state standards (CCSS) as they relate to teacher preparation. The studies and literature reviewed in this chapter support the continued need to examine teacher preparation programs and how incorporating key components, such as field experiences, connecting coursework to field experiences, culturally responsive pedagogies, and self-efficacy are crucial in preparing mainstream teachers to work with culturally and linguistically diverse students.

History of Teacher Preparation Programs

In the 19th century, educational reform sought to establish "common" or "normal" schools where all students could be educated without regard to social class or religion. Horace Mann, an American lawyer, was credited as the father of the common school. In establishing normal schools, Mann hoped to create a training program for teachers to work in these schools and that children of all classes could be brought together to experience common learning. Mann questioned, "in order to bring up our schools to the point of excellence demanded by the nature of our institutions, must there not be a special course of study and training to qualify teachers for their office?" (as cited in Potter, Hollas & Coyne, 2015, p. 145). John Dewey (1915) stated that normal schools "arose because of the necessity for training teachers with the idea of partly professional drill and partly that of culture" (2015).

In 1837, the Massachusetts School Board was formed and Mann was appointed as a board member; he became the first secretary of the board to direct educational reform (Potter, et al., 2015). In 1839, the first public normal school was established in Lexington, Massachusetts,

which marked the origin of formal teacher education. The second normal school was established in Barre, Massachusetts and provided students with the same practice teaching experience (Potter, et al., 2015). By 1885, normal schools existed in states from Maine to California and by the end of the 19th century, there were 167 public normal schools and several private schools that graduated more than 11,000 potential teachers (p. 146). The development of teacher preparation in colleges and universities followed the normal school movement with the establishment of laboratory schools. The purpose of laboratory schools was to provide a setting for learning and using model classrooms as a place for prospective teachers to practice new skills. These schools eventually expanded to include broader concepts of teacher preparation such as observation and demonstration, research and experimentation, student teaching and dissemination of instructional teaching procedures. Teacher education programs increasingly began using local public schools as clinical teaching sites which led to the gradual decline of laboratory schools. By the 1950s, there were fewer than 100 laboratory schools remaining in operation on university campuses nationwide.

In the 1950s, student teaching was known as "practice teaching". Since then, the student teaching model has remained mostly unchanged (Potter, et al., 2015). Student teaching is considered to be the most beneficial and critical experience of teacher preparation. This experience is described as the culminating experience and viewed as the "bridge between preparation for teaching and the beginning of a teaching career" (2015).

Policy

Policies governing teacher education are not developed or enacted at a single level by a single agency, but at multiple levels and by many actors, including federal, state, and local agencies (Cochran-Smith, et al., 2013). Advocacy groups, research organizations, alliances,

centers, consortiums, commissions, think tanks, and other individuals are some of the multiple influencers in teacher education policy which are organized to inform and influence policy at various levels (2013). There are multiple reform policies being proposed, piloted, or debated by stakeholders and policy makers.

In response to these policies, IHEs are attempting to infuse diversity throughout their Teacher Education Programs (Lopez-Reyna, et al., 2012). Some IHEs are committed to integrating diversity throughout their programs. Some focus on a few courses in which to address culturally diverse needs, while other IHEs add one stand-alone course (p. 188).

Teacher education is working to define and establish reasonable expectations and accountability targets, as there is significant variability in what is considered to be "sufficient and adequate" preparation (Hutchinson, 2013). Current controversies surrounding teacher accountability includes questioning of the goals that should drive policies (state, federal, and professional accountability), which statewide assessments should be used for initial teacher certification, who should conduct the assessments, and what the consequences should be for failure to perform (Cochran-Smith, et al., 2013).

The U.S. Department of Education (2013) established a policy framework for transforming teaching and learning that builds a comprehensive, coherent system (pgs. 5-8). The framework incorporates seven components:

1. A culture of shared responsibility and leadership
2. Top talent, prepared for success
3. Continuous growth and professional development
4. Effective teachers and principals
5. A professional career continuum with competitive compensation

6. Conditions for successful teaching and learning
7. Engaged communities

Teacher Preparation

The needs of public education are greater than they have ever been before and teacher preparation needs a dramatic overhaul; no in-school intervention has a greater impact on student learning than an effective teacher. English Learners may have the greatest potential to grow academically, but the academic achievement gap between EL populations and white middle class students continues to be widening as the disproportionate number of ELs taught by underprepared teachers has resulted in the failure to maintain pace in demonstrating EL achievement (Bennett, 2012; Nasir & Heineke, 2014).

Teacher education has not yet caught up with the rapid shift in demographics and teachers feel ill prepared to teach in lower socioeconomic areas or work across languages and across cultures (Bennett 2012; Salerno & Kibler, 2013). The most rapid growth has occurred in places of the country where there has been little or no prior experience in serving ELs in the educational system. The education system relies on TEPs to recruit, select, and prepare approximately 200,000 future teachers every year. Over the course of the next ten years, 1.6 million teachers will retire and 1.6 million new teachers will be needed to take their place (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Only 23% of all teachers and only 14% of teachers in high-poverty schools come from the top third of college graduates (2011).

Math, engineering, science, technology, and special education are areas of teaching that are going unfilled as many states are not setting a high enough standard for entry into the profession. Teacher education programs that set minimal standards for entry and graduation produce inadequately trained teachers who whose students fail to make sufficient academic

growth and progress. Strong teacher preparation programs prepare teachers who possess or learn the necessary skills and knowledge to be hired, retained, and their students make academic progress and learning gains. Excellent teaching must be rewarded and supported at each stage in the educational system. Many teacher preparation programs do not provide clinical experiences that adequately prepare preservice teachers for the schools in which they will work (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). School districts report difficulty in recruiting highly qualified teachers in high need subject areas (math, science, technology, and engineering) and high need fields such as English Learners and special education.

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2010) suggests that significant changes must be made to the delivery, monitoring, evaluation, supervision, and staffing of TEPs. There needs to be rigorous accountability, strengthening of candidate selection and placement, revamping curricula, supporting partnerships, and expanding the knowledge base to identify what works and support continuous improvement. Some of the proposed changes are being addressed through frameworks that describe the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that teachers must possess in order to effectively teach ELs in the mainstream setting. Preparing for diverse classrooms requires thoughtful planning and integration of content expertise, abundant and appropriate field experiences, and a wide range of professional resources (deJong, et al., 2013). Although these frameworks reflect slightly different perspectives, they all emphasize the importance of and the role of language and culture. deJong, et al., propose three dimensions: Understanding ELs from a bilingual and bicultural perspective, understanding how language and culture shape school experiences and inform pedagogy for bilingual learners, and the ability to mediate a range of contextual factors in the schools and classrooms (p. 95).

Many teachers lack experience with students from ethnic, linguistic, socioeconomic, and cultural backgrounds different than their own. The U.S. teaching workforce remains fairly homogeneous as predominantly female, middle class, English-speaking, and White; while the student body is increasingly black or Hispanic. The student population is growing in diversity, culturally, racially, and linguistically (Garcia, et al., 2010; Tellez & Manthey, 2015). The reality of teacher demographics is very different than the students they serve and does not reflect the diversity of the nation's students.

Lohfink, Morales, Shroyer, and Yahnke (2012) encourage bilingual candidates to enter the teaching profession; however, it is not easy to find teacher candidates who share similar social, cultural, and historical backgrounds with their students. Whether or not candidates share similar backgrounds with learners, there are alternate ways of building teacher capacity for working with ELs. Teacher candidates need to understand the processes of second language acquisition, the role of language in completing academic tasks, and knowledge about the ways scaffolding instruction can provide access to content-area learning. Candidates' skill development depends on professors with the knowledge, prior experience, and expertise to create courses that address the particular needs of ELs. Teacher education faculty need to learn and assimilate knowledge of language and culture into their disciplines in order to pass it on to teacher candidates.

Teacher Education Faculty

Alamillo, Padilla, and Arenas (2011) examined a teacher education program in the California State University (CSU) system located in the Central Valley of California and consists of seven counties with approximately 150,754 ELs. The CSU School of Education prepares the majority of teachers in the Central Valley. Within the past two years, however, teacher

preparation by other private institutions has increased due to CSU's requirement that candidates must pass the California Examinations for Teachers prior to entering their teacher preparation program.

The CSU School of Education, including teacher education supervisors, is comprised of approximately 102 full-time and part-time faculty. In an effort to address the needs of the educational community, the Dean of the School of Education and EL faculty developed a professional development plan to be implemented over an initial 3-year period. The plan included appointing an EL coordinator, establishing an EL faculty focus group, providing a professional development day for all faculty, participating in a local district site visit for all faculty, developing and implementing a series of EL seminars, and continuing the discussion on current research in the area of ELs (p. 267). Initially, the purpose was to find out the extent of knowledge that faculty already involved had and the extent to which they would integrate revisited or new knowledge into their teacher preparation courses once they completed the faculty seminars. Experts in the field of second language acquisition provided in-service workshops and ongoing professional discussions for teacher faculty, and as a result, faculty and supervisors were expected to integrate this information in their courses and seminars. The seminars were strictly voluntary and open to faculty in all departments, however, the majority of participants were from the Department of Literacy and Early Education and the Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

The study was based on a qualitative, interpretive approach obtained from results of surveys and observations. Two surveys were prepared by faculty for attendees to complete prior to and post seminar. The intention of the initial survey was to get a sense of faculty preparation in the area of instruction for ELs prior to the seminars and after the seminar, to examine how

faculty awareness changed. The surveys were completed, collected, and examined for themes that would be discussed in future seminars. Faculty also informally observed the overall interest of attendees and their level of knowledge in the issues discussed. Once data was collected, CSU faculty met bimonthly and discussed the results of seminars and other related issues which allowed for reflection on efforts to improve faculty preparation in effective EL instruction (p. 271).

Study findings indicate that teacher education must focus on how methods and theory are addressed across all subject areas; not solely in courses specifically designed for teaching EL specific strategies. Although teachers are receiving professional development on EL methods, many do not find it useful. Participants responded that although they were familiar with appropriate strategies to use, they were unaware of the foundational research and theory behind those strategies, making them unaware of the reason why they were appropriate (p. 271). Alamillo, et al. (2011) suggest looking at the program as a whole and determining how to address the ways in which teacher candidates are trained in methods. Preservice teachers need specific language acquisition pedagogy, knowledge, and skills that are introduced throughout their coursework and practiced in field placements; these conditions were critically important to the EL faculty focus group in planning and implementing the 3-year program.

Teacher Education Curricula

The structures and staff within higher education do not always promote sharing of practices across faculty members within a program, let alone across multiple programs. This may explain the inconsistencies of syllabi and why faculty and candidates have varied experiences. Baetcher (2012) examined the extent to which the teacher education curricula at one IHE addressed the instructional needs of ELs. The purpose of the study was to gain an

understanding of curricula components that addressed ELs and which did not (p. 8). An examination of curricula was conducted via the vantage points of evaluation of syllabi, reports from faculty, and reports from teacher candidates. In Baetcher's study, a curriculum is defined as "including all the required activities, from readings, assignments, projects, to fieldwork teaching and observation, across each course in a program" (2012).

Baetcher's study took place at a school of education in a large urban city in the northeast United States (2012). The university is a nationally accredited school of education and enrolls approximately 2,800 students. Study participants were full and part-time professors who were instructors of at least one course within the program. Course syllabi were obtained from all of the courses offered in the program and reviewed for particular attention to ELs. Questionnaires were administered electronically to all faculty and teacher candidates who were enrolled in one of the six preparation programs leading to state certification included in this study (p. 10).

In determining the extent to which ELs were addressed in the program's curricula, existing course syllabi were analyzed. With the dean's permission, syllabi were downloaded from a central online repository that was accessible within the school of education community. A total of 119 syllabi were reviewed; the most recent version was analyzed in order to see current versions of every course offered in the program. Syllabi were coded using the Innovation Configuration on Instructional Practices for Mainstream Teachers of EL students (developed by the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality), which is a rubric specifically designed for the purpose of assessing the degree of attention provided to ELs in the syllabus. The rubric focuses on four areas and is used as a tool to support teacher educators in evaluation of their curricula in terms of its attention to ELs (Baetcher, 2012). The four areas of focus addressed the sociocultural and political foundations of teaching ELs, foundations of

second language acquisition, effective instructional practices for teaching content to ELs, and assessment and testing accommodations. The syllabus was evaluated on a scale of 1 to 4 (1 indicating there was no evidence that the concept was addressed; 2 indicating that the concept was mentioned in the syllabi; 3 indicating that the concept was mentioned and there was a related assigned reading; 4 indicating that the concept was mentioned in syllabus, readings, and at least one other activity (observation assignments, journal responses, fieldwork, special projects).

Results of the syllabi analysis indicated that the majority did not specify readings, assignments, projects, or clinical (field-based) assignments relative to ELs, and received lower scores than reports made by faculty and candidates. Findings also indicated that candidates believed that some of the topics had been addressed briefly in their course activities, but there was little formal attention to ELs in the curricula. Across all four domain areas, the average rating for syllabi inclusion of ELs ranged from 1.18 out of 4 in the area of assessment and accommodations to 1.49 in the area of second language acquisition processes (Baetcher, 2012). The study also identified various systems, such as state certification bodies and institutions of higher education, which interacted with faculty members' beliefs and priorities that resulted in multiple challenges that may hinder opportunities to focus on ELs in the curriculum. Teaming and collaborative, cross-departmental alliances offered opportunities to enhance knowledge and led to inter-class visitation, shared online course activities, and common assignments. The study also suggested joint fieldwork assignments between elementary and secondary candidates across programs which allowed for opportunities to dialogue about cultural and linguistic challenges (p. 16).

Field Experiences

Field experiences must be at the center of teacher preparation as they are considered to be an effective method of providing teacher candidates with positive opportunities to directly observe, interact with, and teach culturally and linguistically diverse students through hands-on learning opportunities (Daniel, 2014). In developing field experiences, partnerships between IHEs and school districts should include shared decision making, oversight on candidate selection and completion by school districts and teacher education programs, bringing accountability closer to the classroom and ensuring professional accountability (NCATE, 2010). The table below indicates how planning, funding and operations can become integrated into the daily functions of partnerships (p. 3):

Table 4. A Continuum of Partnership Development for Clinically Based Teacher Preparation

Goal	Beginning	Developing	Integrated	Sustaining and Generative
Partnerships that support: Development of clinical practice knowledge, skills, and dispositions Student achievement Inquiry for continuous improvement	Beliefs, verbal commitments, plans, organization, and initial work are consistent with the goals of the partnership	Partners pursue the goals with partial institutional support	The goals of the partnership are integrated into the partnering institutions. Partnership work is expected and supported, and reflects what is known about best practice.	Systemic changes take place in policy and practice in partnering institutions. Policy at the district, state, and national level supports partnerships for clinically based teacher preparation and improved student learning.

Source: NCATE (2001). *Standards for Professional Development Schools.*

In many TEPs, field-based practice is poorly defined, inadequately supported, and remains the most impromptu part of teacher education (NCATE, 2010, p. 5, 6). Field-based experience varies as some candidates may have had numerous practicum experiences prior to student teaching, while others have had little or no prior field experiences. For instance, some teacher candidates may spend a full year student teaching under an expert mentor, while another candidate may have an inexperienced mentor for a shorter time period. The Blue Ribbon Panel reports that although the majority of states require student teaching (most states require anywhere between 10 and 14 weeks), most states do not specify what student teaching experiences should look like or how programs should be held accountable. Although approximately half of all states require mentor training, the roles and requirements of mentors are not specified. All of these factors lead to tremendous variation in how and where clinical training is delivered and unevenness in quality (2010). The Blue Ribbon Panel identified 10 key principles that should be followed in designing more effective field-based preparation programs (NCATE, 2010):

1. Student learning is the focus.
2. Clinical preparation is integrated throughout every facet of teacher education in a dynamic way.
3. Candidate's progress and the elements of a preparation program are continuously judged on the basis of data.
4. Programs prepare teachers who are expert in content and how to teach it and are also innovators, collaborators and problem solvers.
5. Candidates learn in an interactive professional community.

6. Field-based educators and coaches are rigorously selected and prepared and drawn from both higher education and the P-12 sector.
7. Specific sites are designated and funded to support embedded clinical preparation.
8. Technology applications foster high-impact preparation.
9. A powerful research and development agenda and systematic gathering and use of data supports continuous improvement in teacher preparation.
10. Strategic partnerships are imperative for powerful clinical preparation.

Preservice teachers must be provided opportunities and experiences where they can get to know ELs as individuals in supportive environments under skilled mentors (Salerno & Kibler, 2013). The study conducted by Salerno and Kibler (2013) examined how preservice teachers at a university in the South-Atlantic region describe linguistically diverse students. Data for the study was collected through document analysis of culminating case-study projects and self-study action research projects written by PSTs in their final field-experience course. As part of the project, PSTs selected three or four students they considered to be challenging to teach and selected research questions based on student needs. Each student was observed five times, the teacher was interviewed once, and three work samples per student were gathered. PSTs then analyzed their data (field notes, interview transcripts, work samples), and wrote about their findings and strategies for each student. The analysis focused specifically on student descriptions and findings, discussion, and recommendations.

Salerno and Kibler (2013) invited PSTs from two course sections to participate in the study. An IRB-approved, blind-consent process was used and participant identities were not known until after they graduated. Study participants included PSTs preparing to work with varied age levels and across content areas. The first level of data analysis performed was to

reduce data for further analysis of sections about students. Salerno used NVivo software to apply "start codes" in order to sort linguistically diverse students from other students. A list of identifiers that PSTs used to label students was established and these descriptive codes described the students based on diversity and socioeconomic status. The data was reduced again to consider linguistically diverse students and a new set of "start codes" were established by chunking EL data into descriptions and recommendations. A second round of interpretive coding was completed to study all descriptive pieces, specifically for the themes of behavior, language use, and families (p. 11).

Results of Salerno and Kibler's study suggest that although many state licensure regulations and teacher education programs nationally do not require PSTs to have specific training experiences with linguistically diverse students, such opportunities could be helpful (2012). The findings point to the need for TEPs to provide opportunities and experiences where PSTs get to know linguistically diverse students as individuals in supportive environments under skilled mentors. Preservice teachers need specific training focused on instructing linguistically diverse students including experiences as working in various classroom settings for opportunities for personal interactions and to gain experience managing linguistically diverse classrooms.

A growing body of research has indicated that courses should provide meaningful content, theories of language acquisition and teaching strategies for ELs in conjunction with opportunities for diverse settings and field experiences to work directly with ELs (Tran, 2015). The purpose of Tran's study (2015) was to extract how teachers' perceptions of their preparation and efficacy beliefs support their abilities in working with ELs. The study utilized a mixed method design called Concurrent Triangulation Strategy composed of a quantitative survey and case study. In the quantitative stage, a survey for new teachers was created to

address knowledge and perceptions in their pre-service course experiences and efficacy beliefs in relation to EL methodologies, multicultural education, and cultural/linguistic diversity (2015). The survey was adapted and developed with open and closed-ended items and organized into categories according to culture, teaching strategies, teaching behaviors, and assessment practices. The qualitative phase included a select group of teachers and an in-depth case study of interviews and classroom observations. This allowed for "richer" details of teachers' experiences to be recorded in a real-life context resulting in more descriptive data (p. 31).

Tran's data source involved teachers with fewer than five years of teaching experience from two local school districts in central Texas (2015). Teachers were given questionnaires via online email invitation; 144 surveys were returned, and 6 out of the 20 participants who consented to participate in the second phase of the research were selected to conduct in-depth case studies. Due to similarity in two of the cases, the sample was narrowed to five participants. Qualitative data were analyzed and coded using NVivo software program and codes used were derived from existing literature regarding instructional practices for ELs (p. 33). Additional data such as surveys, interviews, classroom observations, and field notes were triangulated for analysis. Analysis of the data indicates that preservice courses and methodologies positively influence a teacher's perception of how their preparation can support their abilities in working with ELs.

A synthesis of the research suggests that field-experiences must be connected to methods and theory courses and content knowledge (Daniel, 2014; Lopez-Reyna, et al., 2012; McDonald, et al., 2011). Many TEPs do not adequately make the connection between coursework and field experiences, which calls for a shift in program design (Lopez-Reyna, et al., 2012). Lopez-Reyna, et al. (2012) examined five minority serving IHEs who restructured their programming

based on the need to better prepare their preservice teacher to effectively meet the needs of CLD students. All five IHEs focused on improving their program content and quality. In ensuring that candidates acquired appropriate knowledge regarding multiculturalism and diversity, each university restructured their program contents, instruction, and curriculum. Methods courses emphasized culturally responsive teaching practices that could be adapted to multiple subject areas and assignments and applied in clinical settings. Clinical or field-based assignments allowed candidates to practice collaboration, apply principles of behavioral and cognitive theories, and explore different perspectives through a culturally responsive lens (2012). The study identified the need for creating collaborative and equitable relationships among all stakeholders in the TEP evaluation process. Teacher education programs need to identify the data needed by various stakeholders in order to provide evidence of quality and areas for improvement and must then reach a consensus about what data are useful, at what levels, and for what purposes. Program evaluation should include mutually beneficial goals, emphasis on systematic communication, and collaborative climate for evaluation, and technically sound evaluation systems (p. 191).

The IHEs selected for Lopez-Reyna's study were the University of Texas Austin, the University of South Carolina Upstate, the University of Guam, Springfield College, and the University of the District of Columbia (2012). The University of Texas Austin (UT) created a series of intersecting matrices to develop courses and specific assignments within each course that align with the Council for Exceptional Children's (CEC) standards and state standards. Curriculum was redesigned to blend specific competencies required to teach culturally and linguistically diverse students with disabilities (p. 188). Curriculum was restructured to include assignments that targeted culturally responsive topics in all coursework

and clinical settings. Content courses were revised to ensure that teacher candidates acquired knowledge regarding multiculturalism and diversity and field-based assignments were revised to allow the application of principles through a culturally responsive lens (p. 188). Candidates were simultaneously enrolled in methods of teaching and a clinical course where they were required to plan and implement a unit of instruction, design activities, and reflect upon their abilities to provide instruction in responsive ways (Lopez-Reyna, et al., 2012). The University of Guam (U Guam) aligned their program content to provide candidates with experiences and course content for serving multiple diverse populations utilizing the rubric required by NCATE Standard 4 (see Table 7 NCATE Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions). Program courses included additional attention to multicultural education and courses were taken in conjunction with a practicum experience. In addition, meaningful assessment and purposeful field-based activities allowed PSTs the opportunity to connect culturally relevant coursework to practice. Springfield College redesigned their instructional methods courses to emphasize culturally responsive teaching practices and could be adapted to multiple content areas. Course objectives included planning for culturally relevant lessons designed to meet the needs of ELs with various life experiences (p. 190). A result of the study identifies the need to link coursework to field experiences. Lopez-Reyna's results also suggest the importance of including stakeholder feedback and colleague buy in as critical elements in the improvement process (p. 195).

In a similar study, Tinkler and Tinkler's (2013) study explored the impact that the experience in a service-learning project had on the preservice teachers' perceptions of and receptiveness to diversity. The study identified three broad stages of field-based experiences as

the ability of seeing one's self as other, recognizing the imperative of the other, and moving toward social justice.

Participants in the study were preservice teachers who were enrolled in two sections of social foundations of education course in a small, public, Mid-Atlantic university. As part of the TEP program, the education department implemented a service-learning component in effort to bring issues of teacher perception and receptiveness to diversity to the forefront. Preservice teachers were required to complete ten hours of service learning by tutoring students at the Job Corps Center. Students at the Job Corps Center ranged in age from 16-24, were of various ethnicities and came from differing socioeconomic backgrounds. Preservice teachers who participated in the study ranged in age from their late teens to their early thirties, were primarily White, and the majority were female (28) and nine were male (p. 48).

The primary source of data collection used in this study was the analysis of PST reflection papers. Three sets of reflection papers were written throughout the semester (totaling 111 papers) and the study analyzed 37 final reflections. Methodological triangulation was utilized in effort to provide credibility for the study. Using an open coding process, the reflection papers were coded and major themes were identified. The themes were grouped using axial coding, which identified three broad overarching categories. Three broad themes that emerged are seeing the self as other, recognizing the imperative of the other, and moving toward social justice. Interviews with six participants were conducted for the purpose of confirming or disconfirming tentative themes that had emerged from the data. Interview participants were selected based on their previous experiences with diversity as reflected upon in their final written reflections. The interviews utilized a semi-structured protocol and specific questions were asked to support the cross-interview analysis (2013). The study also consisted of the administration of

a brief, anonymous questionnaire consisting of open and close-ended response items that allowed study participants to provide feedback.

Tinkler and Tinkler's findings indicate that preservice teachers' self-esteem and self-efficacy increased, and their perceptions and responsiveness to diversity were strengthened. Preservice teachers also demonstrated improved problem solving skills and enhanced academic development. Other benefits identified were improved receptiveness to multicultural issues, greater acceptance of students of color in the classroom, willingness to try and change their own pedagogy and curriculum, changed perspectives about urban students of color, and increased level of commitment towards social justice (2013). Data collected from this study provided evidence that this particular service-learning project had an impact of varying degrees on this group of preservice teachers. Preservice teachers who began with an openness to diversity, found that the experience further broadened their understanding. Students less open to diversity found that the service learning experience created an understanding that addressing diversity is important to their continued growth as future teachers (p. 50). Overall, the reflection papers were positive and the themes that emerged from reflection papers and questionnaires were supported in greater depth through the interviews (p. 50).

Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching

The vast range in the cultural, linguistic, social class, familial support, and educational backgrounds of ELs pose complex challenges for teachers (Roy-Campbell, 2013). When teachers and students come from different ethnic, cultural, and social backgrounds, cultural differences can create serious challenges to effective teaching and learning (Gay, 2012). A teacher's negative attitude or misconceptions may positively or negatively influence student learning and can prevent student needs from being met. Misconceptions can result in inaccurate

conclusions about individual student intelligence, ability, motivation, and can result in erroneous placement and misdiagnoses of learning difficulties (Khong & Saito, 2014). There are common beliefs, attitudes, assumptions, and misconceptions about how ELs learn. Khong & Saito (2014) addressed the six most common misconceptions:

1. ELs should be able to acquire English quickly. Academic English is necessary for students to succeed in school and in society. ELs need 5 to 7 years (and sometimes up to 10 years) before they can attain the academic literacy necessary to negotiate in mainstream classrooms. Cummins (1979) made a distinction between basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) to address the period of time that is typically required by immigrant children as they acquire conversational fluency in their second language when compared to grade-appropriate academic proficiency in that language (p. 1). Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) typically develop in two years or less, while academic language or Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) can take up to seven or more years to fully develop. Proficient BICS and CALP skills are needed for ELs to successfully negotiate classroom instruction (Cummins, 1979).
2. ELs should avoid using their native language to acquire English. Research shows that the use of the student's first language can facilitate acquisition of the second language. Cross-linguistic transfer or the process of transfer is the process in second-language acquisition that takes place when people use linguistic resources from their first language to learn aspects of their second language. When ELs are allowed and encouraged to use their first language, they are better able to comprehend and express their understanding of text in English (Martinez, et. al., 2014). Students who have a

strong educational foundation in their first language are able to transfer and apply those skills to their learning of English (Leafstedt & Gerber, 2005).

3. Exposure and interaction will result in English language learning. Exposure alone is insufficient for learning a language. Learning a language is a complex and multidimensional process that is dependent on a set of complex variables and requires academic language skills in multiple domains including vocabulary, grammar/syntax, and phonology (Samson & Collins, 2012; Staehr Fenner & Kuhlman, 2012).
4. All ELs learn English in the same way and at the same rate. Language skills develop at different rates which impacts the linguistic dimension of academic development. Language-minority students come from diverse backgrounds with different languages, cultures, and varied educational experiences, therefore, it is impossible to generalize that the same methods will work for all language-minority students. However, there are five fairly predictable stages of language acquisition: preproduction, early production, speech emergence, intermediate fluency, and advanced fluency (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). Although all ELs experience each of these states, the amount of time spent at each level highly depends on individual student characteristics (Martinez, et. al., 2014). It is important for teachers to remember that monolingual English-speaking students and ELs do not learn in the same ways. Although there are some strategies that are effective in teaching both populations of students, practices that are effective for one group of learners should not be expected to produce the same results in another group (Khong & Saito, 2014). Some teachers mistake pedagogical practices and characterize effective instruction as "just good teaching". Effective instruction requires a deeper understanding of

cultural and linguistic dispositions that ELs bring to the classroom (Harper & de Jong, 2010; Roy-Campbell, 2013). Many teachers feel that little change is required in current teacher education practices as the needs of ELs do not differ from those of native English-speaking students who are from diverse racial or socioeconomic backgrounds. However, there are specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions directly related to language and culture that must be addressed. The "just good teaching approach" views the teaching of ELs as a matter of pedagogical adaptations that can be incorporated into a mainstream teacher's existing repertoire of instructional strategies designed for native English speakers (Harper & de Jong, 2010). What differentiates "just good teaching" from strategies that specifically address the needs of ELs, is that English is very much present and accounted for and techniques are incorporated that teach language and content.

5. The younger the child, the greater facility in acquiring English. Young learners may acquire better pronunciation but under controlled conditions, adults have been shown to perform better. The link between age and second language outcomes and achieving competency in a second language, especially for academic purposes, is more complex and takes considerably longer than previously thought (Genesee, 2015). Common beliefs that young learners can more easily acquire a second language typically do not take into consideration the complexities of language in the educational context (p. 9). Education researchers argue that there are significant differences in the language skills used for social communication and those used for academic purposes; it can take between 5 to 7 years to achieve English proficiency for academic purposes that are comparable to that of monolinguals. Older students

can make more rapid progress in comparison to younger students because their first language and literacy skills are more developed. Through the transfer or the use of common underlying cognitive abilities linked to reading and writing, literacy skills acquired in one language can facilitate literacy development in a second language (p. 9). Older students may also acquire second language skills more rapidly because learning in the higher grades is generally more abstract and context-reduced than in earlier grades (p. 10)

6. Children have acquired a second language once they are able to speak it. Achieving the ability to communicate orally is not the same as acquiring academic literacy. Acquiring English as a second language or as an additional language takes several years or more to acquire (Samson & Collins, 2012; Staehr Fenner & Kuhlman, 2012). Many teachers assume that ELs who sound as if they are fluent and are able to use social English with few errors are ready to be taught in the content areas. In reality, they lack the deeper, more complex level of academic English that is critical for them to achieve in content areas. It takes ELs longer than their non-EL peers to become proficient in academic language (Samson & Collins, 2012).

Geneva Gay (2013) defined culturally responsive teaching as "using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of references, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them" (Gay, 2010c, p. 31) (p. 50). Culturally Responsive Teaching connects in-school learning to out-of-school learning, promotes educational equity and excellence, creates community among individuals from different cultural/social/ethnic backgrounds, and develops students' agency, efficacy, and empowerment (Gay, 2013). Culturally Responsive Teaching embraces an attitude to support

diversity and the knowledge and skills to incorporate content with culture relevant to individual students to facilitate learning (Bennett, 2012). Learning is best understood when it is situated in the social and cultural context of the classroom and is structured around mentors who are knowledgeable in providing opportunities to observe culturally and linguistically responsive teaching practices (Daniel, 2014; Nasir & Heineke, 2014). Culturally Responsive Teaching includes a deeper knowledge of learning styles, preferences for cooperative vs. individual problem solving, behavior expectations between adults and children, and gender roles (Rychly & Graves, 2012). It requires that teachers reflect upon their own cultural frames of reference and that they have knowledge of other cultural practices in order to adjust instruction appropriately. Culturally Responsive Teaching helps all students acquire more knowledge about cultural diversity using the cultural heritage, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as instructional resources to improve their learning opportunities and outcomes (Gay, 2012).

Four practices that are essential in designing and implementing CRT requires that teachers be caring and empathetic, reflective about their attitudes and beliefs about other cultures, knowledgeable about other cultures, and reflective about their own cultural frames of reference (Gay, 2012). It requires teachers to explore and self-reflect on their personal histories and experiences. Some may be resistant to admitting that they possess prejudices toward certain groups and must come to terms with any preconceived notions and confront biases that may have influenced their value system, and reconcile negative feelings they may have towards any culture, language, or ethnic group (Taylor, 2010).

Bennett's (2012) study investigated facets of field experience that influence preservice teachers' understandings about culturally responsive pedagogy. Bennett utilized a qualitative, embedded case study to investigate a smaller part of the entire case in effort to gain deeper

insight (2012). Convenience sampling was used to select the eight PSTs who participated in the study. The preservice teachers tutored students, ranging in age from five to twelve years old, at a community center located in an urban, impoverished area; 90% of the children living in the area receive free and reduced lunch. Tutoring sessions occurred at the community center as part of an afterschool program. All PSTs were White, English-speaking, middle class, and ranged in age from 19 to 24. The participating PSTs had taken one diversity course and had previously been enrolled in one or two courses in their program that contained an EL component; however, the different professors who taught these courses had varied knowledge and expertise in diversity issues (p. 388).

Study data sources included PST reflections written field notes, reflexive journals, and interviews (three individual and two focus group). In analyzing the data, Bennett utilized constant comparison analysis in effort to discover central themes and categories (2012). The data was read a minimum of three times and categorized into chunks beginning with interview transcripts. The chunks were then labeled and sorted according to similarity with previously identified codes, and then meanings were attributed to each category. After a complete analysis was completed using constant comparison analysis, Bennett used a within-case analysis to examine themes and relationships of the study that confirmed and disconfirmed the evidence toward changes in understandings toward culturally responsive teaching (p. 391). In order to gain a deeper understanding and to enhance the possibility of the results' relevance to other cases, a cross-case analysis was utilized. Cross-case analysis allowed the researcher to find negative cases that enhanced the discoveries

Bennett's study identified several significant discoveries that suggest implications and applications for teacher education as it pertains to culturally responsive teaching. He explored three principles identified with culturally relevant teaching:

Principle 1: Teachers recognize conceptions of self and others

Principle 2: Teachers understand the significance of social interaction and promote social engagement in the classroom

Principle 3: Teachers consider the conception of knowledge

One-on-one student-teacher interactions and scaffolding critical reflection through questions and conversations were found to be the most valuable (2012). The study also identified ineffective elements of the field experience such as the lack of explicit instruction and limited student-teacher interaction. Preservice teachers with limited or fewer student-teacher interactions displayed fewer significant changes in their understandings about culturally responsive teaching.

Teacher Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is an important component of behavior change and has a powerful connection to teaching and learning. Self-efficacy is a cognitive process in which one's beliefs in their persistence, capabilities to organize and conduct activities, response to potential failure, and coping strategies affect their performance on a certain task and produces certain outcomes making the surrounding context controllable (Bandura, 1997; Yucesan Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010; Tellez & Manthey, 2015). Bandura (1997) defined self-efficacy as the "belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments." Self-efficacy beliefs are a stronger predictor of an individual's behavior and are influenced by mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and psychological and emotional states (Oginga Siwatu, 2011). Effective classroom behaviors, positive student outcomes, and

perceived ability to work with students from diverse backgrounds are directly related to teacher self-efficacy and confidence, teaching methodology, and skills (Fitts & Gross, 2012; Tran, 2015).

There is some research to support the notion that in order to better serve ELs, teachers must develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to address linguistic and cultural diversity. Training in diversity and exposure to non-dominant language is a foundational pre-requisite for developing effective teaching practices and has a positive effect on teacher candidates' attitudes towards linguistic differences (Fitts & Gross, 2012). Teachers who have positive attitudes and express higher levels of efficacy with ELs are more likely to see their students as capable of academic success. Teacher candidates expressed positive views of bilingualism and of the students' social and intellectual capabilities and noted that their previous negative beliefs were often based on lack of social experiences with ELs (2012). Teacher candidates gained insight into the concept of academic English and the huge language demands that are placed on ELs in the school setting. They also gained awareness into the academic strengths and needs, social networks and an overall positive attitude towards bilingualism and an appreciation for the students' linguistic abilities.

Fitts and Gross (2012) conducted a qualitative case study to investigate the evolution of preservice teachers' knowledge and beliefs about ELs. Previous studies were completed by the researchers that focused on how PSTs knowledge, beliefs and attitudes towards CLD children are impacted over time and how it impacts PSTs identity formation and role acquisition (2012). Participants in the study were enrolled in an introductory teaching course required for admission to the TEP at the university where the researchers were employed. The introductory course covered a wide range of educational topics, with an emphasis on demographic shifts in the state's

population and the increasing EL population (p. 78). Tutoring occurred for ten weeks and preservice teachers were paired with one EL student for duration of the sessions. Individual tutoring sessions varied from 20 to 60 minutes of academic support, depending on individual student needs.

Data was collected through participant surveys and focus group interviews. Eighteen PSTs (5 males and 13 female) participated in the study by completing an initial, midterm, and final exit survey. Fifteen participants responded to the initial survey which included open-ended questions about participants' language learning backgrounds, prior tutoring experiences, and understandings of ELs. The midterm survey was completed by 13 participants and included six open-ended questions specific to the participants' relationship with the tutee, perceptions of ELs, and strategies used during tutoring sessions. After the last class meeting, the final exit survey (that mirrored the initial survey) was completed by 12 participants. Focus group interviews were conducted at the end of the semester and were an important source of triangulation for the survey data and were essential for drawing out participants' insight (p. 80). In addition to participant surveys and interviews, Fitts attended the weekly tutoring sessions and kept an informal reflection journal (2012).

Focus group interviews were transcribed and the primary documents were entered into a qualitative software analysis program. Initial survey data was analyzed and a code list was organized and tabulated according to categorical data such as gender, major, and language skills. Both researchers coded open-ended items, discussed initial impressions and developed a descriptive code list which was used to code remaining survey responses (p. 80). Code families that were identified as relevant to the study were challenges, connections, culture, cultural differences, language, perceptions of ELs, prior experience of tutor, popular culture,

relationships, and tutee attributes (p. 81). After item and pattern analysis was conducted on all of the data, Fitts and Gross identified interpretive assertions about key themes. In order to gain insight into PST changes and grown over the course of the semester, their assertions were tested across data sources and compared to the participants' responses over time.

Data obtained from this study revealed that participants had limited personal experience in terms of interacting with CLD individuals. Preservice teachers typically identified bilingual or EL students as Hispanic and all of the initial respondents predicted that the biggest challenge of tutoring would be in communication (Fitts & Gross, 2012). By the end of the semester, participant responses were noticeably more enthusiastic, indicating a positive shift in PSTs beliefs of the social and intellectual capabilities of the students they tutored. Preservice teachers also stated that previous beliefs they may have had about ELs had further developed or changed (p. 85). Through the tutoring experience, PSTs developed an understanding of ELs as bilingual and bicultural individuals, and as a result, were able to re-examine and re-evaluate potentially limited views of ELs. The data also suggests that the experience had an overall positive impact on PSTs beliefs and knowledge about bilingualism; participants demonstrated an understanding that bilingualism promotes increased mental flexibility and recognized the social and cognitive advantages associated with bilingualism

Research also demonstrates that early in their preparation, teacher candidates must begin to understand the implications for their own cultural identities and belief systems. They must examine their prior experiences, beliefs and attitudes towards ELs and how that may impact their expectations of culturally diverse students. Preparation programs need to provide experiences where teacher candidates can confront and understand their attitudes and assumptions, as their

opinions and underlying attitudes impact how they work with and support ELs (Hutchinson, 2013).

Hutchinson's (2013) case study explored the impact of a three-credit foundations course for teaching ELs. The course was offered as part of the requirements for a baccalaureate degree program in elementary education and was designed to give PSTs an understanding of basic concepts and principles in second language acquisition and teaching (p. 30). Over the course of ten weeks, PSTs were to observe ESL support (pullout) classrooms three times to collect data and write a research paper based on their experiences and observations. The study focused on junior-level PSTs enrolled in the foundations course and students took this course prior to student teaching in their senior year. The TEP is a small regional campus of a large research university, located in a large metropolis area and encompasses rural, suburban, and urban school districts (p. 31). There were 25 participants in the study and the majority had limited exposure to working with ELs. Twenty participants were female and ranged in age from 18-22 years old; 5 participants were from minority backgrounds.

The Language Attitude of Teachers Scale (LATS) is a tool that helps identify PSTs attitudes toward linguistic diversity. The LATS was administered prior to the course in order to gather baseline data and it was administered again at the end of the course. Using a principal components analysis, three core areas were identified in the areas of language politics, LEP intolerance, and language support:

Table 5: Language Attitude of Teachers Scale Survey Responses: Language Politics

	Language Politics Statement *Beliefs about speaking English and requiring it in public settings*
1	To be considered American, one should speak English.
3	Parents of non- or LEP students should be counseled to speak English with their children whenever possible.
7	Local and state governments should require that all government business (including voting) be conducted in English.
12	English should be the official language of the U.S.

Table 6: Language Attitude of Teachers Scale Survey Responses: LEP Intolerance

	LEP Intolerance Statement *Beliefs about how English should be acquired and their attitudes toward ELs in schools.*
6	The rapid learning of English should be a priority for non or LEP students even if it means they lose the ability to speak their native language.
8	Having a non or LEP student in the classroom is detrimental to the learning of other students.
10	Most non and LEP children are not motivated to learn English.
11	At school, the learning of the English language by non or LEP children should take precedence over learning subject matter.
13	Non and LEP students often use unjustified claims of discrimination as an excuse for not doing well in school.

Table 7: Language Attitude of Teachers Scale Survey Responses: Language Support

	Language Support Statement *How ELs can and should be supported in schools.*
2	I would support the government spending additional money to provide better programs for linguistic-minority students in the public schools.
4	It is important that people in the U.S. learn a language in addition to English.
5	It is unreasonable to expect a regular classroom to teach a child who does not speak English.
9	Regular classroom teachers should be required to receive preservice or in-service training to be prepared to meet the needs of linguistic minorities.

Data obtained by the LATS was diverse, varied, and provided a rich source of information about initial attitudes, assumptions, awareness, and understanding about working with and supporting ELs in the classroom (p. 33). Classroom observational data was also used in the data collection

process. Preservice teachers completed observations in the elementary and secondary schools; their findings presented in a research paper at the end of the course. In order to determine critical significant differences for each of the statements, pre and post LATS data was analyzed and compared using a one-sample t-test (Hutchinson, 2013). Qualitative analysis was used to examine classroom observation data. Reflective writings were examined through the lens of the research questions and organized to identify statements related to the three core areas of the LATS survey (p. 33).

Study results indicate that in the area of language politics, PSTs showed a slight increase in agreement about speaking English and requiring it in public settings. Observational data indicates that almost all of the PSTs were unaware of how ELs were identified, assessed, and supported. The data also reveals that the majority of PSTs were exposed to ESL support in which native language instruction was used to scaffold learning. Many commented that this type of support was beneficial in classrooms where there was only one native language present (p. 38).

Results in the area of LEP intolerance indicates an increase towards having ELs in the classroom and that ELs do not use unjustified claims of discrimination as an excuse for not doing well in school (p. 41). According to the observational data, PSTs stated that they increased their knowledge of how to work with ELs and grew personally from the experience as they confronted some assumptions they previously may have held towards ELs. Preservice teachers were able to connect what they saw in the ESL support classroom to what they had learned in the foundations course, particularly the need for differential instruction, oral language development, and alternative assessment (p. 41).

Study results in the category of Language Support, revealed an increased tolerance in how ELs should be supported in schools. Preservice teachers specifically believed that the government should provide more monetary support for better programming and mainstream classroom teachers should be required to receive training to prepare them to meet the needs of ELs (Hutchinson, 2013). Data obtained from observations indicate that PSTs were surprised at the lack of facilities and program materials that ESL teachers had and came to respect the job [that ESL teachers] do to help ELs learn English. All of this led PSTs to the realization of what they themselves would need to do once they had their own classrooms (p. 46).

Types of Instruction

Dixon, Yssel, McConnell, & Hardin (2014) reference Tomlinson & Jarvis' (2009) definition of differentiation:

An approach to curriculum and instruction that systematically takes student differences into account designs opportunities for each student to engage with information and ideas and to develop essential skills. Differentiation provides a framework for responding to differences in students' current and developing levels of readiness, their learning profiles, and their interests, to optimize the match between students and learning opportunities. These three dimensions of student difference can be addressed through adjustments to the content, process, products, and environments of student-learning, and each is justified by a research-based rationale (pgs. 112-113, p. 599).

Differentiation is a way of thinking about teaching and learning that is student-centered and requires teachers to be flexible in their approach to teaching and to adjust the curriculum and presentation of information to learners (Dixon, Yssel, McConnell, & Hardin, 2014). Differentiation recognizes varying backgrounds, knowledge, readiness, language, and

preferences in learning and interests, and to act on that knowledge. The intent is to maximize each student's growth and individual success by meeting each student where they are and assist in the learning process. Differentiation relies on strong and skillful teachers to plan and implement different levels of the same concept at the same time (p. 113).

Differentiation provides the opportunity to become more focused on language development activities within the content lesson (Baetcher, Artigliere, Patterson, & Spaetzer, 2012). It is generally tailored to specific subgroups of students rather than the whole class and involves creating variations of the main lesson activities. Differentiation asks how appropriate a lesson is for students who have varied learning needs and varied levels of English proficiency and literacy skills (p. 15). Tomlinson's framework (2001) for differentiating tasks has been used widely to organize the different ways an activity can be modified for different learners. The framework is based on content (what the teacher provides as learning input), process (how the teacher has structured the activity), or product (what the students are expected to produce) (p. 16).

Learning how to differentiate instruction is important for teachers during their teacher preparation programs (Dixon, Yssel, McConnell, & Hardin, 2014). A major hurdle in preparing preservice teachers to differentiate instruction has been that they tend not to see much differentiated instruction in actual classrooms (Martin, 2013). Teacher education programs need to be actively engaged in preparing future teachers to differentiate (Dixon, Yssel, McConnell, & Hardin, 2014). Few novice teacher possess an understanding of what differentiated instruction actually looks like. Guidance in teacher preparation programs would help teacher candidates to understand the concept of differentiation to teaching and learning that involves analyzing learning goals, continual assessment of student needs, and instructional modifications in

response to data about readiness levels, interests, and learning profiles (p. 114). Modeling (differentiated instruction) should be a central task for faculty in teacher education programs and TEPs should arrange early field experiences where preservice teachers are paired with mentors who effectively practice differentiated instruction.

There are several principles that may guide teachers in the process of learning to differentiate their instruction for ELLs (Baetcher, Artigliere, Patterson, & Spaetzer, 2012).

1. Know strengths and weaknesses in English
2. Set a common content objective and differentiate the language objective
3. Make differentiation manageable for the teacher--does not require the teacher to create several different tasks but through small variations to a base activity; not radically different activities
4. Make learning manageable for the students through differentiation
5. Identify a base activity for higher-level students and tier downward--the learning goal should be the same for all the students; differentiated instruction should not mean different learning goals
6. Use yourself rather than a higher-level student to serve as the differentiation in the lesson
7. Use flexible rather than fixed grouping
8. Offer a choice of activities to let students do the differentiating
9. Recognize that cognitive complexity is intertwined with language proficiency
10. Allot the same number of minutes for a differentiated task

Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model was developed through a 7-year research study and

sponsored by the National Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE) and funded by the U.S. Department of Education (Kareva & Echevarria, 2013). Sheltered instruction is used for content area instruction in all subject areas and makes lessons meaningful for second language learners (p. 239). The goal is to provide access to core curriculum through modified lessons while giving students an opportunity to learn the target language as they master important content and skills (p. 240).

The SIOP Model was initially designed as an observation tool for researchers to measure teachers' implementation of sheltered instruction techniques and evolved into a lesson planning and delivery approach (p. 240). The model guides teachers to improve their instruction, using practices that assist students in learning content and academic language. It combines features recommended for high quality instruction for all students with specific features for second language learners and is used in classrooms of all grade levels and across all content areas.

Future Research

There is a need to examine whether or not teachers have the necessary support(s) to ensure that their EL students reach required grade-level achievement standards. Significant changes are needed in the way that teachers are prepared and supported in serving this population. Teacher preparation should require all teachers to possess some basic knowledge relevant to ELs as a first step towards helping this population of students achieve greater academic success. There is potential for improving EL student outcomes in terms of the knowledge and skills that teachers must possess by addressing the lack of accountability and alignment among teacher education programs, state certification offices, and local school districts (Samson & Collins, 2012). There must be guidance at the federal level, involvement of accrediting bodies and state agencies. Policymakers and teacher educators must recognize the

need to prepare all teachers to teach ELs and focus on teacher learning across all stage of teachers' careers; preservice, induction, and later stages (Lucas & Villegas, 2013).

Future studies should take a more longitudinal approach in examining preservice teachers. Tran (2015) suggests starting with studying teacher candidates during their preparation coursework related to EL methodologies. Longitudinal studies should continue to follow candidates as they progress throughout an education program; during preparation coursework, and continue following them as they begin their first years of teaching to see what lasting impact the experience in the foundations courses might have (Bennett, 2012; Fitts & Gross, 2012; Lopez-Reyna, et al., 2012; Tinkler & Tinkler, 2013).

Teacher education programs need to bring researchers, teacher educators, university supervisors, and teacher practitioners together in supporting and designing a coherent system for preparing teachers to teach ELs across the teacher development curriculum (Alamillo, et al., 2011). Future research needs to examine local efforts to build systems through university-school district partnerships. There needs to be a shift in program design that calls for coursework to be intertwined with clinical practice, as many pre-service education programs do not adequately bridge the gap between coursework and classroom experiences (Lopez-Reyna, et. al., 2012). Another concern regarding best approaches in preparing future teachers warrants additional research on teacher candidates' field experiences and student teaching internships (Tran, 2015). More information is needed in identifying how coursework experiences promote reflective dialogue between fieldwork experiences to emphasize how educational policies and practices are carried out (2015).

At the college level, there must be continuous efforts to adjust and improve teacher education programs and courses to meet the needs of teacher candidates that enable them to

address the specific issues of ELs (Kumar Singh, 2013). Lopez, et al. (2013) identified the need to determine if what is included in policy is actually addressed in teacher preparation programs and the degree to which teacher preparation programs and policies align. Future studies should examine the ways different courses are associated with EL achievement in terms of their (course) requirements. Bennett (2012) identifies the need to gain insight and understanding on how to better prepare teachers through the use of culturally responsive pedagogy; future research should focus on a larger number of participants with various linguistic, ethnic, racial, socioeconomic, and cultural backgrounds. There is a need for continued research in order to determine how new and existing teachers feel about their preparation experiences, perceptions, and efficacy beliefs for working with ELs (Tran, 2015).

Roy-Campbell (2013) identified the need for educators and researchers in the literacy field to increase their research and publication of articles in general-education journals about issues of education ELs. The question of how ELs needs are being met and dealt with in specific general-education literacy courses and how it could be done more effectively should be examined in greater depth. General education journals and articles that address the literacy needs of ELs should be further analyzed so topics that have been investigated and those which require further examination can be identified.

Chapter 3: Methods

Research Method and Design

Qualitative research is a way to gather information and understand human and social problems and is strong in its ability to study an issue within a natural setting and gather multiple forms of data (Creswell, 2009, 2013). Case studies emerged out of a desire to understand complex phenomena and are utilized when research questions seek to understand how or why, where the researcher has little control over events, and the focus is on a current situation within a real-world context (Yin, 2009). Case studies emphasize exploration and description through the examination of all variables in effort to provide as complete an understanding of an event or situation as possible (Becker, et al., 1994-2012).

In a qualitative case study, the researcher collects data about participants using observations, interviews, protocols, tests, examination of records, or collections of writing samples (Becker, et al., 1994-2012). Case study research is enhanced by multiple data sources as it can help provide a "rich, thick" description of the phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). Thick description involves an in-depth description of the entity being evaluated, the circumstances under which it is used, characteristics of the individuals involved, and the nature of the community in which it is located and involves interpreting the meaning of cultural norms and mores, community values, ingrained attitudes, and motives (Becker, et. al., 1994-2012). This is a case study in which the researcher will study all NCATE accredited IHEs in the state of Minnesota with Board of Teaching approved elementary education programs.

Since the goal of this study was to examine how state-approved IHE elementary licensure programs are preparing elementary education teachers to teach EL students in their classrooms, a qualitative approach was determined to be the most appropriate method of obtaining the

information sought. Course syllabi retrieved from NCATE accredited IHEs were examined in order to determine the extent to which each IHE was compliant with state-mandated requirements that must be met as a condition for continuing approval from the Minnesota Board of Teaching and NCATE.

Rubric. A rubric is defined as "a guide listing specific criteria for grading or scoring academic papers, projects, or tests" (Merriam-Webster, 2016). One commonly used definition used by educators is "a document that articulates the expectations for an assignment by listing the criteria, and describing levels of quality from excellent to poor (Reddy & Andrade, 2010). Within higher education, rubrics are used in various ways. Rubrics can teach, evaluate, provide feedback on and grade student projects, and evaluate programs (p. 437). Essentially, rubrics have three features: evaluation criteria (the factors that the assessor considers); quality definitions (a detailed description or explanation of what the student must do in order to attain a specific level of achievement); and a scoring strategy (interprets judgments of a product).

Syllabi. The word 'syllabus' is a summary outline of a discourse, treatise, or course of study or of examination requirements (Merriam-Webster, 2016). The Oxford English Dictionary defines 'syllabus' as an outline of the subjects in a course of study or teaching. The syllabus can serve a variety of purposes and the content within the syllabus can be grouped into several categories. Parkes and Harris (2002) propose that course syllabi can serve as a contract, as a permanent record, and a learning tool. For the purposes of this study, the syllabi will be utilized as a contract and as a learning tool.

The syllabus is most commonly used as a contract or as a learning tool. As a contract, the syllabus serves to set forth the expectations during the term of the contract and guides the behaviors of the instructor and student (p. 55). It defines student and instructor responsibilities

and describes course policy and procedures. As stated by Parkes and Harris (2002), the syllabus as a contract should be clear with an accurate course calendar. Specifically stated should be policies on grading, attendance, late assignment and make-up exams, policies on incompletes and revisions, academic dishonesty, academic freedom, and accommodation of disabilities (p. 56).

As a learning tool, a well-designed syllabus can assist students in becoming more effective learners and can provide information that extends beyond the scope of the course (Parkes & Harris, 2002). The syllabus as a learning tool may include planning and self-management skills, availability of the instructor, common misconceptions, tips on how to do well on assignments, campus resources, samples of high-quality work, and/or study strategies. This type of syllabus may allow students to access information when faculty member(s) may not be personally available for assistance (p. 58).

Research Questions

English learners are among the fastest growing student populations in the state of Minnesota. In the past 20 years, ELs have increased by 300 % (MN LEAPS Act, 2014). Between the years 2000 and 2010, the Latino/Hispanic population in Minnesota grew faster than any other in the state. There are currently over 65,000 EL students enrolled in Minnesota schools with the largest populations including Latino, Somali, and Hmong students (MN LEAPS Act, 2014). In the school year 2012-2013, Minnesota ranked as the fifteenth state in the United States with the highest EL student enrollment in public schools (Migration Policy Institute, 2015). The total public school enrollment for Hispanic students in grades K-12 for the school year 2014-2015 was 70,376; with 66,873 of these students being identified as ELs (MDE, 2016). The Twin Cities Metro Area had the largest increase of ELs, with the largest overall increase in

charter schools. Thirteen of the fifteen school districts outside of the area experienced an increase in the number of ELs over the past five years.

This study examined K-6 teacher preparation programs at IHEs in Minnesota to determine how preservice teachers are being prepared to meet the education needs of ELs.

1. How do state-approved IHE elementary licensure programs in the state of Minnesota prepare elementary education teacher candidates at the bachelor degree level to teach EL students in their classrooms?
2. What opportunities do IHEs provide for general elementary education teacher candidates to gain an understanding of EL needs?

Objectives

The objective of this study was to identify how NCATE accredited K-6 teacher preparation programs at IHEs in Minnesota are preparing elementary teacher candidates to meet the educational needs of ELs. This study examined course syllabi from NCATE accredited IHEs in Minnesota, and NCATE documentation specific to standard 4 (diversity). Results of this study will be shared with IHEs, school districts, and all stakeholders involved in creating teacher education policy and institutions responsible for implementing teacher preparation programs. Each syllabus was examined to identify how preservice teacher programming aligned with the Minnesota Administrative Rules 8710.2000 and 8710.3200, and NCATE standard 4.

Sample and Setting

Each state establishes their own requirements for the preparation of teachers; therefore, specific standards vary. The State of Minnesota was chosen for this study and because this study focuses on IHEs in the state of Minnesota, the results may differ in comparison to other states.

The researcher reviewed eight elementary education teacher preparation programs from IHEs that are accredited by NCATE.

Due to the increasing population of English learners in mainstream classrooms across the United States, it is critical for all teachers to be prepared for working with these students. The exponential growth of culturally and linguistically diverse students in the public school system raises important questions about teacher preparation. Elementary education teachers typically spend more time with English Learners than secondary teachers do. At the elementary level, students tend to stay with one teacher for the majority of the school day, whereas students at the secondary level typically transition from class to class and teacher to teacher throughout the day.

The researcher conducted an online search of NCATE accredited institutions in the state of Minnesota. The search resulted in 15 institutions whose elementary education programs were NCATE accredited; all 15 of these IHEs were initially contacted as possible study participants. Responses were received from 11 of the 15 IHEs and of the 11 who responded, eight agreed to participate in the study.

For anonymity purposes, each NCATE accredited IHE was assigned a code in order to protect their identity. The letter "I" represented "institution" and the number represented the order in which each institution was listed according to random order placement. For example, the first IHE on the list was given the identity "I1", the second IHE was designated "I2", and so forth. Additional information regarding each IHE's enrollment, type of institution (public or

private), location (urban or rural)[1], the date of the most recent Board of Teaching approval, and type of clinical experiences required was also included.

Instrumentation

Each syllabus was reviewed for attention to ELs and examined to identify how course elements aligned with the Minnesota Administrative Rule 8710.2000 Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers (subp. 4 standard 3, diverse learners), Minnesota Administrative Rule 8710.3200 Teachers of Elementary Education (Appendix E, subp. 3, section 2a; subp. 3a. student teaching and field experiences), and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standard 4: Diversity (4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools).

[1] Merriam-Webster defines the word 'urban' as relating to, characteristics of, or constituting a city. Rural is defined as 'relating to the country and the people who live there instead of the city'.

Table 8: NCATE accredited Institutes of Higher Education in Minnesota

School	Enrollment	Type	Rural or Urban	Next Visit
I1	3,500	private	urban	Spring 2018
I2	38,231	online	online	Spring 2018
I3	3,640	private	rural	Fall 2019
I4	4,380	private	urban	Spring 2017
I5	2,357	private	rural	Spring 2020
I6	2,500	private	urban	Spring 2019
I7	15,000	public	rural	Fall 2018
I8	5,836	public	urban	Spring 2022
I9	15,461	public	urban	Spring 2022
I10	1,900	public	rural	Fall 2022
I11	30,500	public	urban	Fall 2019
I12	10,878	public	urban	Fall 2017
I13	10,245	private	urban	Spring 2019
I14	52,600	private	online	Fall 2018
I15	8,500	public	rural	Spring 2020

When each education department was contacted, syllabi from courses that covered K-6 English Learner standards were requested from each institution.

Data Collection

The goal of collecting data for a case study is to triangulate data from multiple sources to make the findings as robust as possible (Yin, 2008). The purpose of this research was to examine how state-approved IHE elementary licensure programs in the state of Minnesota are preparing teachers to understand EL needs. The first step was to collect information and artifacts about each IHE program. Each IHE identified for the study were contacted via electronic mail message that included an introductory letter and IRB documentation (see Appendix G and H).

Data Analysis

Once individual course syllabi were collected, the researcher completed one rubric for each IHE. Each syllabus was coded manually using a rubric that was developed by the researcher and based on MN Administrative Rules 8710.2000 and 8710.3200 and NCATE standard 4. Manual coding was reasonable in this study due to the small sample size.

Coding. Coding is the process of organizing material into segments before bringing meaning to that information (Creswell, 2009). Coding involves taking text or picture data, grouping it into categories, and labeling the category with a specific term. Creswell suggests analyzing data for material that readers would expect to find based on literature, or that is unusual or surprising; something that was not originally anticipated or is of conceptual interest to the reader (2009, p. 186-187). Bogdan and Biklan (1992) suggested an alternate conceptualization of coding according to setting and context codes; perspectives held by subjects; subjects' ways of thinking about people and objects; process codes; activity codes; strategy codes; relationship and social structure codes; or preassigned coding schemes.

The researcher completed one rubric per IHE; each course was examined and as evaluation criterion was located within the syllabus, a checkmark was placed under each course

next to the quality definitions. Once all courses were reviewed and the rubric was completed, the researcher scored the rubric according to the scoring strategy (see Appendix F).

The researcher considered the use of MaxQDA or NVivo as additional sources of data analysis. However, after conversing with colleagues who had utilized these programs in the past, the researcher determined that neither one would provide any additional information in this particular research. MaxQDA and NVivo are professional software programs for qualitative data analysis. Both programs assist in analyzing unstructured data such as interviews, articles, media, surveys, transcripts, documents, and articles.

Rubric Development

The researcher developed a rubric to measure how well teacher education programs (of NCATE accredited institutions in Minnesota) prepare elementary teachers to work with English Learners according to K-6 English Learner standards and NCATE documentation (specific to Standard 4).

Standards are used as best practice in preparing teachers and developing teacher education programs. The attributes selected to be included in the rubric are essential in addressing EL issues surrounding diversity and are elements that should be present in culturally-focused teacher programs and high quality courses. These attributes are identified in the Minnesota Administrative Rules (specifically rules 8710.2000 subp. 4, standard 3; 8710.3200 subp. 3, section E2a) and NCATE standard (4d: Diversity).

One rubric was completed for each Institute of Higher Education (IHE). Each IHE was assigned a pseudonym in order to provide anonymity. For example, Institution 1 was identified as "I1", institution 2 was identified as "I2", and so forth. Each course within that IHE was identified as "C1" (course 1), "C2" (course 2), and so on. The number of syllabi

reviewed was determined by the number of courses within a specific IHEs teacher education program that addressed K-6 English Learner standards and NCATE standard 4. As each syllabus was reviewed, the researcher placed an "x" in the box behind each attribute as it was identified in the syllabus. The course total was figured by adding the number of "x" marked per course and was then divided by the total number possible. Each institution received a percentage and a total score (or overall rating) based on the following criteria:

80% - 100% - exceeds criteria/excellent = 5

60% - 79% - very good = 4

40% - 59% - meets criteria/good = 3

20% - 39% - unsatisfactory = 2

0 - 19% - did not meet criteria/poor = 1

Field Test

The rubric was used in a field test prior to the actual research. The purpose of the field check was to check for accuracy and usability. In the field test, course syllabi were obtained from three college professors and each syllabus was reviewed according to the rubric. Instructor A provided one syllabus; Instructor B provided three syllabi; and Instructor C provided four syllabi. Each syllabus was reviewed and scores were averaged in order to obtain a total rating. Results of the field test were:

Sample IHE	%	Rating
Instructor A	44%	3 = good
Instructor B	48%	3 = good
Instructor C	65%	4 = very good

It should be noted that the scores obtained from the field test were lower than expected, as most of the syllabi utilized in the field test were not courses that cover or address K-6 English Learner standards.

Ethical Considerations

The data used in this study was gathered from course syllabi and did not involve human subjects. Therefore, the specific guidelines related to human subjects addressed in the Institutional Review Board Approval Process were not applicable.

Chapter 4: Results

An initial email was sent to all 15 of the IHEs selected for the study. The email contained an introductory letter from the researcher with an attachment including IRB documents which included identifying information, participants, informed consent, risks, and confidentiality (see Appendix G).

The syllabi presented important information and components of the curriculum of each course within each IHE. However, it cannot be assumed that particular concepts were not addressed or taught because they did not appear on the course syllabi. Teacher educators bring individual strengths, beliefs, and limitations to their teaching, making it difficult to specify what actually occurs in a course just through examination of syllabi.

The researcher sent an electronic request for information in early October 2016. The researcher sent out a second request for information two weeks after the initial request. The second request for information included a follow up email attached to the original request. A third request for information was sent electronically three weeks after the initial request. Institutes of Higher Education who had already responded or provided information were not contacted again; only IHEs who had not responded at all. The researcher made a fourth attempt via telephone calls to the institutes who had not responded to the electronic requests. The research concluded four weeks after the initial request was sent.

Responses

Institution 1 Response received on 10/04/16 stating that they are giving up CAEP accreditation. Following the second request for information on 10/17/16, the institution responded that they would be declining the invitation to participate in the research.

Institution 2	Programs at this IHE are for licensed teachers pursuing their Master's and Doctoral degrees. They do not have an initial teacher licensure program.
Institution 3	Telephone call received on 10/04/16 from an individual at the IHE inquiring about the email that was received. An email response was received on 10/05/16 from the chair of the education department and a link was sent where the requested information could be obtained.
Institution 4	A response was received following the second request for information stating they would participate in the research. Email response sent 10/24 following up on previous email stating they would participate. Information was received.
Institution 5	A response was received following the second request for information, stating that they were declining participation as they are in the midst of curriculum rewrites and would prefer not to participate until they are fully updated.
Institution 6	No response received following electronic requests on 10/3 and 10/17. Participation was declined via telephone call on 10/27/16.
Institution 7	No response received following electronic requests on 10/3 and 10/17. Participation was declined via telephone call on 10/27/16.
Institution 8	No response received following electronic requests on 10/3 and 10/17. Email response sent 10/24 following up on previous email stating they would participate. Information was received.
Institution 9	No response received following electronic requests on 10/3 and 10/17. Email response sent 10/24 following up on previous email stating they would

	participate. Information was received.
Institution 10	Following the second request on 10/17/16 for information, a response was received stating that the lead faculty of their EL course for the initial elementary education licensure program would be in touch. Response received 10/18 including one course syllabi.
Institution 11	Received out of office response following 10/17 follow up email. Follow up email was sent on 10/24 after no response received from the initial email. 10/24 received another out of office response. Participation was declined during a telephone call on 10/27/16.
Institution 12	Received a response on 10/06/16 requesting a formal institutional email account for further correspondence. The IHE stated that they would be glad to assist in providing the researcher with information and asked what additional information was needed. The researcher provided two formal institutional email accounts with the information being requested. Following the second email, information was received.
Institution 13	No response received from electronic requests on 10/3 and 10/17. Participation was declined via telephone call on 10/26/16.
Institution 14	An initial response was received after a second request was sent electronically. The response came from an individual who stated that he was not able to assist but would locate contact information of someone in that department. A follow up email was sent on 10/24, and a contact name was provided. After correspondence with this individual, it was determined that this IHE would not be appropriate for participation in the study as they have

one teacher preparation program (for initial Special Education teaching licensure). The IHE has a proposed elementary education licensure program that has not started yet.

Institution 15 No response received from electronic requests on 10/3 and 10/17. Participation was declined via telephone call on 10/27/16.

Results

Table 9: Ratings based on participation

IHE		%	Rating
I1	Declined	x	x
I2	Program requirements do not fit research criteria	x	x
I3	Participated	71%	4 – very good
I4	Participated	59%	3 – meets criteria/good
I5	Declined	x	x
I6	Declined	x	x
I7	Participated	71%	4 – very good
I8	Participated	59%	3 – meets criteria/good
I9	Participated	29%	2 – unsatisfactory
I10	Participated	76%	4 – very good
I11	Declined	x	x
I12	Participated	35%	2 - unsatisfactory
I13	Declined	x	x
I14	Does not have a program that fits research criteria	x	x
I15	Participation	47%	3 – meets criteria/good

Table 10: Results

	IHE	% of IHEs participating whose syllabi addressed each element

MN Administrative Rule 8710.2000 (subp. 4, standard 3) Understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create adapted instructional opportunities by:		
(E) Understanding how learning is influenced by individual experiences, talents, prior learning	4, 7, 8, 10, 15	5/8 63%
(F) Understanding contributions and lifestyles of racial, cultural, and economic groups	3, 8, 10	3/8 38%
(H) Understanding cultural and community diversity (how to incorporate experiences, cultures, and community resources into instruction	3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 15	6/8 75%
(O) Using information about families, cultures, and communities as the basis for connecting instruction to experiences	3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15	7/8 88%
(P) Bringing multiple perspectives to subject matter discussions (including attention to personal, family, and community experiences, cultural norms)	3, 7, 9, 10	4/8 50%
(R) Identifying and applying technology resources to enable and empower learners with diverse backgrounds, characteristics, and abilities	10	1/8 13%
MN Administrative Rule 8710.3200 (subp. 3, section E 2 a)		
• Knowledge of and the ability to use various assessment tools (formal and informal) to plan and evaluate effective instruction	4, 10, 12	3/8 38%
• Plan, evaluate, and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students from various cognitive, linguistic, and	3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15	8/8 100%

cultural backgrounds		
• Design and implement appropriate classroom interventions for struggling readers		0
NCATE Standard 4d: Diversity		
• Extensive and substantive field experiences or clinical practices o Field experiences and clinical practice support the development of educators who can apply their knowledge of diversity to work in schools with all students	3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 15	7/8 88%
o Field experiences or clinical practices designed to help candidates understand the influence of culture on education	3, 4, 7, 8, 10	5/8 63%
o Candidates and faculty from diverse groups informs field experiences in culturally meaningful ways	3, 7	2/8 25%
• Interact with students from a broad range of diverse groups o Candidates have the opportunity to interact with adults, children, and youth from their own and other ethnic/racial cultures	3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15	7/8 88%
• Experiences help candidates confront issues of diversity o Provide opportunities for candidates to understand diversity and equity in the teaching and learning process	3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15	7/8 88%
• Develop strategies for improving student learning and teacher effectiveness o Coursework must be designed to help candidates understand the influence of culture on education	3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 15	6/8 75%
o Educators are able to reflect multicultural and global		0

perspectives that draw on the histories, experiences, and representations of students and families		
• Candidates and faculty from diverse groups informs the unit's curriculum and pedagogy in culturally meaningful ways	3, 4, 7	3/8 38%

It should be noted that only one syllabus was received for review from each participating IHE. According to study results, institutions 3 and 7 (met 71% of criteria) and institution 10 (met 76% of criteria). These institutions received an overall score of 4 (very good). Institutions 4 and 8 met 59% of the criteria, and institution 15 met 47% of criteria; all received an overall score of 3 (good). Study results indicated that institutions 9 and 12 received unsatisfactory ratings, with results of 29% (institution 9) and 35% (institution 12). Institutions 2 and 4 were eliminated from the study, as they did not have programs that met the criteria.

Study results found that some of the syllabi stated standards directly from the MN Administrative Rules, while some involved interpretation by the researcher. Results of the study identified two elements that were not addressed by any of the syllabi: Minnesota Administrative Rule 8710.3200 (subp. 3, section E 2 a - Design and implement appropriate classroom interventions for struggling readers) and NCATE Standard 4d (Diversity - Educators are able to reflect multicultural and global perspectives that draw on the histories, experiences, and representations of students and families). One element was addressed by all eight of the participating IHEs (Minnesota Administrative Rule 8710.3200 (subp. 3, section E 2 a – Plan, evaluate, and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students from various cognitive, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds).

In order to make sense of data, the researcher completed several steps. Once responses and requested information were received, the researcher read through each syllabus. While

examining the syllabi, the researcher referenced the rubric, highlighted key words, and checked off components on the rubric as they were identified. Due to the general nature and depending on the type of course the syllabus was from, some interpretation was required on the researcher's part; however, some courses included criteria that was taken directly from the standard and did not require interpretation. The researcher combined information from her notes and created key phrases in effort to make comparisons between each of the syllabi (see Table 10 for key phrases according to each standard on the rubric).

Survey results indicated that IHEs in Minnesota are making efforts towards better preparing elementary teachers for working with ELs. However, despite these improvements, IHEs must continue moving forward in making changes to their teacher education programs. According to the rubric used in analyzing course syllabi, 38% of participating IHEs were identified as being very good, 38% of participating IHEs met criteria, and 25% of participating IHEs were found to be unsatisfactory.

The following three tables identify generalized key phrases that were identified for each criterion listed on the rubric under Minnesota Administrative Rules 8710.2000 and 8710.3200, and NCATE standard 4 (diversity).

Table 11: Key Phrases according to MN Administrative Rule 8710.2000

MN Administrative Rule 8710.2000	**Key phrases from syllabi**
(subp. 4, standard 3) Understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create adapted	

instructional opportunities by:	
Understanding how learning is influenced by individual experiences, talents, prior learning	• Consider background issues, home language and culture that are relevant in the school setting • Demonstrate best practices related to connecting with families from diverse cultures • Awareness of strategies that develop an environment that values individual differences • Prepare students with course content and analytical and reflective skills to understand diversity
Understanding contributions and lifestyles of racial, cultural, and economic groups	• Develop a growing understanding of the cultural backgrounds of the current EL population in Minnesota • Consider background issues, home language and culture that are relevant in the school setting • Create an understanding and appreciation of diverse peoples and diverse perspectives • Courses designed to give students opportunities to experience diversity with reflection • Demonstrate best practices related to connecting with families from diverse cultures
Understanding cultural and community diversity (how to incorporate experiences, cultures, and community resources into instruction	• Courses designed to give students opportunities to experience diversity with reflection • Develop a growing understanding of the cultural backgrounds of the current EL population in Minnesota • Consider background issues, home language and culture that are relevant in the school setting • Prepare students with course content and analytical and reflective skills to understand diversity • Demonstrate best practices related to connecting with families from diverse cultures • Candidates know how and where to access services and resources to meet student needs and use students' experience to connect instruction to learning
Using information about families, cultures, and communities as the basis for connecting instruction to experiences	• Develop a growing understanding of the cultural backgrounds of the current EL population in Minnesota • Prepare students with course content and analytical and reflective skills to understand diversity • Awareness of strategies that develop an environment that values individual differences

	• Courses designed to give students opportunities to experience diversity with reflection • Candidates know how and where to access services and resources to meet student needs and use students' experience to connect instruction to learning • Consider background issues, home language and culture that are relevant in the school setting • Demonstrate best practices related to connecting with families from diverse cultures
Bringing multiple perspectives to subject matter discussions (including attention to personal, family, and community experiences, cultural norms)	• Awareness of strategies that develop an environment that values individual differences • Prepare students with course content and analytical and reflective skills to understand diversity • Consider background issues, home language and culture that are relevant in the school setting • Courses designed to give students opportunities to experience diversity with reflection • Demonstrate best practices related to connecting with families from diverse cultures • Candidates know how and where to access services and resources to meet student needs and use students' experience to connect instruction to learning

Minnesota Administrative Rule 8710.2000 (subpart 4, standard 3) states that a teacher must understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create adapted instructional opportunities. Teachers must understand how learning is influenced by individual experiences, talents, prior learning, and understand the contributions, lifestyles and cultural and community diversity. Experiences, cultures, and community resources must be incorporated into instruction. Teachers must bring multiple perspectives to subject matter discussions including attention to personal, family, and community experiences. Teachers must identify and apply technology resources to enable and empower learners with diverse backgrounds, characteristics and abilities.

Seven of the eight IHEs (institutions 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 15) who participated in the study reported various ways of incorporating elements from MN Administrative Rule 8710.2000 into their teacher preparation programs. Candidates participated in a program where they job shadow a practicing elementary teacher, and others were required to write online posts that addressed diversity, learning styles, instructional strategies, and student learning. Teacher candidates who attended these institutions were also required to attend on-campus events that addressed diversity, gender, or education.

Institution three provided a full semester of block classes for candidates that built on previous experiences. Concurrent education coursework was incorporated into all phases of the program that integrated multicultural education. Institution three required candidates to participate in a one-week, full time immersion experience in a diverse urban setting and a three-week part time local experience as a teacher assistant in a diverse elementary school. Objectives of the block experience exposed candidates to foundations of multicultural education where they had shared clinical and field experiences. These opportunities allowed for reflection and provided support for candidates in various phases of intercultural encounter(s). The theoretical content of block courses was systematically related to clinical practices and candidates assessed their attitudes toward diversity.

All seven of the institutions that met elements of MN rule 8710.2000, addressed how they increased the diversity of their education department faculty and student enrollment. The participating IHEs reported their commitment to increasing diversity among their faculty and students through active and ongoing recruitment. Institutions 3, 7, 10, and fifteen provided additional information (in addition to the syllabi) that addressed and described what these IHEs are implementing to increase diversity among staff and students within their campuses. Due to

their rural location, these institutions reported having difficulty recruiting students and faculty of color. In effort to ensure anonymity of the institutions, additional information that was received will be referred to as "diversity reports". The diversity reports included information on how diversity was incorporated into early foundations courses, clinical experiences in classrooms with diverse populations, and how diversity is being increased among faculty and student populations.

Human resource specialists whose specific duties directly related to increasing staff diversity. These institutions sought a wider pool of student applicants by placing advertisements in multiple publications and used professional and social networks in effort to reach a range of racial, cultural, and ethnic groups. Guest instructors who are racially, culturally, or ethnically diverse were invited to lecture and share their knowledge and experiences with students.

Diversity reports from institutions 3 and 10 described the extra measures that were established in effort to increase racial and ethnic diversity of the student population. Due to the rural location, these IHEs reported difficulty in recruiting faculty and students of color and of diverse backgrounds. The same IHEs who reported having difficulty recruiting faculty with diverse backgrounds experienced similar difficulties in recruiting students of color and of diverse backgrounds; institutes located in the metropolitan area had the greatest increase of students of color. These institutions have created programs that partner with local middle and high schools to encourage and recruit students of color to consider teaching as a profession.

Table 12: Key Phrases according to MN Administrative Rule 8710.3200

MN Administrative Rule 8710.3200 (subp. 3, section E 2 a)	**Key phrases from syllabus**
Knowledge of and the ability to use various assessment tools (formal and	• Apply assessment strategies that increase student learning and are fair and useful for English

informal) to plan and evaluate effective instruction	learners
Plan, evaluate, and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students from various cognitive, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds	• Plan for modifications for cultural and linguistic diversity by selecting and design of adaptive materials and supports • Plan differentiated instruction • Prepare students with course content and analytical and reflective skills to understand diversity • Courses designed to give students opportunities to experience diversity with reflection • Opportunities to identify and design appropriate instruction for diverse learners
Design and implement appropriate classroom interventions for struggling readers	NONE

Minnesota Administrative Rule 8710.3200 states that teachers must have knowledge of and the ability to use various assessment tools, both formal and informal, to plan and evaluate effective instruction. Teachers must plan, evaluate, and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students from various cognitive, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds. They must be able to design and implement appropriate classroom interventions for struggling readers.

All eight of the IHEs who participated in the study provided opportunities for candidates to practice strategies that develop classroom environments where individual differences are valued. Candidates learned about and utilized various learning strategies suited to ELs and allowed opportunities to differentiate instruction for diverse learning styles. Candidates use knowledge of students' families, cultures, and communities as a basis for designing culturally relevant learning experiences and connecting instruction to students' experiences. Although syllabi from all participating IHEs met criteria in two of the three areas on the rubric under 8710.3200, none addressed the design or implementation of appropriate classroom interventions for struggling readers.

Table 13: Key Phrases according to NCATE Standard 4

NCATE Standard 4d: Diversity	Key phrases from syllabus
Extensive and substantive field experiences or clinical practices support the development of educators who can apply their knowledge of diversity to work in schools with all students	• Opportunities to identify and design appropriate instruction for diverse learners • Faculty incorporate diversity into curriculum • Faculty have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations
Extensive and substantive field experiences or clinical practices are designed to help candidates understand the influence of culture on education	• Opportunities to identify and design appropriate instruction for diverse learners • Faculty incorporate diversity into curriculum • Faculty have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations
Extensive and substantive field experiences or clinical practices: Candidates and faculty from diverse groups informs field experiences in culturally meaningful ways	• Faculty incorporate diversity into curriculum • Faculty have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations
Interact with students from a broad range of diverse groups by having the opportunity to interact with adults, children, and youth from their own and other ethnic/racial cultures	• Create an understanding and appreciation of diverse peoples and diverse perspectives • Create an academic, cultural, and workplace environment and community that celebrates differences • Courses designed to give students opportunities to experience diversity with reflection •
Interact with students from a broad range of diverse groups: Experiences help candidates confront issues of diversity by providing opportunities for candidates to understand diversity and equity in the teaching and learning process	• Create an understanding and appreciation of diverse peoples and diverse perspectives • Prepare students with course content and analytical and reflective skills to understand diversity • Courses designed to give students opportunities to experience diversity with reflection • Curricular components focus on understanding diversity, prejudice, and oppression • Help candidates' become aware of their own cultural competency
Develop strategies for improving student learning and teacher effectiveness by designing coursework to help candidates understand the influence of culture	• Prepare students with course content and analytical and reflective skills to understand diversity • Courses designed to give students opportunities to experience diversity with reflection • Curricular components focus on understanding

on education	diversity, prejudice, and oppression • Help candidates' become aware of their own cultural competency
Develop strategies for improving student learning and teacher effectiveness by reflect multicultural and global perspectives that draw on the histories, experiences, and representations of students and families	NONE
Candidates and faculty from diverse groups informs the unit's curriculum and pedagogy in culturally meaningful ways	• Faculty incorporate diversity into curriculum • Faculty have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations

The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education's (NCATE) fourth standard addresses diversity through the design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum. This standard outlines the experiences that candidates must acquire and must demonstrate in order to help all students learn. Of the eight syllabi that were reviewed, all provided information that addressed the ways in which their teacher preparation programs are preparing candidates to work effectively with all students. Coursework must be designed to help understand the influence of culture on education and faculty from diverse groups inform the unit's curriculum and pedagogy in culturally meaningful ways.

During clinical experiences, candidates participate in and perform many duties. The syllabi that were reviewed stated several duties that included classroom observations, assisting with instructional preparation and record-keeping, maintaining developmental and reflective journals, reading with students, providing remedial work with individual students or small groups of students, administering tests and quizzes, and providing small group and whole class instruction with the supervising teacher. Candidates must be able to know how and where to

access services and resources needed to meet the needs and use information about the student as a basis for connecting instruction to learners. Within some of the IHEs, clinical experiences are provided through block courses and immersion experiences. Candidates have the opportunity to interact with adults, children, and youth from other ethnic and racial cultures. These experiences allow candidates to confront issues of diversity and understanding how it impacts the teaching and learning process. All participating IHEs provided opportunities for candidates to study abroad ranging from a 4-week term to a 16-week semester.

Course syllabi indicated that all eight participating IHEs provided various methods and field experiences for candidates to identify and design appropriate instruction for diverse learners. Institution 10 implemented new requirements related to diversity. Courses were designed to prepare teacher candidates with course content and analytical and reflective skills to better understand diversity and give students opportunities to experience diversity under the supervision of faculty members. In addition to the diverse cultures graduation requirement, institution 10 requires all teacher candidates to meet the Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice.

Institution 12 provided courses that not only focus on curricular components, but help candidates' become aware of their own cultural competency through the Intercultural Developmental Inventory (IDI). Students take the IDI assessment, analyze their results, and apply the information to their teaching. Results of the IDI assists candidates in understanding diversity and provided a foundation for candidates to build on during other coursework and field experiences.

In their diversity reports, institutions three, seven, and ten established committees that are responsible for searching, hiring, and retaining diverse staff. These IHEs have coordinators who

represent the institution at college fairs, open houses and university coordinated admissions events. The coordinators conduct orientation for all undergraduate students admitted to the college of education and are responsible for building the pool of potential recruits for teacher preparation. Institution seven has a committee that provides leadership to ensure that faculty have the knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations. These committees were established to implement the process, procedures and professional development that increases intercultural and global awareness.

Institution nine developed a program to identify, recruit, and support underrepresented students who show the promise of success. The program provided an intense transition from high school to college and assisted underrepresented students with mastering subject matter and building and improving basic skills. The program was responsible for recruiting and serving diverse students and provided opportunities for cultural partnerships with other students on campus whose culture differs from their own.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Overview of the Study

Addressing the diverse needs of English learners is challenging and evolving work. There are no quick solutions or answers for a task of this magnitude. Efforts must be ongoing in

order to build and improve teacher education programs. Teachers need better training, induction, and support as English learner populations continue to increase. It is essential for all teachers to support oral language development, promote academic language development, and value culture diversity (Samson & Collins, 2012).

As the population of English Learners in mainstream classrooms across the United States continues to increase, all teachers must take responsibility for and be adequately prepared for teaching ELs. Institutes of higher education must examine how their teacher education programs are preparing teacher candidates to work with culturally and linguistically diverse students in the public school system. Current programs must be examined to identify the opportunities and experiences that are provided to teacher candidates that assist them with understanding the complex needs of EL students. This study aimed to examine K-6 elementary teacher preparation programs at selected Minnesota institutes of higher education in effort to determine how teachers are being prepared to meet the needs of ELs. The study also attempted to examine the opportunities that are provided to help preservice teachers gain an understanding of EL needs.

Implications

As part of their professional preparation, most preservice teachers are required to take one or two courses that focus solely on ELs (NCATE, 2010). Research states that EL strategies must be infused throughout teacher education programs (Baetcher, 2012, NCATE, 2010). The opportunity for preservice teachers to translate concepts into practical activities are limited when only one or two courses are required within their preparation program. If it is possible to provide only one course that focuses on EL issues, teacher educators could attempt to maximize learning by trying to accomplish as much as possible within that individual class. Since required courses on ELs are limited in most TEPs, teacher candidates should be encouraged to take additional

coursework whenever possible in order to enhance learning and further their knowledge of EL issues and teaching strategies.

Teacher education programs need to provide experiences where candidates are able to get to know ELs as individuals within supportive environments. Examples are working in various classroom settings, opportunities for personal interactions, and opportunities to engage in discussions and receive feedback regarding instructional approaches (Salerno & Kibler, 2013). Implications can be extended to teacher educators in other fields as this issue impacts all educators (Roy-Campbell, 2013).

Recommendations

Teaching English learners requires significant expertise that goes beyond what is expected of teachers who do not have ELs in their classrooms. The following are recommendations for practitioners and considerations for the field.

Recommendations for Practitioners. School districts need to clearly communicate their expectations to IHEs who prepare teachers. Schools should accept student teachers from institutions who are committed to preparing candidates and provide high quality training prior to student teaching. A recommendation for strengthening candidate selection and placement is to increase the rigor and diversity for admission to TEPs. This would include building among partnership programs and exploring the selection criteria used across institutions. Districts should match specific needs with institutions that perform well on relevant standards; this means if students in the district are performing poorly in reading, the district should search for IHEs who do the best job preparing reading teachers.

School districts must find ways that allow teachers of ELs who have the experience and knowledge to share their expertise with students, parents, and colleagues. It may be worthwhile

to explore incentives that could encourage teachers with this expertise to take on extra duties in a formal capacity. It would be advantageous to identify factors that may attract individuals with bilingual skills to go into the field of education, and once in the field, what kinds of supports would prevent them from leaving.

Professional development overall should include a greater focus on EL teaching. New teachers should be paired with qualified teachers who serve as mentors and provided with extensive professional development that focuses on and includes EL instructional skills.

Recommendations for Academics. There is a correlation between what happens in preparation programs and outcomes such as teacher placement, teacher retention, teacher sense of self-efficacy, licensure, certification scores, quality of graduates' teaching, and K-12 student outcomes (Fuller, 2014). There appears to be a one-sided focus on program inputs without consideration of the outcomes; although inputs are crucial to the quality of teacher preparation programs, it is the outcomes that distinguish quality programs from poor quality programs (p. 65). According to Fuller (2014), teacher placement rates, longevity in the profession, teacher behavior in the classroom, and teacher effect on student outcomes should be examined.

Preservice teachers should be required to take at least one course that is devoted entirely to teaching ELs. Currently, faculty are responsible for infusing specialized knowledge and EL strategies into existing curriculum. School partners and teacher education faculty must work together to revamp or develop a curriculum that seamlessly integrates coursework and embedded field experience. New courses should be designed to address the essential language-related understandings and pedagogical practices for teaching ELs and should be taught by expert faculty. Preservice teachers need continuous experiences working directly with students as they study theory, content, and pedagogies. Preservice teachers also need opportunities to work in

high-need schools and in schools that are difficult to staff. By working in these settings, preservice teachers have direct contact with ELs, which is essential in helping them envision how they can apply what they are learning to the classroom.

Future Research

There is a continued need to examine whether teachers have the knowledge and support(s) to ensure that EL students reach required grade-level achievement standards. There must be guidance at the federal level, involvement of accrediting bodies and state agencies. Teacher education programs need to bring researchers, teacher educators, university supervisors, and teacher practitioners together in supporting and designing a coherent system for preparing teachers across the teacher development curriculum (Alamillo, et al., 2011). Continuous efforts must be made to adjust and improve teacher education programs and courses to meet the needs of teacher candidates that enable them to address the specific issues of ELs (Kumar Singh, 2013). Lopez, et al. (2013) identified the need to determine if what is included in policy is actually addressed in teacher preparation programs and the degree to which teacher preparation programs and policies align.

Future studies should take a longitudinal approach in examining preservice teachers. Longitudinal studies should follow candidates as they progress throughout an education program, during preparation coursework, and continue following them as they begin their first years of teaching to see what lasting impact the experience in the foundations courses might have (Bennett, 2012; Fitts & Gross, 2012; Lopez-Reyna, et al., 2012; Tinkler & Tinkler, 2013). Additional studies are needed to identify whether teachers use and apply what they've learned in their preparation program, and if so, how they use that knowledge. Since the goal is to prepare

teachers who are able to increase learning opportunities for ELs, future studies must link teacher practice to student learning.

Due to this study's extremely small sample size, it is difficult to generalize the findings because it is unknown as to how many courses on diversity are offered within each IHE. All of the syllabi reviewed had EL strategies infused into the course, but were not solely focused on EL issues and strategies. For example, the syllabus reviewed for institution twelve was a reading course (differentiating reading instruction). Incorporated within the course was a section on making modifications for cultural and linguistic diversity; however, diversity was not the main focus. Future research could examine entire TEPs to determine how many courses provide specific instruction on diversity instead of addressing it indirectly in one course or throughout a series of courses.

Syllabi review alone cannot determine how educators reflect upon multicultural perspectives. Future research could examine ways in which teacher candidates are required to or able to reflect on multicultural and global perspectives that draw on the histories, experiences, and representations of students and families.

Future research on this topic should consider the use of synonyms when determining responses for commonly used words and phrases, as different institutions may use varying words when describing the same ideas or concepts. Another suggestion for future studies that examine course syllabi, would be to use inter-coder reliability as a means to add validity to results.

Conclusions

Due to the increased inclusion of ELs in the general education classroom, there is an urgent need to examine teacher education for all teachers; not just teachers of EL and bilingual

specialists (Lucas & Villegas, 2013). Although there have been signs of progress, there is much work remaining to be done in order to ensure that all preservice teachers receive the proper training in order to meet the needs of EL students. Preparing to teach ELs in the mainstream classroom requires the integration of content expertise, appropriate field experiences and a vast range of resources (deJong, Harper, & Coady, 2013). Teachers must possess specialized knowledge and pedagogical skills specific to ELs and TEPs must drive candidates to take action to prevent academic inequities. Institutes of higher education and TEPs need to search for ways to actively prepare teacher candidates while incorporating authentic settings with ELs, their parents and communities, and with other professionals.

There is significant room for improvement in how teacher-education programs prepare teachers across college preparation programs, induction, and later stages of their careers (Lucas & Villegas, 2013; Samson & Collins, 2012). The preparation of general education teachers widely varies and teacher education faculty often do not possess the requisite knowledge, skills or dispositions needed in these areas (Roy-Campbell, 2013; Staehr Fenner & Kuhlman, 2012). In an effort to increase academic outcomes for ELs, there must be greater continuity in teacher-education programs and how teachers are certified and evaluated by local education agencies (Samson & Collins, 2012). Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) must shift their focus by examining their teaching faculty, their knowledge of EL instruction, and how they integrate effective EL practices into their courses (Alamillo, et al., 2011).

Findings from this and from similar studies add to the existing literature on preparing teachers to work with ELs. Preparing teachers to work with ELs is a complex process involving a plethora of factors and intertwining them into teacher education programs. It is inevitable that all preservice teachers will work with ELs at some point in their career. Therefore, it is critical

for all teacher educators to possess the skills and knowledge necessary to provide successful interventions that develop positive beliefs and effective practice.

References

Aceves, T. C., & Orosco, M. J. (2014). Culturally responsive teaching (Document No.

IC-2). Retrieved from University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development, Accountability, and Reform Center website.

Alamillo, L., Padilla, F., & Arenas, R. (2011). Focus on Faculty: Improving the Preparation of Teachers of English Learner Students. Journal of Latinos and Education, (10)3, 261-276. DOI: 10.1080/15348431.2011.581115

Baecher, L. (2012). Examining the Place of English Language Learners within the Teacher Education Curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching, (2)*1, 8-20. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5420/jct.v1n2p8

Baetcher, L, Artigliere, M., Patterson, D. K. & Spaetzer, A. (2012). Differentiated Instruction for English Language Learners as "Variations on a Theme", Middle School Journal, 43:3, 12-21, DOI: 10.1080/00940771.11461807

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review (84)*2, 191-215.

Becker, B., Dawson, P., Devine, K., Hannum, C., Hill, S., Leydens, J., Matuskevich, D., Traver, C., & Palmquist, M. (1994-2012). Case Studies. Writing @CSU. Colorado State University.

Bennett, S. V. (2012). Effective Facets of a Field Experience That Contributed to Eight Preservice Teachers' Developing Understandings About Culturally Responsive Teaching. Urban Education, 48(3), 380-419. DOI: 10.1177/0042085912452155

Casteel, C. J. & Ballantyne, K. G. (2010). *Professional Development in Action: Improving Teaching for English Learners*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.

Cheung, A. C. K. & Slavin, R. E. (2012). Effective Reading Programs for Spanish

Dominant English Language Learners (ELLs) in the Elementary Grades: A Synthesis of Research. *Review of Educational Research (82)*4, 351-395. DOI: 10.3102/0034654312465472

Cochran-Smith, M., Piazza, P., & Power, C. (2013). The Politics of Accountability: Assessing Teacher Education in the United States. *The Educational Forum (77)*, 6-27.

Collins, B. A., Samson, J. F. (2012). Preparing All Teachers to Meet the Needs of English Language Learners: Applying Research to Policy and Practice for Teacher Effectiveness.

Commins, N. L. (2014). Supporting Bilingual Learners and their Families: Key Understandings for Pre-Service Teachers and the Institutions that Prepare Them. *Association of Mexican-American Educators (AMAE) Special Issue (8)*1, 102-111.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2015). The CAEP Standards. Retrieved from http://www.caepnet.org

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. Working Papers on Bilingualism, No 19.

Daniel, S. M. (2014). Learning to Educate English Language Learners in Pre-Service Elementary Practicums. Teacher Education Quarterly.

deJong, E. J., Harper, C. A., & Coady, M. R. (2013). Enhanced Knowledge and Skills for Elementary Mainstream Teachers of English Language Learners. *Theory Into Practice (52),* 89-97

Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA). (2016). Fast Facts.

Dixon, F. A., Yssel, N., McConnell, J. M. & Hardin, T. (2014). Differentiated Instruction, Professional Development, and Teacher Efficacy. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 37(2), 111-127. DOI: 10.1177/0162353214529042

Duignan, B. (2015). Plessy v. Ferguson.

Education Commission of the States (ECS). (2014). What ELL training, if any, is required of general classroom teachers?

Education Law (2015). Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Fernandez, N. (2013). Disproportionate Classification of ESL Students in U.S. Special Education. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language-Electronic Journal, 17*(2).

Fitts, F & Gross, L. A. (2012). Teacher Candidates Learning from English Learners: Constructing Concepts of Language and Culture in Tuesday's Tutors After-School Program. *Teacher Education Quarterly*.

Fuller, E. J. (2014). Shaky Methods, Shaky Motives: A Critique of the National Council of Teacher Quality's Review of Teacher Preparation Programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 65(1), 63-77. DOI: 10.1177/0022487113503872

Gandara, P. (2015). Is U.S. Language Education Policy Outdates? Past as Prologue:

The National Academy of Education at 50. Members Reflect. Washington, DC: National Academy of Education.

Gandara P. & Santibanez, L. (2016). The Teachers Our English Language Learners Need. Educational Leadership. Retrieved from www.ascd.org

Garcia, E., Meatriz Arias, M., Harris Murri, N. J., Serna, C. (2010). Developing Responsive Teachers: A Challenge for a Demographic Reality. *Journal of Teacher Education (61),* 132-142.

Gay, G. (2013). Teaching To and Through Cultural Diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry (43)*1, 48-70. DOI: 10.1111/curi.12002

Genesee, F. (2015). Myths About Early Childhood Bilingualism. *Canadian Psychology*, *(56)* 1, 6-15.

Gorski, P. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 309-318.

Gorski, P. C. & Goodman, R. D. (2011). Is There a "Hierarchy of Oppression" in U.S. Multicultural Teacher Education Coursework? *Action in Teacher Education, 33*(5-6), 455-475. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2011.627305

Harper, C., & De Jong, E. (2010). Is ESL just good teaching? In M. Bigelow and C. Walker (Eds.), *Creating teacher community: Selected papers from the third international conference on language teaching,* pp. 115-132. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.

Hutchinson, M. (2013). Bridging the Gap: Preservice Teachers and Their Knowledge of Working With English Language Learners. *TESOL Journal*.

Kareva, V., & Echevarria, J. (2013). Using the SIOP Model for Effective Content

Teaching with Second and Foreign Language Learners. *Journal of Education and Training Studies (1*)2.

Khong, T. D. H. & Saito, E. (2014). Challenges confronting teachers of English language learners. *Educational Review (66)*2, 210-225.

Klett Gyovai, L, Cartledge, G., Kourea, L., Yurick, A., & Gibson, L. (2009). Early Reading Intervention: Responding to the Learning Needs of Young At-Risk English Language Learners. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 32, 143-162

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom.* Oxford, UK; Pergamon.

Lastrapes, W., & Negishi, M. (2012). Foundational Field Experiences: A Window into Preservice Teachers' Cultural Consciousness and Self-Efficacy for Teaching Diverse Learners. *SRATE Journal*, *(21)*1, 37-43.

Leafstedt, J. M., & Gerber, M. M. (2005). Crossover of phonological processing skills: A study of Spanish-speaking students in two instructional settings. *Remedial and Special Education, 26, 226-235*.

Lohfink, G., Morales, A., Shroyer, G., & Yanhke, S. (2012). Growing Effective CLD Teachers for Today's Classrooms of CLD Children. *Action in Teacher Education (34)*, 1, 41-54.

Loos, E., Gonzalez, G. G., Cuartas, L, Miller, M., Abdo, R., Bogart, S. (2014). History of the United States Legislative Policy and English Language Learners.

Lopez, F., Scanlan, M., & Gundrum, B. (2013). Preparing Teachers of English Language Learners: Empirical Evidence and Policy Implications. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, (21)*20.

Lopez-Reyna, N. A., Snowden, P. A., Stuart, N. M., Baumgartner, D., & Maiorano, M. J. (2012). Critical Features of Program Improvement: Lessons From Five Minority Serving Universities. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning (2)*3, 186-199.

Lucas, T. & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing Linguistically Responsive Teachers: Laying the Foundation in Preservice Teacher Education. *Theory Into Practice, (52),* 98-109. DOI: 10.1080/00405841.2013.770327

Martinez-Wenzl, M., Perez, K.C., & Gandara, P. (2012). Is Arizona's Approach to Educating Its ELs Superior to Other Forms of Instruction? *Teachers College Record, (114)*.

Martinez, R. S., Harris, B., & McClain, M. B. (2014). Practices That Promote English Reading for English Learners (ELs). Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation (24), 128-148. DOI: 10.1080/10474412.2014.903192

Matas, A., Rodriguez, J. L. (2014). The Education of English Learners in California Following the Passage of Proposition 227: A Case Study of an Urban School District. *Perspectives on Urban Education 11*(2), 44-56.

McDonald, M., Tyson, K., Brayko, K., Bowman, M., Delport, J. & Shimomura, F. (2011). Innovation and Impact in Teacher Education: Community-Based Organizations as Field Placements for Preservice Teachers. *Teachers College Record, (113)*8, 1668-1700.

McGraner, K. L., Saenz, L. (2009). Preparing Teachers of English Language Learners. TQ Connection Issue Paper on Improving Student Outcomes in General and Special Education. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

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

Migration Policy Institute (2015). ELL Information Center Fact Sheet Series: States and Districts with the Highest Number and Share of English Language Learners. National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy.

Minnesota Administrative Rule. (2016). 8710.3200 TEACHERS OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

Minnesota Administrative Rule. (2016). 8710.2000 STANDARDS OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICE FOR TEACHERS.

Minnesota Department of Education, MDE (2016). English Learners.

Minnesota Department of Education. (2012). Minnesota State Plan for Federal "Highly Qualified" Teacher Requirements.

Minnesota Learning for English Academic Proficiency and Success (MN LEAPS Act) Act. (2014).

Nasir, A. & Heineke, A. J. (2014). Teacher Candidates and Latina/o English Learners at Fenton Elementary School: The Role of Early Clinical Experiences in Urban Teacher Education. *Association of Mexican-American Educators (AMAE), (8)*1, 60-71.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2010). *Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers. Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning.*

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (2016). "Unit Standards in Effect 2008.

Oginga Siwatu, K. (2011). Preservice Teachers' Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy-Forming Experiences: A Mixed Methods Study. The Journal of Educational Research. DOI: 10.1080/00220671.2010.487081

Olivas, M. A. (2010). Plyler v. Doe: Still Guaranteeing Unauthorized Immigrant Children's Right to Attend U.S. Public Schools.

Olson, L. (2014). Meeting the Unique Needs of Long Term English Language Learners: A Guide for Educators. National Education Association.

Pang, V. O., & Park, C. D. (2011). Creating interdisciplinary multicultural teacher education. *Studying diversity in teacher education* (pgs. 63-80). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.

Parkes, J. & Harris, M. B. (2002). The Purposes of a Syllabus. *College Teaching, (50)*2, 55-61. DOI: 10.1080/87567550209595875

Potter, J. P., Hollas, T., & Coyne, J. (2015). Preparing the future: An examination of teacher quality in today's teacher preparation programs. Consortium for Educational Development, Evaluation, and Research; Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi College of Education and Human Development. ISBN 987-0-9718442-8-5.

Reddy, Y. M., & Andrade, H. (2010). A review of rubric use in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education (35)* 4, 435-448.

Roblero, B. (2013). The Importance of Preparing Teachers to Education Vulnerable Populations. *Harvard Journal of Hispanic Policy (25)*, 97-115.

Roy-Campbell, Z. M. (2013). Who Educates Teacher Educators About English Language Learners? *Reading Horizons, (52)*3, 255-280.

Rychly, L., & Graves, E. (2012). Teacher Characteristics for Culturally Responsive Pedagogy. *The Official Journal of the National Association for Multicultural Education 14*(1), 44-49. DOI: 10.1080.15210960.646853.

Salerno, A. S. & Kibler, A. K. K. (2013). Before They Teach: How Pre-Service Teachers Plan for Linguistically Diverse Students. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *(40),* 4, 5-26.

Samson, J. F., Collins, B. A. (2012). Preparing All Teachers to Meet the Needs of English Language Learners: Applying Research to Policy and Practice for Teacher Effectiveness.

Samson, J. F., Lesaux, N. K. (2009). Language-Minority Learners in Special Education: Rates and Predictors of Identification for Services. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 42*(2), 148-162. DOI: 10.1177/0022219408326221

Scott, A. N., Boynton Hauerwas, L., & Brown, R. D. (2014). State Policy and Guidance for Identifying Learning Disabilities in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 37*(3), 172-185. DOI: 10.1177/073194813507261

Sleeter, C. (2011). An agenda to strengthen culturally responsive pedagogy. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, (10)*2, 7-23.

Staehr Fenner, D. & Kuhlman, N. (2012). Preparing Pre-service Teachers To Work With English Learners. The National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.

Staehr Fenner, D. & Kuhlman, N. (2012). Preparing Techers of English Language Learners: Practical Applications of the PreK-12 TESOL Professional Standards.

Taylor, R. W. (2010). The Role of Teacher Education Programs in Creating

Culturally Competent Teachers: A Moral Imperative for Ensuring the Academic Success of Diverse Student Populations. Multicultural Education.

Tellez, K., & Manthey, G. (2015). Teachers' perceptions of effective school-wide programs and strategies for English language learners. *Learning Environmental Resources (8)*1, 111-127.

TESOL International Association, (2013). *Overview of the Common Core State Standards Initiatives for ELLs.* Alexandria, VA.

Tinkler, B. & Tinkler, A. (2013). Experiencing the Other: The Impact of Service Learning on Preservice Teachers' Perceptions of Diversity. *Teaching Education Quarterly, (40)*4, Persisting Issues and New Solutions (Fall 2013), 41-62.

Tran, Y. (2015). ESL Pedagogy and Certification: Teacher Perceptions and Efficacy. Journal of Education and Learning (4)2, 28-42.

U.S. Department of Education. (2013). *A Blueprint for R.E.S.P.E.C.T. Recognizing Educational Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching.*

United States Department of State (2011). Becoming American: Beyond the Melting Pot. *U.S. Department of State, 15* (9).

U.S. Department of Education. (2015). Developing Programs for English Language Learners.

U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *Our Future, Our Teachers: The Obama Administration's Plan for Teacher Education Reform and Improvement*. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Education (2015). Title IX — General Provisions (25) Limited English Proficient.

Valdez Pierce, L. (2012). Preparing Pre-Service Teachers to Meet TESOL/NCATE

Professional Teaching Standards. The National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (4)3.

Viesca, K. M. (2013). Linguicism and Racism in Massachusetts Education Policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives (21)*52.

Wilkinson, C. Y., Ortiz, A. A., Robertson, P. M., & Kushner, M. A. (2006). English language learners with reading-related LD: Linking data from multiple sources to make eligibility determinations. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 29(2), 129-141.

Yin, R. (2008). Case study research: Design and methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Yucesan Durgunoglu, A & Hughes, T. (2010). How Prepared are the U.S. Preservice Teachers to Teach English Language Learners? International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, (22)1, 32-41.

Zacarian, D. (2012). Serving English Learners: Laws, Policies, and Regulations.

Appendices

Appendix A: States that require ELL training of general classroom teachers (ECS, 2014)

FEDERAL LAW	School districts must provide research-based professional development to any teachers, administrators, and staff who work with ELLs. The training

	must focus on methods for working with ELLs and be long and enough and offered frequently enough to have a positive and lasting effect.
Alabama	Alabama Quality Teaching Standards require teachers to align their practice and professional learning with a number of standards including diversity standards. There are three language diversity indicators among the key indicators of the standard: • Knowledge of the process of English language acquisition and strategies to support the learning of students whose first language is not English. • Ability to differentiate between learner difficulties that are related to cognitive or skill development and those that relate to language learning. • Ability to collaborate with teachers of English language learners and to assist those students with full integration into the regular classroom.
Arizona	All classroom teachers, supervisors, and administrators must have a bilingual, ESL, or structured English immersion endorsement. The structured English immersion endorsement may be obtained through semester hours and professional development hours. Bilingual and ELS endorsements are available only through semester hours.
California	All teachers with one or more ELLs in their classrooms must have an English learner certificate or authorization.
Florida	None. However, state policy specifies the type and amount of training required for any teachers who are assigned to instruct ELLs, or who instruct ELLs using ESOL strategies or home language strategies.
Indiana	Requirements for all teaching licenses including instruction on methods for teaching English as a new language.
Kansas	Governed by the department of education's ELL guidebook or federal law rather than state policy.
Massachusetts	Teachers providing instruction in core academic subjects who provide sheltered English instruction (SEI) to ELLs must have an SEI endorsement. Any administrator supervising or evaluating a core academic teacher who is providing SEI instruction must have an SEI teacher or administrator endorsement or earn the endorsement within one year.
Missouri	To receive a mainstream teaching license or a special education license, candidates must complete coursework and demonstrate competency in content planning and delivery for English language learners.
Nevada	None. ELL training is not required for mainstream teachers but may be selected by a pre-service teacher as one of his/her course subjects, and a major or minor in ESL education is one of the allowable degrees required for a secondary teaching license. In addition, ELL training is required for teachers with a conditional teaching license in certain circumstances.
New Hampshire	Most general classroom teachers are not required to have ELL training, with a few exceptions. Reading and writing teachers must have some training in teaching methods for developing literacy of ELLs. Early

	childhood teachers must have training in bilingualism and the needs of ELLs. Finally, English language arts teachers for grades 5 and higher must have some training in the nature and needs of students whose primary language is not English.
New Jersey	Teacher preparation programs, school district evaluations, and professional development programs must align with standards that include strategies for making content accessible to English language learners and for evaluating and supporting their development of English proficiency.
New Mexico	Candidates for the elementary (K-8) and secondary (7-12) education licenses must have knowledge of using strategies to facilitate language acquisition and development. Candidates for the elementary license must have the ability to develop appropriate responses to differences among language learners. In addition, candidates for the early childhood license (through grade 3) must demonstrate knowledge of second-language acquisition and bilingualism. Districts must provide professional development to all administrators and teachers in the following areas: research-based bilingual/multicultural and/or language revitalization programs and implications for instruction, best practices of ESL instruction, English language development, and principles of language acquisition. School districts' professional development plans must also include the state's bilingual/multicultural education programs.
New York	General classroom teachers must attend an approved preparation program that includes instruction on working effectively with students from homes where English is not spoken. Starting in 2014-2015, school districts must provide professional development that address the needs of ELLs to all teachers and administrators. At least 15 percent of mainstream teachers' required professional development must focus on language acquisition, including co-teaching strategies and integrating language and content instruction for ELLs. At least 50 percent of professional development for bilingual and ESL teachers must be about language acquisition and best practices for co-teaching strategies and integrating language and content instruction for ELLs.
Oregon	None. However, any school district offering ELL programs must give licensed education personnel an opportunity to obtain training as an ESL or bilingual teacher at no cost to the personnel.
Pennsylvania	Teacher preparation programs must include coursework that addresses the needs of English language learners.
Texas	During the five-year teaching license renewal period up to 25 percent of a teacher's continuing professional education activities must include instruction about educating diverse student populations, including students of limited English proficiency.
Virginia	Candidates for mainstream teaching licenses (early/primary, elementary, middle, and secondary) must have training in teaching methods for ELLs. Teacher preparation programs in Virginia must require preservice teachers to demonstrate an ability to modify and manage learning environments and experiences to meet the individual needs of children with limited

	proficiency in English and children with diverse cultural needs. Finally, during the license renewal process local school districts must provide teachers and administrators with training on working with ELLs.
Washington	Teacher preparation programs in Washington must ensure that preservice teachers develop the following competencies to support English language development: theories of language acquisition, including academic language development; using multiple instruction strategies, including the principles of second language acquisition, to address student academic language ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds; and student cultural identity.

Appendix B: State policies regarding teaching of English language learner (ELL) students, by state: 2008-09

	State has teacher standards for ELL	State requires all prospective teachers to

State	instruction	demonstrate competence in ELL instruction
Alabama	No	No
Alaska	No	No
Arizona	Yes	Yes
Arkansas	Yes	No
California	Yes	No
Colorado	Yes	No
Connecticut	No	No
Delaware	No	No
District of Columbia	No	No
Florida	Yes	Yes
Georgia	Yes	No
Hawaii	No	No
Idaho	Yes	No
Illinois	Yes	No
Indiana	Yes	No
Iowa	Yes	No
Kansas	Yes	No
Kentucky	No	No
Louisiana	No	No
Maine	No	No
Maryland	Yes	No
Massachusetts	Yes	No
Michigan	Yes	No
Minnesota	Yes	No
Mississippi	No	No
Missouri	No	No
Montana	Yes	No
Nebraska	Yes	No
Nevada	No	No
New Hampshire	Yes	No
New Jersey	Yes	No
New Mexico	Yes	No
New York	Yes	Yes
North Carolina	Yes	No
North Dakota	Yes	No
Ohio	No	No
Oklahoma	No	No
Oregon	Yes	No
Pennsylvania	Yes	No
Rhode Island	Yes	No
South Carolina	No	No

South Dakota	No	No
Tennessee	Yes	No
Texas	Yes	No
Utah	No	No
Vermont	Yes	No
Virginia	Yes	No
Washington	No	No
West Virginia	Yes	No
Wisconsin	Yes	No
Wyoming	Yes	No
TOTAL	**33**	**3**

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, 2009; Roblero, 2013

Appendix C: List of Key Assessments

Required NCATE Category	Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	TESOL Standard
1. Licensure	PRAXIS II,	Standardized,	1a, 1b, 2, 5a

	English to speakers of other languages (Fall 2012)	norm-referenced assessment	
2. Content knowledge in ESOL	Bridging the Cultural Divide Project	Performance-based assessment	2, 5b
3. Ability to plan instruction	Unit Plan	Performance-based assessment	3a, 3b, 3c, 4c
4. Student teaching	Student Teaching Internship Evaluation	Performance-based assessment	3a, 3b, 3c, 4c
5. Effect on student learning	Assessment Toolkit	Performance-based assessment	4a, 4b, 4c
6. Professionalism	Philosophy of Teaching Statement	Performance-based assessment	5a, 5b
7. Optional	Text Analysis Project	Performance-based assessment	1a, 2

(Valdez Pierce, 2012)

Appendix D: 8710.2000 STANDARDS OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICE FOR TEACHERS

Subp. 4. Standard 3, diverse learners. A teacher must understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to students with diverse backgrounds and exceptionalities. The teacher must:

(G) Understanding how learning is influenced by individual experiences, talents, prior learning

(H) Understanding contributions and lifestyles of racial, cultural, and economic groups

(I) Understanding cultural and community diversity (how to incorporate experiences, cultures, and community resources into instruction

(Q) Using information about families, cultures, and communities as the basis for connecting instruction to experiences

(R) Bringing multiple perspectives to subject matter discussions (including attention to personal, family, and community experiences, cultural norms)

Appendix E: 8710.3200 TEACHERS OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Subp. 3. **Subject matter standards, elementary education.** A candidate must complete a preparation program for licensure under subpart 2, item C, that must include the candidate's demonstration of the knowledge and skills in items A to L.

E. A teacher of children in kindergarten through grade 6 must have knowledge of and ability to use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading instruction, including:

(2) formal and informal tools to:

(a) plan, evaluate, and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students from various cognitive, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds

Subp. 3a. **Student teaching and field experiences.** A candidate for licensure to teach elementary students in kindergarten through grade 6 must have a variety of field experiences which must include at least 100 school-based hours prior to student teaching that provide opportunities to apply and demonstrate competency of professional dispositions and the required skills and knowledge under this part and part 8710.2000.

Across the combination of student teaching and other field-based placements, candidates must have experiences at both the primary and intermediate elementary levels.

Appendix F: Center for Research, Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE) five standards for effective pedagogy

Standard	**Indicators** **The teacher…**
Joint productivity	• Designs instructional activities requiring student

	collaboration to accomplish a joint product. • Matches the demands of the joint productive activity to the time available for accomplishing them. • Arranges classroom seating to accommodate students' individual and group needs to communicate and work jointly. • Participates with students in joint productive activity. • Organizes students in a variety of groupings, such as by friendship, mixed academic ability, language, project, or interests, to promote interaction. • Plans with students how to work in groups and move from one activity to another, such as from large group introduction to small group activity, for cleanup, dismissal, and the like. • Manages student and teacher access to materials and technology to facilitate joint productive activity. • Monitors and supports student collaboration in positive ways.
Developing language proficiency in speaking, reading and writing across the curriculum	• Listens to student talk about familiar topics such as home and community. • Responds to students' talk and questions, making 'in-flight' changes during conversation that directly relate to students' comments. • Assists written and oral language development through modeling, eliciting, probing, restating, clarifying, questioning, praising, etc., in purposeful conversation and writing. • Interacts with students in ways that respect students' preferences for speaking that may be different from the teacher's, such as wait-time, eye contact, turn-taking, or spotlighting. • Connects student language with literacy and content area knowledge through speaking, listening, reading, and writing activities. • Encourages students to use content vocabulary to express their understanding. • Provides frequent opportunity for students to interact with each other and the teacher during instructional activities. • Encourages students' use of first and second languages in instructional activities.
Making meaning for students by	• Begins activities with what students already know

contextualizing teaching and curriculum	from home, community, and school. • Designs instructional activities that are meaningful to students in terms of local community norms and knowledge. • Acquires knowledge of local norms and knowledge by talking to students, parents or family members, community members, and by reading pertinent documents. • Assists students to connect and apply their learning to home and community. • Plans jointly with students to design community-based learning activities. • Provides opportunities for parents or families to participate in classroom instructional activities. • Varies activities to include students' preferences, from collective and cooperative to individual and competitive. • Varies styles of conversation and participation to include students' cultural preferences, such as co-narration, call-and-response, and choral, among others.
Teaching complex thinking	• Assures that students – for each instructional topic – see the whole picture as a basis for understanding the parts. • Presents challenging standards for student performance. • Designs instructional tasks that advance student understanding to more complex levels. • Assists students to accomplish more complex understanding by building from their previous success. • Gives clear, direct feedback about how student performance compares with the challenging standards.
Teaching through conversation	• Arranges the classroom to accommodate conversation between the teacher and a small group of students on a regular and frequent basis. • Has a clear academic goal that guides conversation with students. • Ensures that student talk occurs at higher rates than teacher talk. • Guides conversation to include students' views, judgments, and rationales using text evidence and other substantive support. • Ensures that all students are included in the

	conversation according to their preferences. • Listens carefully to assess levels of students' understanding. • Assists students' learning throughout the conversation by questioning, restating, praising, encouraging, etc. • Guides the students to prepare a product that indicates the Instructional Conversation's goal was achieved.

Source: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE, 2008)

Appendix G: The Sheltered Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model

Lesson Preparation

1. **Content objectives** clearly defined, displayed and reviewed with students
2. **Language objectives** clearly defined, displayed and reviewed with students

3. **Content concepts** appropriate for age and educational background level of students
4. **Supplementary materials** used to a high degree, making the lesson clear and meaningful (e.g., computer programs, graphs, models, visuals)
5. **Adaptation of content** (e.g., text, assignment) to all levels of student proficiency
6. **Meaningful activities** that integrate lesson concepts (e.g., interviews, letter writing, simulations, models) with language practice opportunities for reading, writing, listening, and/or speaking

Building Background

7. **Concepts explicitly linked** to students' background experiences
8. **Links explicitly made** between past learning and new concepts
9. **Key vocabulary emphasized** (e.g., introduced, written, repeated, and highlighted for students to see)

Comprehensible Input

10. **Speech** appropriate for students' proficiency levels (e.g., slower rate, enunciation, and simple sentence structure for beginners)
11. **Clear explanation** of academic tasks
12. **A variety of techniques** used to make content concepts clear (e.g., modeling, visuals, hands-on activities, demonstrations, gestures, body language)

Strategies

13. Ample opportunities provided for students to use **learning strategies**
14. **Scaffolding techniques** consistently used, assisting and supporting student understanding (e.g., think-alouds)
15. **A variety of questions or tasks that promote higher-order thinking skills** (e.g., literal, analytical, and interpretive questions)

Interaction

16. Frequent opportunities for **interaction** and discussion between teacher/student and among students, which encourage elaborated responses about lesson concepts
17. **Grouping configurations** support language and content objectives of the lesson
18. Sufficient **wait time for student responses** consistently provided
19. Ample opportunities for students to **clarify key concepts in L1** as needed with aide, peer, or L1 text

Practice & Application

20. **Hands-on materials and/or manipulatives** provided for students to practice using new content knowledge
21. Activities provided for students **to apply content and language knowledge** in the classroom
22. Activities integrate all **language skills** (i.e., reading, writing, listening, and speaking)

Lesson Delivery

23. **Content objectives** clearly supported by lesson delivery
24. **Language objectives** clearly supported by lesson delivery
25. **Students engaged** approximately 90% to 100% of the period
26. **Pacing** of the lesson appropriate to students' ability levels

Review & Assessment

27. Comprehensive **review of key vocabulary**
28. Comprehensive **review of key content concepts**
29. Regular **feedback** provided to students on their output (e.g., language, content, work)
30. **Assessment of student comprehension and learning** of all lesson objectives (e.g., spot checking, group response) throughout the lesson

Kareva, V., & Echevarria, J. (2013). Using the SIOP Model for Effective Content Teaching with Second and Foreign Language Learners. *Journal of Education and Training Studies (1*)2.

Appendix H: IHE Rubric

One rubric will be completed for each Institute of Higher Education (IHE). The number of course syllabi to be reviewed will be determined by the EPPAS document. An "x" will be placed in the box behind each element as it is identified in each syllabus. Each institution will

receive a total score, an average (if there were more than one syllabi reviewed), and a grand total score.

C1 = course 1
C2 = course 2
C3 = course 3
C4 = course 4

The overall or grand total rating score will be based (on a scale of 0-5; 5 being the "best or highest" and 0 being "lowest or information is completely missing"):

80% - 100% - exceeds criteria/excellent = 5
60% - 79% - very good = 4
40% - 59% - meets criteria/good = 3
20% - 39% - unsatisfactory = 2
0 - 19% - did not meet criteria/poor = 1

IHE:	**C1**	**C2**	**C3**	**C4**	**Average %**
MN Administrative Rule 8710.2000 (subp. 4, standard 3) Understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create adapted instructional opportunities by:					
(E) Understanding how learning is influenced by individual experiences, talents, prior learning					
(F) Understanding contributions and lifestyles of racial, cultural, and economic groups					
(H) Understanding cultural and community diversity (how to incorporate experiences, cultures, and community resources into instruction					
(O) Using information about families, cultures, and communities as the basis for connecting instruction to experiences					
(P) Bringing multiple perspectives to subject matter discussions (including attention to personal, family, and community experiences, cultural norms)					
(R) Identifying and applying technology resources to enable and empower learners with diverse backgrounds, characteristics, and abilities					
MN Administrative Rule 8710.3200 (subp. 3, section E 2 a)					
• Knowledge of and the ability to use various assessment tools (formal and informal) to plan and					

evaluate effective instruction					
• Plan, evaluate, and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students from various cognitive, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds					
• Design and implement appropriate classroom interventions for struggling readers					
NCATE Standard 4d: Diversity					
• Extensive and substantive field experiences or clinical practices o Field experiences and clinical practice support the development of educators who can apply their knowledge of diversity to work in schools with all students					
o Field experiences or clinical practices designed to help candidates understand the influence of culture on education					
o Candidates and faculty from diverse groups informs field experiences in culturally meaningful ways					
• Interact with students from a broad range of diverse groups o Candidates have the opportunity to interact with adults, children, and youth from their own and other ethnic/racial cultures					
• Experiences help candidates confront issues of diversity o Provide opportunities for candidates to understand diversity and equity in the teaching and learning process					
• Develop strategies for improving student learning and teacher effectiveness o Coursework must be designed to help candidates understand the influence of culture on education					
o Educators are able to reflect multicultural and global perspectives that draw on the histories, experiences, and representations of students and families					
• Candidates and faculty from diverse groups informs the unit's curriculum and pedagogy in culturally meaningful ways					
AVERAGE PER COURSE:					

Appendix I

Request for Approval of Research with Human Participants
In Social and Behavioral Research

Institutional Review Board for Research with Humans
Bethel University
P.O. Box 2322

3900 Bethel Drive
St. Paul, MN 55112

College and Federal policies require that each project involving studies on humans be reviewed to consider 1) the rights and welfare of the individuals involved; 2) the appropriateness of the methods used to secure informed consent; and 3) the risk and potential benefits of the investigation. Bethel has a three-level review structure, such that not all research proposals need to come to the IRB committee. The levels of review and their associated criteria may be viewed on Bethel's website. **Research may not be initiated prior to formal, written approval by the appropriate committee or person.**

A. Identifying Information

1) **Date – September 28, 2016**
2) **Principal Investigator** –
   Sarah L. Stay
   622 Meadow Lane, Albert Lea, MN 56007
   Ph# 507-318-0227
   sas42526@bethel.edu
   sarahstay@hotmail.com
3) **Co-investigators** – N/A
4) **Project Title -** *A case study of how teacher preparation programs in Minnesota are preparing elementary teachers to work with English Learners*
5) **Key Words** – *Teacher preparation, elementary, English Learners, case study, qualitative*
6) **Inclusive Dates of Project** – September 2016 – November 2016
7) **Research Advisor** –
   Katie Bonawitz, Ed.D., Graduate Education Department – Bethel University
   3900 Bethel Drive St. Paul, MN 55112 PO #2377
   651-638-6724
   katie-bonawitz@bethel.edu
8) **Funding Agency** – N/A
9) **Investigational Agents** – N/A

B. Participants

1) **Type of Participants** – Institutes of Higher Education in the state of Minnesota
2) **Institutional Affiliation** – Participants will be recruited from an online search conducted by the principal investigator.
3) **Approximate Number of Participants -** 15
4) **How Participants are Chosen** – The researcher will conduct an online search of institutes of higher education (IHEs) whose elementary education teacher preparation programs are accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).
5) **How Participants are Contacted** – Participants will be contacted by the principal investigator based on information gathered from an online search that their IHE has an elementary education program that is NCATE accredited. Participants will receive a letter sent electronically inviting them to participate in the study.

6) **Inducements** – N/A; however each participating IHE will be provided with a copy of the research.
7) **Monetary Charges** – N/A

C. Informed Consent –All participants must sign the informed consent form before the document review takes place. The informed consent form is attached to this file.

D. Abstract and Protocol

1) **Hypothesis and Research Design** –The purpose of this case study is to examine K-6 teacher preparation programs at IHEs in Minnesota with the goal of determining how preservice teachers are being prepared to meet the education needs of ELs. This study will examine K-6 teacher preparation programs at IHEs in Minnesota with the goal of determining how preservice teachers are being prepared to meet the education needs of ELs by answering the following questions: 1) How do state-approved IHE elementary licensure programs in the state of Minnesota prepare elementary education teachers at the bachelor degree level to teach EL students in their classrooms? 2) What opportunities do IHEs provide for general education teachers to gain an understanding of EL needs?
2) **Protocol** – The investigator will conduct a search of IHEs (institutes of higher education) in Minnesota, whose teacher education programs are NCATE accredited. All IHEs will be contacted for participation in the study. For anonymity purposes, each IHE will be given a code in order to protect their identity. Upon agreeing to participate in the study, each IHE will be asked to submit the following information: EPPAS documents, NCATE documentation, and course syllabi will be reviewed for attention to ELs. These documents will also be examined to identify how course elements align with the Minnesota Administrative Rule 8710.2000, Minnesota Administrative Rule 8710.3200, and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standard 4. The documents will be manually coded by the researcher and each IHE will receive an overall score according to the scoring strategy as identified in the rubric.

E. Risks

1) **Privacy** – The information being shared will be provided solely by the participants. The only identifying characteristics will be additional information regarding each IHE's enrollment, type of institution (public or private), location (urban or rural), the date of the most recent Board of Teaching approval, and type of clinical experiences required will be included also.
2) **Physical stimuli** – No known risk identified.
3) **Deprivation** – No known risk identified.
4) **Deception** – No known risk identified.
5) **Sensitive information** – All identifying information will be changed in order to protect the identity of each IHE.
6) **Offensive materials** – No known risk identified.
7) **Physical exertion** – No known risk identified.

F. Confidentiality – For anonymity purposes, each IHE will be designated a code in order to ensure anonymity. The letter "I" will represent the "institution" and the number that follows represents the IHE as it is put in a randomly ordered list. Additional information regarding each

IHE's enrollment, type of institution (public or private), location (urban or rural), the date of the most recent Board of Teaching approval, and type of clinical experiences required will also be included.

G. Signatures –
"I certify that the information furnished concerning the procedures to be taken for the protection of human participants is correct. I will seek and obtain prior approval for any substantive modification in the proposal and will report promptly any unexpected or otherwise significant adverse effects in the course of this study."
1/9/09

Dear _____,

You are invited to participate in a case study of how teacher education programs in Minnesota are preparing elementary teachers to work with English Learners. If you choose to participate in the study, I ask that you electronically send course syllabi related to courses that cover K-6 English Learner standards. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because your teacher education program is NCATE accredited. Any information obtained in connection with this study that can be identified with you will remain confidential. In any written reports or

publications, the identity of your institution, program(s), and courses will remain anonymous. I am conducting this research for my doctoral studies in the Ed. D program at Bethel University in St. Paul, Minnesota.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your future relations with Bethel University in any way. If you decide to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time without affecting such relationships.

This research project has been reviewed and approved in accordance with Bethel University's Levels of Review (Level 2: research involving curricular and instructional strategies). If you have any questions about the research and/or research participants' rights or wish to report a research-related injury, please call Sarah Stay, Lead Investigator, at 507-318-0227 or Craig Paulson, Program Director, Ed. Program at Bethel University at 651-635-8025.

You will be offered a copy of this form to keep.

_____

You are making a decision whether or not to participate. Your signature indicates that you have read the information provided above and have decided to participate. You may withdraw at any time without prejudice after signing this form should you choose to discontinue participation in this study.

_____

Signature Date

_____

Signature of Witness (when appropriate) Date

_____

Signature of Investigator Date

Appendix J

[email request]

Dear _____,

My name is Sarah Stay and I am a doctoral student at Bethel University, working on my doctoral dissertation. I am conducting research on how teacher education programs in Minnesota are preparing elementary teachers to work with English Learners by examining the syllabi of courses

that cover K-6 EL standards. Your institution was selected as a potential participant because your elementary education program is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Attached to this email are the Institutional Review Board documents which include detailed information on the study. I've contacted you as starting point; however, if you are not able to provide the requested information, it would be greatly appreciated it if you could let me know the name and contact information of the individual(s) who may be able to assist in my research.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,

Sarah L. Stay
Bethel University Doctoral Student
507-318-0227
sarahstay@hotmail.com
sas42526@bethel.edu
sarah.stay@alschools.org