

# Research Appendix

---

## *10 Key Research Areas to Support Teacher Collaboration and Co-Teaching for the Sake of ELLs*

**T**en broad topics of research or related areas of best practice are presented in this appendix to further support claims we made in Chapter 2, "Why Is Collaboration Needed?"

### **1. WHAT DO RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICE REVEAL ABOUT SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT?**

One of Cummins's (1984) most noted contributions to the field of ESOL is the distinction between what he originally labeled as Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). BICS describes the ability to use language in social contexts, whereas CALP refers to the type of language necessary to develop conceptual understanding of cognitively and academically challenging school subjects. More recently, Cummins and Man (2007) distinguish among the following three types of language skills:

1. Conversational fluency ("the ability to carry on a conversation in familiar face-to-face situations," p. 799)
2. Discrete language skills ("the learning of rule-governed aspects of language," p. 800)
3. Academic language proficiency ("the extent to which an individual has access to and command of the oral and written academic registers of schooling," p. 800)

The most important implication of this distinction is that these three language skills often have three distinctive developmental trajectories both for first and second language learners. Cummins and Man (2007) also caution that there is minimal transfer between the development of the first two skills (conversational competence and distinct language skills) and that of academic language proficiency. Thus, all three types of language skills will need to be developed using appropriate methodologies.

Among many others, Collier and Thomas's (1999) research suggests that it takes most ELLs five to seven years to develop native-like academic language proficiency and literacy. However, they documented that students with interrupted formal education (SIFE) or those whose native-language literacy was below grade level took seven to ten years to develop grade-level proficiency and literacy skills in English. Hakuta (2000) concurs that ELLs need a minimum of three to five years to develop oral proficiency (communicative skills), whereas academic English proficiency can take even longer, at least four to seven years.

While focusing on the effectiveness of dual-language programs, Collier and Thomas (2004) also discuss the importance of keeping ELLs connected to the general-education curriculum and recognizing the challenge they face to catch up to their English-speaking peers. Collier and Thomas conclude that

if students are isolated from the curricular mainstream for many years, they are likely to lose ground to those in the instructional mainstream, who are constantly pushing ahead. To catch up to their peers, students below grade level must make more than one year's progress every year to eventually close the gap. (p. 2)

Cummins (1987, 1991) claims that the linguistic and cognitive interdependence between bilingual children's first and second languages facilitates rather than impedes their language acquisition and attainment of academic English. Since then, second language researchers have repeatedly emphasized the importance of acknowledging, valuing, and incorporating ELLs' native languages and prior knowledge into instruction of grade-level subject matter in English (August, Carol, Dressler, & Snow, 2005; Rubinstein-Avila, 2006).

## **2. WHAT DO RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICE REVEAL ABOUT ACCULTURATION AND CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE TEACHING?**

Many researchers have explored the challenges of implementing culturally responsive teaching practices and the positive impacts thereof. Ladson-Billings (2000) defines *culturally relevant teaching* as "the kind of teaching that is designed not merely to fit the school culture to the students' culture but also to use student culture as the basis for helping students understand themselves and others, structure social interactions, and conceptualize knowledge" (p. 142). Similarly, Geneva Gay's (2000) extensive research on *culturally responsive education*—defined as "using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant and effective for them. It teaches *to and through* the strengths of these students. It is *culturally validating and affirming*" (p. 29)—suggests that such education helps ELLs become more connected with schools and more successful in their academic and linguistic development.

Thus, Gay (2002) urges educators to develop a type of cross-cultural understanding and cultural competence that considers the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives

of linguistically and culturally diverse students as catalysts for reaching them more successfully. She explains that *cultural scaffolding* is necessary for ELLs so they better understand the cultural norms of the classroom, the acceptable set of behaviors along with common participation structures. Teachers also need to take the time and every opportunity to recognize and successfully build on their ELLs' prior learning experiences. Téllez and Waxman (2005) poignantly remind us that "we can no longer believe that ELD (English Language Development) teaching is merely language instruction. Teachers must understand how culture and language interact in the development of youth as active participants in a democracy, as well as in the learning of English" (p. 34). Since teaching ELLs most often means teaching immigrant children or the children of immigrants, it is indispensable to have specialized knowledge of and sensitivity to students' home cultures, the twenty-first-century immigrant experience, as well as a solid understanding of how out-of-school and in-school cultural experiences interact with each other.

Based on extensive research on understanding and responding to the needs of twenty-first-century immigrant youths, Rong and Preissle (2009) make these five overall recommendations<sup>1</sup>:

1. Acknowledge the demographic trends and changes and their implications in your school: Immigration has led to the emergence of new, diverse communities that continue to transform schools. Educators must respect and capitalize on the diversity children and their families bring to the school and leave the deficit model behind.
2. Adapt curriculum and instruction to be more responsive to students' background knowledge, prior experiences, home culture, and academic/linguistic needs.
3. Create a more culturally sensitive and responsive schooling experience and learning environment for immigrant students. From learning how to pronounce their names correctly to training all school personnel to be able to maintain a culturally supportive environment, schools should make an ongoing effort to improve the learning experience for all.
4. Build partnerships and strengthen existing networks with families and communities. Understand the strengths and resources that families bring to the community, while at the same time recognizing their needs and helping them establish local connections.
5. Prepare and continue to educate all school staff on how to work with immigrant families both through teacher preparation programs and through professional-development programs.

Rong and Preissle (2009) also note that "by understanding the complexity of the immigrant experience, educators will gain an increased sensitivity to the circumstances of immigrant students in their schools and classrooms" (p. 122). We must understand that this complexity is further complicated by the fact that many more ELLs are first- or even second-generation, U.S.-born children whose English language proficiency is lacking native-like fluency.

---

1. Adapted from Rong, X. L., & Preissle, J. (2009). *Educating immigrant students in the 21st century: What educators need to know*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

### **3. WHAT DO RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICE REVEAL ABOUT BILINGUALISM AND NATIVE-LANGUAGE USE?**

Regarding ELLs' home language, Cummins (2001) claims that "to reject a child's language in the school is to reject the child" (p. 19). Therefore, schools and all teachers working with ELLs must make a conscious effort to embrace all dimensions of their language learners' identities, especially their linguistic heritage and home language use. One suggested practice is to create a supportive school setting for all students by valuing plurilingualism and making all students' languages visible and valued (Agirdag, 2009). When students' home languages are used and affirmed in school, their identities are also affirmed, and their families feel more inclined to join the school community.

Christensen (2008) also cautions that "by bringing students' languages from their homes into the classroom, we validate their culture and their history as topics worthy of study" (p. 59). In a culturally inclusive community, written and unwritten policies and practices in schools and classrooms will ensure that all students are welcome. ELLs must feel that they belong and can learn regardless of their home languages. Their home culture is affirmed when they see aspects of their out-of-school cultural and linguistic experiences reflected in the school environment and activities (signs welcoming school community members and visitors, multilingual student work displayed on bulletin boards, culturally and linguistically diverse guest speakers at assemblies, books and nonprint media in the library, music played by the school band, or sports played at recess). Christensen also notes that "approaching students' home languages with respect is one of the most important curricular choices teachers can make" (p. 62).

### **4. WHAT DO RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICE REVEAL ABOUT ELLS' LITERACY DEVELOPMENT?**

An increasing body of research is concerned with exploring effective instructional strategies that support the literacy development of culturally and linguistically diverse students. August and Shanahan (2006) led a panel of experts and edited an extensive research review on ELLs and their literacy development. They found a vast amount of publications on the topic; however, only a limited number of empirical studies had definitive results. Nonetheless, they were able to make the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. ELLs may also benefit from literacy instruction that focuses on the key components of reading—as identified by the National Reading Panel (NICHD, 2000): phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension. However, they cautioned that adjustments are necessary for enhanced outcomes among ELLs.
2. Word-level skills can be attained more successfully when instruction in the five components of reading is successful. Yet, text-level skills—such as comprehension

and writing skills—are closely aligned to oral-language development. Thus August and Shanahan suggest the development of oral proficiency in English as well.

3. ELLs' first-language oral proficiency and literacy skills can be used to assist literacy development in English.

August and Shanahan (2006) conclude that there was "surprisingly little evidence for the impact of sociocultural variables on literacy achievement or development. However, home language experiences can have a positive impact on literacy achievement" (p. 7).

Gersten et al. (2007) also conducted a comprehensive review of research on effective literacy and English language instruction for ELLs focusing on the elementary grades. Their recommendations are as follows:

1. Conduct formative assessments with ELLs to assess their progress with phonological processing, letter knowledge, word reading, and text comprehension. Based on the data, design additional instructional support and monitor ELLs' reading progress.
2. Offer intensive, small-group literacy intervention for ELLs. Among other skills, focus on the five core reading elements (phonological awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension).
3. Focus on systematic, high-quality vocabulary instruction that helps ELLs understand both difficult academic content and conversational English.
4. Develop ELLs' academic language proficiency necessary to function in general-education classes.
5. Design instructional activities for pairs of students at different levels of language proficiency so they may work collaboratively on academic tasks in a structured fashion.

A major theme that emerges in these recommendations is "the importance of intensive, interactive English language development instruction for all English learners. This instruction needs to focus on developing academic language (the decontextualized language of the schools, the language of academic discourse, of texts, and of formal argument)" (p. 2). Since this is the type of language needed to be successful in the general-education classroom, with grade- and age-appropriate content materials and on standardized tests, teacher collaboration to support such language development is critical.

Panofsky et al. (2005) note a significant absence of research on writing instruction for adolescent ELLs in U.S. schools. Nonetheless, their report concludes the following:

1. Effective teacher feedback should be specific: it should (a) use examples from ELLs' own writing, (b) rely on specific information from the students' personal experiences or shared texts, and (c) offer indirect error correction, which requires students to correct their error identified by the teacher.
2. If peer editing is used, it should be explicitly taught by modeling and be monitored to be effective.



3. ELLs need more direct writing instruction, which should be supported by instruction in oral-language development and structural, skills-based instruction in their general-education classes.

In addition, there are several other promising findings and practices related to ELLs' literacy development. Mindful of the complexities of second language development, Williams (2001) suggests that teachers of ELLs "encourage students to read at their reading level—not at their oral proficiency level" (p. 751).

## **5. WHAT DO RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICE REVEAL ABOUT DEVELOPING ELLS' ACADEMIC LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY?**

Ma (2002) notes that English-as-a-second-language (ESL) instruction is often assumed to consist of programs "in which students receive specific periods of instruction aimed at the development of English language skills, focusing on grammar, vocabulary, and communication rather than on academic subjects" (p. 4). However, many practitioners and researchers also reported that ESL programs have evolved or are being augmented to address age- and grade-appropriate, general-education content-area standards. As early as 1988, Freeman and Freeman reported that since the beginning of the 1980s, the focus of ESL instruction has shifted from merely building linguistic competence to also addressing academic language and math, science, and social studies curricula. Content-based ESL, Sheltered Instruction, followed by several other models and approaches emerged in response to this shift in focus.

### **Sheltered Instruction and the SIOP Model**

Various interpretations of *sheltering* have been developed to enable ELLs to study grade-appropriate content that their monolingual English counterparts are exposed to. A common characteristic of all sheltered classes is that ELLs receive special assistance to help them understand general-education course content while also developing a broad range of language skills. In the 1990s, Echevarria, Vogt, and Short along with a large team of ESL and general-education practitioners developed a comprehensive model known today as the *Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol* or SIOP (2008).

The SIOP Model consists of eight major components (Preparation, Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction, Practice/Application, Lesson Delivery, and Review/Evaluation) and 30 subcomponents or instructional strategies centering on the concept that each lesson teachers deliver must be built on matching language and content objectives to allow ELLs to acquire both necessary linguistic skills and academic content knowledge.

The features that most set SIOP apart from high-quality instruction for native English speakers include (a) extended wait time, (b) teaching key vocabulary, (c) adapting content to ELLs' background knowledge and language proficiency levels, (d) language objectives, (e) clarification in the students' native language, (f) modifying one's speech

to be appropriate for ELLs' proficiency levels, (g) using a range of supplementary materials, and (h) explicitly connecting new learning to student background experiences.

## Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach

The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach, or CALLA (Chamot & O'Malley, 1987, 1994), is a model that integrates content instruction, academic language development, and explicit learning strategy instruction. CALLA is supported by cognitive learning theory and incorporates 18 distinct learning strategies: Chamot and O'Malley suggested that teachers systematically incorporate a choice of five metacognitive strategies (Advance Organization, Selective Attention, Organizational Planning, Self-Monitoring, and Self-Evaluation), 10 cognitive strategies (Resourcing, Grouping, Note Taking, Summarizing, Deduction, Imagery, Auditory Representation, Elaboration, Transfer, and Inferencing), and three social and affective strategies (Questioning for Clarification, Cooperation, and Self-Talk) in each lesson.

Chamot and O'Malley (1994) also created a framework for explicitly teaching language learning strategies by offering a five-step sequence for introducing, presenting, practicing, evaluating, and expanding and applying learning strategies to new contexts in other classes. By adding purposeful strategy instruction to language and content goals, ELLs become more self-directed learners and become actively participating learners (Chamot, 1995). CALLA may be used in ESL and general-education classrooms. Instructional activities encourage student participation, cooperative learning, and higher-order thinking.

## ExC-ELL

Calderón (2007) conducted extensive research on effective content-based literacy instructional practices for adolescent ELLs and designed what she named Expediting Comprehension for English Language Learners (ExC-ELL). ExC-ELL is a lesson planning and delivery system consisting of the following 10 key components (pp. 14–15)<sup>2</sup>:

1. Content standards, objectives, indicators, purpose, outcomes, and targets
2. Parsing of text by teachers
3. Summarization/overview of unit, lesson, chapter
4. Background building of concepts
5. Review previous lesson/concepts/content
6. Systematic vocabulary instruction
7. Formulate questions for drawing background knowledge
8. Engagement with text
9. Consolidation of content and skills
10. Assessments

2. Adapted from Calderón, M. E. (2007). *Teaching reading to English language learners, Grades 6–12: A framework for improving achievement in the content areas*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Most recently, Dong (2009) highlighted ways in which content-based instruction lends itself to teacher collaboration:

Sometimes two teachers collaborate to give content-based instruction (CBI). One of the teachers is a content specialist and the other an ESL specialist. They may teach the class together or the class time may be divided between the two of them. For example, the content specialist will give a short lecture and then the English teacher will check that the students have understood the important words by reviewing them later. This kind of team teaching requires teachers to work closely together to plan and evaluate classes. (p. 30)

## **6. WHAT DO RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICE REVEAL ABOUT EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES?**

According to Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock (2001), the following nine instructional strategies are most likely to lead to improved student achievement:

1. Identifying similarities and differences
2. Summarizing and note taking
3. Reinforcing effort and providing recognition
4. Assigning homework and ensuring opportunities for practice
5. Using nonlinguistic representations
6. Implementing cooperative learning
7. Setting objectives and providing feedback
8. Generating and testing hypotheses
9. Using cues, questions, and advance organizers

Jane Hill and Kathleen Flynn (2006) adapted Marzano et al.'s (2001) *Classroom Instruction That Works* to guide teachers of English language learners on how to use best practice in their classes. Based on an extensive meta-analysis conducted by the McREL researchers, Hill and Flynn suggest that the same nine instructional strategies may be used for ELLs when carefully scaffolded and differentiated based on ELLs' stages of language acquisition. The strategies revised for ELLs are as follows:

- Identifying similarities and differences between and among concepts
- Helping students learn to synthesize and organize information through summarizing and note-taking techniques
- Reinforcing students' efforts and providing recognition of linguistic development and academic achievements



- Offering meaningful opportunities to review new information and apply new knowledge through adapted homework and scaffolded practice
- Encouraging the use of nonlinguistic representations, thus using visual, tactile, and kinesthetic modalities
- Using cooperative learning to enhance student interactions
- Setting clear objectives and providing meaningful feedback
- Generating and testing hypotheses
- Activating students' prior knowledge and helping them process new information through cues, questions, and advance organizers

Hill and Flynn's approach supports the belief that when the same strategies are used by general-education and ESL teachers collaboratively, consistency of instruction enhances student learning. We also support the notion that careful adaptations of each of these strategies are necessary for optimal results.

## **7. WHAT DO RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICE REVEAL ABOUT CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT AND MAPPING?**

Udelhofen (2005) identifies curriculum mapping as a process "that is respectful of the knowledge of every teacher, encourages collaboration and reflection, and is sensitive to the complexities of student learning and the teaching profession" (p. 3). The most prevalent feature of curriculum mapping lies in its flexibility, since the process allows for addressing the changing curriculum needs of school districts. In addition, it invites active participation from all teachers and depends on their expertise and collaboration. Throughout the curriculum-mapping process, teachers engage in both reflecting on the taught curriculum and planning for the future. Both backward (journal) mapping and forward (projection) mapping invite teachers to create current, reality-based, and standards-aligned curricula.

Glatthorn, Boschee, and Whitehead (2006) caution that high-quality instruction requires clear, explicit learning goals. In too many schools, they observed a disconnect among key components of effective schooling: State standards, district curriculum guides or frameworks, the teachers' instructional plans and their actual lesson delivery, and the assessment measures used are often disjointed. "Curriculum alignment is a process of ensuring that the written, the taught, and the tested curricula are closely congruent," Glatthorn et al. argue (p. 278). It is also suggested that aligning curriculum vertically and horizontally will be closely tied to teacher professional-development activities that allow teachers to examine their own practices and collaboratively improve instruction for their students.

Though neither Udelhofen (2005) nor Glatthorn et al. (2006) focus specifically on the purpose and outcome of curriculum mapping or alignment for the sake of ELLs, such curriculum development practices are expected to result in enhanced understanding of the general-education curricula by ESL teachers and the ESL curriculum by general-education educators, thus resulting in a more enhanced, shared responsibility for ELLs.

## **8. WHAT DO RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICE REVEAL ABOUT TEACHER TEAMING AND CO-TEACHING?**

Teacher teaming and co-teaching have been researched for several decades. In a recent synthesis of research findings, Spraker (2003) notes that certain factors have been found to affect the quality of teaming and its impact on student learning. These include (a) administrative support, (b) training for participating on teacher teams, (c) clarity in team organization, (d) longevity of teams and their membership, (e) time for planning and ongoing discussions, (f) and integrating content and instructional practices.

Numerous research publications have addressed collaboration among general- and special education teachers (see, for example, Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007); similar attention to ESL collaboration is just emerging. As early as 1992, Fradd discussed the potential outcomes of teacher collaboration implemented to serve all kids with special needs, including ELLs. Among others, Davison (2006) extensively researched collaboration among ESL and content-area teachers with a special emphasis on the nature and challenges of developing collaborative and co-teaching relationships. She used the term *partnership teaching* (also commonly used in research and publications originating in the UK; see, for example, Creese, 2002, 2004, 2005) and emphasized that

Partnership Teaching is not just another term for "co-operative teaching." Co-operative teaching is where a language support teacher and class or subject teacher plan together a curriculum and teaching strategies which will take into account the learning needs of all pupils, trying to adjust the learning situation to fit the pupils. Partnership Teaching is more than that. It builds on the concept of co-operative teaching by linking the work of two teachers, or indeed a whole department/year team or other partners, with plans for curriculum development and staff development across the school. (pp. 454–455)

The most important question on teachers' and administrators' minds might be, "Does it yield increased student achievement?" An emerging line of research is documenting the impact of teacher collaboration and co-teaching on student learning. Pardini (2006) describes the results of an ongoing, multiyear initiative in the St. Paul Public Schools in Minnesota, where traditional ESL programs have been completely replaced by a collaborative program model. ESL and general-education teachers on all grade levels team teach. Pardini notes that

between 2003 and 2005, the gap in reading achievement between the district's ELL and non-ELL students fell from 13 to 6 percentage points, as measured by the percent of students showing proficiency on the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment. In math, the gap fell from 6.7 to 2.7 percentage points. The district's ELL students also did well when compared with their peers statewide, outscoring them in each of the last three years in reading and math as measured by the Test of Emerging Academic English. (p. 21)

In fact, ELLs in Saint Paul Public Schools have made steady gains on all standardized tests administrated in the state in closing the achievement gap between ELL and non-ELL students.

In 2007, York-Barr, Ghre, and Sommers investigated the process and outcomes of a three-year implementation of a collaborative inclusive ELL program model. They not only noted that teachers shared “a strong and nearly unanimous sense that students were highly advantaged by the inclusive and collaborative instructional models—academically, socially, and in terms of classroom participation” (p. 321), but also reported positive achievement gains due to the collaborative practices. Most recently, Causton-Theoharis and Theoharis (2008) also noted significantly increased reading achievement scores over a three-year period in a Madison, Wisconsin, school that moved to a full inclusion model eliminating all pull-out services both for special education students and ELLs. Through an extensive restructuring of the school that used already existing human resources and required no extra cost, collaboration and co-teaching practices became the dominant service delivery format yielding impressive achievement results.

## 9. WHAT DO RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICE REVEAL ABOUT TEACHER LEARNING?

Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, and Bransford (2005) systematically reviewed research as well as classic and current theoretical frameworks on how teachers learn and develop in their profession. After applying the three broad principals of *How People Learn* (National Research Council, 2000) to teacher learning, they suggest the following:

1. Prospective teachers should enter the classroom with preconceived notions about how teaching works, which inevitably affects their future practice. This initial understanding conditions what and how they will learn as they enter the profession of teaching.
2. To be able to apply what teachers know, they must have
  - a. a strong theoretical foundation and factual knowledge base,
  - b. a solid understanding of facts and ideas within the context of a conceptual framework, and
  - c. an organizational framework and mechanism to retrieve and respond to new knowledge.
3. To take charge of their own learning and be able to understand and manage new situations as they arise in the classroom, teachers need to develop a metacognitive approach to their own learning.

Based on Joyce and Showers' (1980, 1988) and others' earlier work on professional learning, DuFour and Berkey (1995) conclude that when teachers participate in training, they learn best if they have an opportunity to experience the following: Teachers must have an understanding of the theory and research that supports the innovation. The trainer must offer a hands-on demonstration, while teachers need initial practice in the innovation. To ensure successful implementation, teachers need constructive feedback on their efforts followed by on-going coaching until the innovation becomes an integral part of their repertoire.

In addition, McLaughlin and Talbert (2006) also suggest that teachers learn best as members of communities of practice. New knowledge and skill development is especially effective when teacher learning is facilitated in a supportive environment with the following four approaches intertwined (we added key questions that may guide teachers as they engage in collaborative learning practices):

- Knowledge-centered
  - What are the key problems and issues?
  - What practices have been used?
  - What essential knowledge and skills do we need to solve the identified problems?
- Learner-centered
  - In what way(s) can I use my personal or professional interests and background knowledge and skills?
  - How can I connect my prior knowledge and well-established skills to the new information presented to me or explored collaboratively?
- Assessment-centered
  - How can I get ongoing feedback on my understanding and implementation of new content and skills?
  - Who will be available to guide me and support my learning?
- Community-centered
  - How are my peers involved in collaborative explorations of new content and skills?
  - How can we build upon each other's knowledge and skills to create new understandings and practices?

## **10. WHAT DO RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICE REVEAL ABOUT PROFESSIONAL-DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING COMMUNITIES?**

Sergiovanni (2000) offers a leadership framework for school administrators to create a unique *culture, community, and personal meaning* in our schools. He notes that

community is at the heart of a school's lifeworld. It provides the substance for finding and making meaning and the framework for culture building. Think of community as a powerful antioxidant that can protect the school's lifeworld, ensuring that means will serve ends rather than determine them. Communities are collections of people who come together because they share common commitments, ideas, and values. (p. 59)

Sergiovanni discusses five key dimensions of a professional-learning community, which we have adapted to the ESL context here:

1. Learning communities
  - a. All members of the school community are deeply engaged in lifelong learning.
  - b. Learning is differentiated to match the learners' abilities and needs.
  - c. Learning is valued both as an activity and as a way of life.
2. Collegial communities
  - a. All members of the school community are meaningfully connected to each other.
  - b. A common vision and mission is articulated and implemented.
  - c. Shared goals are pursued by all members.
  - d. A sense of camaraderie, interdependence, and mutual obligation pervades the community.

3. Caring communities
  - a. All members of the school community are committed to the well-being of others.
  - b. Concern, thoughtfulness, and respect are not just displayed but are morally embedded in actions.
4. Inclusive communities
  - a. All members of the school community are respected.
  - b. Linguistic, cultural, ethnic, and all other differences are accepted and valued.
  - c. A sense of belonging permeates the community.
5. Inquiring communities
  - a. All members of the school community are engaged in collective inquiry.
  - b. All members participate in collaborative problem solving.

Most recently, Darling-Hammond and Richardson (2009) have reviewed 20 years of research on effective teacher learning and professional development. They examined the content, context, and design of high-quality professional development. Their conclusions are that teachers learn most effectively when

(a) their content knowledge is addressed as well as how to best convey that knowledge to their students; (b) they understand how their students acquire specific content; (c) they have the opportunities for active, hands-on learning; (d) they are empowered to acquire new knowledge, apply it to their own practice, and reflect on the results; (e) their learning is an essential part of a reform effort that connects curriculum, assessment, and standards; (f) learning is collaborative and collegial; and (g) professional development is intensive and sustained over time. (p. 49)

Darling-Hammond and Richardson note that the most successful framework for teachers' professional learning is one based on professional-learning communities.

## A FINAL NOTE

This appendix is not designed to be all-inclusive; it merely highlights key areas of research and a knowledge base that general-education and ESL teachers may benefit from sharing. For further reading on current research related to effective strategies for English learners, please see the following:

- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does—and does not—say. *American Educator*, 32(2), 8–44.
- Goldenberg, C., & Coleman, R. (2010). *Promoting academic achievement among English learners: A guide to the research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Short, D. J., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners—A report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.