

## **Methods for Teaching ESOL**

### **Unit 1 Content**

English language learners represent the fastest growing segment of the school-age population (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2002). Between 1979 and 2003, the overall number of school-age children aged 5-17 increased by 19 percent. During this same period, the number of children who spoke a language other than English at home and who spoke English with difficulty (i.e., those who spoke English less than “very well,” and who are thus considered “English language learners”) grew by 124 percent (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2005). Projections suggest that “language minority students” (those who speak a language other than English at home and who have varying levels of proficiency in English) will comprise over 40 percent of elementary and secondary students by 2030 (Thomas & Collier, 2001). (Flynn & Hill, 2005)

The sheer growth of ELL representation within our classrooms necessitates the honest conversation about how we are meeting the academic needs of all students framed by an educational setting that is shifting toward new academic standards and new ways of evaluating the impact that we are making on all students. In order to gain perspective on where we are going, it is often important to see how far we have come. Let’s begin by understanding some of the historic legislation and educational policies that have led to the development and shaping of the ESOL program as it is in Florida today.

Many of you have heard of the META Consent Decree before, but do you know how it directly impacts your school and your students today? Let’s take a look at the Consent Decree briefly review what it is all about.

#### ***A Summary of The Florida Consent Decree***

In August 1990, a judge of the United States District court, Southern District of Florida, signed a Consent Decree giving the court power to enforce an agreement between the Florida State Board of Education and a coalition of eight groups represented by Multicultural Education, Training, and Advocacy, Inc. (META). The coalition of Florida legal services attorneys drafted this agreement regarding the identification and provision of services to students whose native language is other than English. The plaintiff organizations involved in the case represented a broad spectrum of the civil rights/educational community. They were:

- League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
- ASPIRA of Florida
- The Farmworkers’ Association of Central Florida
- Florida State Conference of NAACP Branches
- Haitian Refugee Center
- Spanish American League Against Discrimination (SALAD)
- American Hispanic Educators’ Association of Dade (AHEAD)
- Haitian Educators’ Association

The Consent Decree addresses first and foremost the right of English language learners to **equal access to all educational programs**. It also serves to comply with federal and state laws regarding the education of English language learners in the State of Florida.

The META Consent Decree settlement terms focus on the following six areas:

<b>META Consent Decree</b>
Identification and assessment
Equal access to appropriate programming
Equal access to appropriate categorical and other programming for limited English proficient (LEP) students
Personnel
Monitoring
Outcome measures

The following is a synopsis of the six areas addressed in the META Consent Decree. To read the Decree in its entirety, log onto <http://www.firn.edu/doe/omsle/cdesec1.htm>.

### **Identification and Assessment**

All students with limited English proficiency must be identified in a timely manner in order to provide appropriate services. In the interim, the student shall receive ESOL services until the initial assessment is complete. If there is a question about whether a student qualifies as an ELL student, an ELL meeting must be convened. The parent(s)' preference will be considered in the final determination. Schools must have a system in place to properly assess the student's prior education in order to develop an appropriate instructional program for the student. Special care should be exercised to ensure that a student's limited English proficiency is not a factor in determining the student's level of knowledge/skills in the basic subject areas. Each ELL student will receive appropriate ESOL services and funding until the student is reclassified as English proficient. Lack of ESOL funding does not relieve schools of their legal obligation to provide appropriate services to ELL students beyond the six years of State ESOL program funding.

### **Equal Access to Appropriate Programming**

ELL students are entitled to equal access to programming in accordance with their levels of English proficiency, academic and special needs. ELL students shall be given access to intensive English instruction and instruction in the basic subject areas. This instruction shall be comprehensible, equal, and comparable in scope, sequence, and quality to that provided to non-ELL students in the same grade level. Textbooks and other instructional

materials used with ELL students must be the same as those used with non-ELL students in the same grade level.

**Equal Access to Appropriate Categorical and Other Programs for English Language Learners**

ELL students are entitled to equal access to programs such as compensatory, exceptional, early childhood, vocational, drop-out prevention, support services, and adult education, regardless of their English proficiency or immigration status.

**Personnel**

All teachers responsible for the instruction of ELL students must register for ESOL endorsement training. Requirements for training are dependent upon a teacher’s subject area certification. The specific training requirements for teachers of ELLs are:

ESOL Training Requirements	
<b>Category I teachers</b> (English/Language Arts/Elementary classroom teachers)	5 courses for a total of 300 inservice hours of training. These inservice courses may be combined with approved university courses.
<b>Category II teachers</b> (Math, Science, Social Studies, Computer Literacy)	1 course for a total of 60 inservice hours of training.
<b>Category III for teachers</b> (related subjects other than Category I or Category II (i.e. P.E., Music, Pre-K, Art, etc))	1 course for a total of 18 inservice hours of training.
<b>Category III for Student Service Providers</b> (School Psychologists, Speech/Language Pathologists, & Social Workers <b>Only</b> )	1 course for a total of 18 inservice hours of training.
<b>Category IV personnel</b> (Guidance Counselors and School-Based Administrators)	1 course for a total of 60 inservice hours of training.

A copy of the required training courses and the timeline for completion of these courses can be found at <http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/esol/Eng/ESOLEndorsement.htm>.

**Monitory Issues**

The Florida Department of Education will monitor school districts for compliance with the programmatic requirements for ELL students. Monitoring shall determine compliance in the following areas:

- Identification and assessment of ELL students
- Instruction of ELL students
- Employment of qualified personnel
- Parental involvement

## **Outcome Measures**

The Florida Department of Education will have a system in place to evaluate and address equal access and program efficacy in regard to ELL students.

## **Other Important Legislation and Litigation**

### **Lau v. Nichols (1974)**

We cannot discuss the legal basis for bilingual education without mentioning the landmark United States Supreme Court decision in Lau v. Nichols.

In 1969, a group of Chinese students sued the San Francisco Unified School District. In their suit, the plaintiffs claimed that they were denied access to a meaningful education because they could not understand the education they received. They claimed the school violated Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

The Court found for the plaintiffs, but did not specify a remedy for their complaint. Instead, the court noted that several solutions were possible, including native-language instruction and ESL classes. As Piatt noted (1990), Lau did not establish a constitutional right to bilingual education or even a requirement that districts provide primary-language content instruction.

Lau was, however, a catalyst for public policy. In the wake of the Lau decision, for example, New York City entered into a consent decree in the ASPIRA case and significantly expanded services to ELL students in New York City. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also promulgated regulations regarding the identification and assessment of ELL students and the delivery of services to them. Although the regulations were never formally adopted, they were used as a de facto guide to Lau compliance by school districts and consequently had a far-reaching effect on programming for ELL students across the country. In addition, after Lau, several states enacted legislation mandating services for ELL students. In 1974, the Supreme Court ruled that the ELL students were receiving fewer benefits than the English-speaking majority students. The ruling did not specify how to remediate this, but did affirm that, under the law, special training for ELL students was required as a condition of federal aid to public schools. This ruling led school districts and several states to enact legislation requiring services for ELL students (*Empowering ESOL Teachers, 2000.*)

<http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=us&vol=414&invol=563>

### **The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) is a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 with significant changes. It requires all children to demonstrate proficiency in reading and mathematics by 2014. Additionally, it addresses the needs of all children, including those from varying socioeconomic, ethnic and cultural backgrounds. NCLB emphasizes teacher quality, school accountability, increased flexibility and local control, and parental choices (Coady et. al., 2003)

### **Title III**

Title III, Part A of NCLB, which targets limited English proficient students, replaces Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title VII previously served only a small fraction of the estimated 4.4 million ELL students nationwide through competitive grants. Unlike Title VII, Title III funds are allocated to states based on the number of ELL students and the number of recently immigrated students. In turn, districts receive Title III funds based on this formula (Coady et. al., 2003)

#### ***How does Title III assist ELL students?***

- helps to ensure that ELL students receive the same access to challenging state academic content and meet the same achievement standards as native speakers of English;
- assists state and local educational agencies to establish, implement, and sustain language instruction education programs for ELL students;
- holds state educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools accountable for the improvements in English proficiency of ELL students each year; and
- holds state educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools accountable for increases in core content knowledge by showing adequate yearly progress of ELL students.

Note:

*The part of the NCLB budget that allocates millions of dollars for English language acquisition for ELL students is Title III, Part A, which replaced Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of NCLB. Title III funds are allocated to states based on the number of ELL students and the number of recently immigrated students.*

Below is a list of traditional and most commonly implemented instructional models for English language learners and a brief description of each:

### **Approaches to Second Language Instruction**

Second language development can take place in the context of many different models, approaches, and methodologies. Teachers must choose from a wide array of methods and materials according to the needs of the learner, availability, preferences, and constraints of the school or setting. Teaching activities that focus on grammatical accuracy may be quite different from those that focus on communicative skills. (Richards, p. 22, 1994)

Approaches to second language instruction can be divided into two categories; the **communicative approaches**, and the **grammar-based approaches**. The following gives you an overview of the types of approaches most widely used in second-language learner classrooms:

**(1) Inclusion or Mainstream**

In an inclusion model, students are taught in English during the entire day. Inclusive education calls for shared responsibility by all educational professionals working with ESOL students. Inclusive education also calls for comprehensive provision of first-rate services and full access to those services by ALL students. These include, among others, district-approved and challenging curriculum, safe and well equipped mainstream classrooms, appropriate assessment, fully and appropriately certified teachers, and other educational specialists and resources. Instruction in basic subject areas is provided to ELL students based on programmatic assessment, irrespective of English language proficiency.

**(2) Self-Contained**

Instruction is provided to ELL students in a self-contained classroom. ELL students are receiving ESOL instruction during the entire school day without having to be pulled-out of the classroom. Instruction includes Language Arts and content subject areas using ESOL methods and strategies. Several ESOL levels may be placed in the same classroom as long as all students receive adequate instruction at their proficiency level.

**(3) Two-Way Bilingual Programs**

In addition to subject-content mastery, the goal of the program is that all students become functionally proficient in a second language. Therefore, students receive instruction half of the day in English and half of the day in another language.

**(4) Transitional Bilingual Programs**

This program provides ELL students with the opportunity to receive instruction in their native language while learning English. In some cases, students are pulled out of the regular classroom and placed with a teacher who can provide subject matter instruction in the student's first language. These students also receive Language Arts through ESOL instruction and ESOL subject-matter instruction and in other cases, if the classroom teacher is bilingual, students receive home language instruction and ESOL Language Arts plus ESOL Content in a self-contained classroom setting. The goal of transitional bilingual programs is to transition students into the mainstream program as quickly as possible. In some cases, ELL students are transitioned too quickly before they are ready to succeed in an all-English environment.

**(5) Sheltered English**

In sheltered English classrooms, students are taught subject matter entirely in English using special teaching techniques even though they are still limited in English language proficiency (Peregoy and Boyle, 1993). Given the many languages that are represented in our schools, sheltered content instruction is one strategy that is effective only if the students already have acquired basic English skills. Sheltered instruction is not a program in and of itself, but is part of a comprehensive program that must be combined with primary language instruction for those who are non-English speakers or at the beginning levels of English (Salinas, 1993).

It is important to remember that the lack of language ability does not mean a lack of concept development or a lack of ability to learn. Teachers should continue to ask inferential and higher order questions (questions that require reasoning ability, hypothesizing, inferring, analyzing, justifying, and predicting) that challenge the student to think. The language used by the teacher need not be complex for thinking skills to be exercised as shown in the model developed by Jeanne Foote of Montebello Unified School district and replicated below:

#### **(6) ESOL Content-Based Instruction**

Content-based instruction shifts the teaching focus from the language to the content areas. For example, in a content-based history class, ELL students are taught and tested on their knowledge of history and on their mastery of language forms. Language is easily incorporated into instruction. Students acquire the second language through active student discussion of the history lesson and through accompanying reading and writing materials and activities. This model is most likely to be implemented in classrooms with students from a wide variety of ethnic and linguistic backgrounds by an ESOL and subject classroom teacher or a bilingual teacher and subject classroom teacher planning thematically designed units of instruction. Content will be adapted to ELL language proficiency level when necessary.

#### **(7) ESOL Pull-Out**

ESOL pull-out enables teachers to provide instruction using ESOL methodology for part of the day. Students spend a portion of their school days in a mainstream classroom and are pulled out of the classroom for instruction in English. A regular class period is set aside for ELL students to study English using ESOL instruction. Students may be grouped according to their language proficiency level. Some schools group students in Resource Centers. Schools that subscribe to this model create a center that includes reading and other special materials for ELL students. Students are pulled out of their classes or go at a set time to the resource center for special instruction in English. It is important to note that students may not be pulled out from content instruction to be taught English.

When selecting a program model, the State of Florida requires that understandable instruction be provided in all course areas using ESOL strategies. Each such course has been structured in conformity with ESOL strategies for teaching ELL students basic subject matter. Each course is taught by qualified personnel and appropriate materials are available to such personnel. Students are learning and progressing toward the completion of the district's pupil progression plan.

the focus of instruction shall be substantive subject matter knowledge, parallel and comparable to that provided to non-ELL students in basic subject-areas, consistent with state-required curriculum frameworks and student performance standards. Such instruction must incorporate appropriate instructional materials.

#### **Summary**

ELL students in ESOL basic subject area classrooms shall have access to the instructional support of an individual proficient in the represented home languages, in addition to a trained ESOL subject area teacher. Schools with at least 15 students speaking the same native language shall provide at least one instructional aide or teacher proficient in the same language and trained to assist in ESOL basic subject area instruction. The District's ELL Plan must specifically address how the district will meet the needs of students in their native language by the use of teachers, aides, parents, and volunteers proficient in the language(s).

Now that we have taken some time to understand some of the important legislation and educational shifts impacting instruction of ELLs, let's take some time to understand some of the key players that have impacted the instructional approaches for ELLs.

Choose one of the recognized researchers/authors who have profoundly impacted education for ELLs. You may use the links provided, but please feel free to broaden your research to other sources as well. Read about this expert's influence on the education of ELLs and write a summary of how this pedagogy or policy is reflected within the ESOL program at your school and in your classroom. Provide specific examples. This will be part of your assignment for this unit.

**Jim Cummings:**

<http://esl.fis.edu/teachers/support/cummin.htm>

[http://www.everythingsl.net/in-services/bics\\_calp.php](http://www.everythingsl.net/in-services/bics_calp.php)

<http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/106048/chapters/How-Students-Acquire-Social-and-Academic-Language.aspx>

**Stephen Krashen:**

[http://www.colorincolorado.org/searchresults/?cx=004997827699593338140%3Afnpf5wd9ngs&cof=FORID%3A11&ie=UTF-8&q=stephen+krashen&sa.x=0&sa.y=0&siteurl=www.colorincolorado.org%2Feducators%2Fquestions%2Fprofessional\\_development%2](http://www.colorincolorado.org/searchresults/?cx=004997827699593338140%3Afnpf5wd9ngs&cof=FORID%3A11&ie=UTF-8&q=stephen+krashen&sa.x=0&sa.y=0&siteurl=www.colorincolorado.org%2Feducators%2Fquestions%2Fprofessional_development%2)

[http://www.everythingsl.net/in-services/comprehensible\\_input\\_output\\_70140.php](http://www.everythingsl.net/in-services/comprehensible_input_output_70140.php)

**Virginia Collier and Wayne Thomas:**

[http://www.everythingsl.net/in-services/\\_long\\_does\\_take\\_learn\\_english\\_55843.php](http://www.everythingsl.net/in-services/_long_does_take_learn_english_55843.php)

<http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/ResBrief10.html>

<http://www.ascd.org/publications/researchbrief/v2n05/toc.aspx>

**Diane August**

<http://www.cal.org/create/about/Bio-August.html>

<http://www.cal.org/topics/ell/working-group.html>

[http://www.air.org/news/index.cfm?fa=viewContent&content\\_id=1323](http://www.air.org/news/index.cfm?fa=viewContent&content_id=1323)