

5-2018

# Meeting the Needs of Long-Term English Learners: A Review of the Literature

Stephanie Shockley

*St. Cloud State University*, [shockles@gmail.com](mailto:shockles@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://repository.stcloudstate.edu/ed\\_etds](http://repository.stcloudstate.edu/ed_etds)

---

## Recommended Citation

Shockley, Stephanie, "Meeting the Needs of Long-Term English Learners: A Review of the Literature" (2018). *Culminating Projects in Teacher Development*. 37.

[http://repository.stcloudstate.edu/ed\\_etds/37](http://repository.stcloudstate.edu/ed_etds/37)

This Starred Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Teacher Development at theRepository at St. Cloud State. It has been accepted for inclusion in Culminating Projects in Teacher Development by an authorized administrator of theRepository at St. Cloud State. For more information, please contact [modea@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:modea@stcloudstate.edu), [rswexelbaum@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:rswexelbaum@stcloudstate.edu).

**Meeting the Needs of Long-Term English Learners:  
A Review of the Literature**

by

Stephanie Shockley

A Starred Paper

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

St. Cloud State University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Science in

Curriculum and Instruction

May, 2018

Starred Paper Committee:

Hsueh-I Lo, Chairperson

Ramon Serrano

Jerry Wellik

## Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction.....	4
Purpose of Study .....	4
Research Questions .....	7
Use of Findings .....	7
Definition of Terms.....	7
2. Review of the Literature .....	10
Historical and Current Context of Long-Term English Learners .....	11
Characteristics of Long-Term English Learners .....	12
English Language Development in Secondary Schools for Long-Term English Learners .....	25
3. Conclusions and Recommendations .....	44
Conclusions.....	45
Recommendations.....	46
Implications for the Classroom.....	48
References.....	53
Appendices	
A. Immigrant Student Typologies .....	57
B. Seven Basic Principles for Meeting the Needs of Long-Term English Language Learners.....	59
C. Eight Components of Successful School Programs.....	60
D. Table 1.1 Guidelines for ELD Instruction .....	65

Chapter	Page
E. Figure 3.2 Blueprint for Instruction of Adolescent English Learners .....	67
F. Long-Term English Learner Dedicated Courses— A Planning Checklist .....	69

## Chapter 1: Introduction

### Purpose of Study

In recent years, educators and policymakers have recognized the large number of English learner (ELs) students in secondary schools who, despite many years in U.S. schools and despite approaching the age at which they should be eligible to graduate, are still not English proficient and face major academic struggles. Such students have been identified as long-term English learners (LTELs). Menken and Kleyn (2010) found that for the majority of LTELs educational programming in the United States, including elementary and middle school, can be characterized as largely *subtractive*. They noted that “their native languages have not been fully developed in school and instead have been largely replaced by English” (pp. 399-400), due to an emphasis on literacy development in English only. Not only has education in the U.S. for LTELs been characterized by inappropriate programming, it is also often fractured. From interviews conducted with students in New York City, Menken, Kleyn, and Chae (2012) identified one category of LTELs as “students with inconsistent U.S. schooling, whereby the system has shifted them between bilingual education, ESL programs, and mainstream classrooms with no language support programming” (pp. 127-128).

Furthermore, although most LTELs are born in the U.S. and have been enrolled in U.S. schools from kindergarten, they may not have necessarily lived in the country continuously (Olsen, 2010). Students in this category spend some time in schools in the U.S., and some time in schools in their country of heritage. Repeated and prolonged transnational moves throughout the education of LTELs result in gaps in knowledge from non-alignment of curricula across nations, a cessation of both English and home language development, and a pattern of adjustment

and readjustment that includes new decisions about language placement and program each time students return to the U.S. (Menken, Kleyn, & Chae, 2012). This lack of consistent language development in both English and the home language leaves significant academic and linguistic gaps in the lives of LTEL, as well as adding to a belief that students are not as capable as their peers (Olsen, 2010).

In addition to the distinct academic and language challenges stemming from the educational experience of LTELs, specific needs associated with engagement and behavior associates with academic success have also been identified in these students. In exploring the perceptions of long-term English learners about their school history, including program placement and academic outcomes, Kim and Garcia (2014) found students viewed themselves as motivated, active learners who no longer identified as ELs and almost all of whom had postsecondary aspirations of attending college to pursue their interests. They described their school experiences as positive but challenging. Yet, when analyzing student academic documents, there appeared “a track record of insufficiently developed English proficiency and continuous academic failure through high school, as reflected in their performance on state assessments” (Kim & Garcia, 2014, p. 306), revealing a gap between students’ postsecondary aspirations and the reality of their academic performance.

Research (Olsen & Jaramillo, 1999) first identifying long-term English learners as a particular population with certain characteristics appeared approximately 20 years ago, but recent research includes not only the needs of LTELs as a specific group of students but how to meet their needs. Researchers (Goldenberg, 2008; Menken, 2013; Menken, Kleyn, & Chae, 2007; Olsen, 2010; Olsen, 2012; Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010) investigating best practices in

educating long-term English learners have drawn from a combination of previous English learner research, hypotheses emerging from English learner research, and research focused on LTELs. The action research base focused particularly on long-term English learners is still small but has yielded encouraging results. Interventions analyzed range from separate English language development classes designed for LTELs to sheltered instruction to heritage language classes or language classes for native speakers to explicit language and literacy instruction across all content areas. The purpose of this study was to review the literature that examines: (1) the emergence of long-term English learners as a growing population with distinct linguistic and academic needs, and (2) the programmatic and instructional practices developed and implemented by educators at the secondary level to ensure educational access and opportunity.

My own interest in the language development of long-term English learners stems from my work with middle-grade English learners in both an academic language support class and content classes. The majority of these students have been classified as long-term English learners or future long-term English learners. They exhibit many of the same patterns of behaviors and academic and language challenges as those commonly used to describe long-term English learners. Long-term English learners have become a concern across the urban district within which I work, as well as neighboring districts. The District currently funds a program specific to supporting long-term English learners. The program was begun over 20 years ago as a youth engagement and enrichment program but shifted scope and focus approximately 5 years ago after identifying a large population of LTELs in the District. In the neighboring district, current questions about proficiency levels of intermediate English learners has drawn attention from the media, prompting programmatic changes to support these specific students.

## Research Questions

Two research questions guided the development of this study:

- What are the educational and linguistic backgrounds of long-term English learners?
- How are educators addressing the needs of long-term English learners in secondary schools?

To answer identified research questions, this study reviews the literature on:

- Long-term English learners (LTELs)
- English language development in secondary schools

## Use of Findings

Findings from this study may be used within my own classroom and school or in other districts to determine the most appropriate and effective language programming for long-term English learners in secondary schools. Information gathered in this study may also serve as potential topics for action research within my Professional Learning Community during the subsequent academic school year. Finally, this research may also encourage further research regarding the changing landscape of learning English as an additional language in United States schools.

## Definitions of Terms

- **Basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS):** Language skills needed in social situations; everyday language needed to interact socially with other people; often referred to as the “language of the playground.”
- **Bilingualism/biliteracy:** Proficiency in the four modalities of language—listening, speaking, reading writing—in English and a native or home language; however, does

not address the fact that linguistic ability may include a third, fourth, or even fifth language.

- **Cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP):** Formal academic learning; this includes listening, speaking, reading, and writing about subject area content material; often referred to as the “language of school.”
- **Emergent bilingual:** Alternative term for long-term English learner that focuses on the creative and dynamic ways students use language.
- **English language development (ELD):** Instruction designed specifically to advance English learners’ knowledge and use of English in increasingly sophisticated ways; maximizes capacity to engage successfully in academic studies taught in English and minimizes language barriers when engaging in academic studies in mainstream English classrooms.
- **English language learner or English learner (ELL or EL):** Student who speaks another language in addition to English; focuses on what students are learning or trying to do, and what they have in common
- **English as a Second Language:** Instruction for students learning English as a language in addition to a native or home language; does not address the fact that linguistic ability may include a third, fourth, or even fifth language.
- **Limited English Proficient:** Official state-designated label for students whose first language is not English; focuses on what students cannot do and emphasizes inability and deficiency.

- **Long-term English learner:** Student who speaks another language in addition to English, has been enrolled in U.S. schools for 6 years or more, and designated as receiving English language support
- **Translanguaging:** The fluid language practices of bilinguals who use their linguistic resources flexibly to construct meaning; there is no separation between English and another language in practice.

## Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study was to review the literature that examines: (1) the emergence of long-term English learners as a growing population with distinct linguistic and academic needs, and (2) the programmatic and instructional practices developed and implemented by educators at the secondary level to ensure educational access and opportunity. Current research on Long-term English learners (LTELs) and English language development (ELD) in secondary schools are reviewed in this chapter. Within the chapter, the following section headings are used to identify the areas necessary to understanding long-term English learners as a distinct student population and the pedagogy designed, applied, and analyzed to meet their needs:

- Historical and Current Context of Long-Term English Learners
- Characteristics of Long-Term English Learners
  - Enrolled in weak language development program models.
  - Distinct, highly complex, and dynamic language practices.
  - Struggle academically.
  - Habits of disengagement, invisibility in school, and little development of behaviors associated with academic success.
- English Language Development in Secondary Schools for Long-Term English Learners
  - School-wide research and best practices.
  - Stand-alone English language development courses.
  - Instruction throughout the day.
  - Bilingual and biliteracy programming.

## **Historical and Current Context of Long-Term English Learners**

The number of students identified as English language learners (ELLs) in United States public schools during the 2014-2015 academic year was an estimated 4.6 million students, or approximately 10% of total student enrollment (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2016). In recent years, educators and policymakers have recognized the large number of English learners in secondary schools who, despite many years in U.S. schools and despite approaching the age at which they should be eligible to graduate, have still not acquired the language and academic skills required to succeed in standards based coursework (Olsen, 2010). Such students have been identified as long-term English learners (LTELs). In New York City, LTELs constitute approximately one-third of all English learners in grades 6 through 12 (Menken & Klyen, 2010; Menken, Kleyn, & Chae, 2012). Long-term English learners have been the majority (59%) of secondary school English Learners in California, with LTELs constituting more than 75% of English Learners in one out of three school districts (Olsen, 2010). Sacramento alone reported three out of four (74%) English learners as having been in California schools for 7 years or more and still without the English skills necessary for academic success (Californians Together, 2014). In 2012, California became the first and only state in the union to pass legislation that set an official definition for LTELs and criteria for identifying students at risk of becoming LTELs (Californians Together, 2014).

While concern and research with this particular group of students has risen in the last decade, Olsen and Jaramillo (1999) initially identified the population in the mid-1990s as one of four typologies of secondary school Limited English Proficient (LEP) students with specific and differing needs—accelerated, college-bound; newly-arrived, in the ESL sequence; under-

schooled, and “Long-Term Limited English Proficient” students (see Appendix A for definitions of the four typologies). The one group not represented among the typologies are English Learners that are normatively developing both linguistically and academically. Long-Term Limited English Proficient students were defined as “students who have been designated as LEP for 7 years or longer, who are no longer in the ESL sequence but, for a variety of reasons, are not yet able to re-designate as English-fluent” (Olsen & Jaramillo, 1999, p. 212). Long-Term LEP students were also characterized as having been born in the United States, educated in the United States their entire lives, yet frequently read and write significantly below grade level, and because they were no longer a part of the ESL sequence in secondary school, barely remembering any dedicated language services from elementary school (Olsen & Jaramillo, 1999). Freeman, Freeman, and Mercuri (2002) also identified long-term English learners as one of three main groups of English learners in United States schools—newly arrived with adequate schooling, newly arrived with limited formal schooling, and long-term English learner. The authors defined Long-term English learners as having been in the U.S. 7 or more years, below grade level in reading and writing, adequate grades but low test scores, inconsistent ESL or bilingual instruction, and a false perception of academic achievement due to passing grades for simply turning in work.

### **Characteristics of Long-Term English Learners**

Building on her research since 1999, Olsen (2010; 2014) has defined “Long Term English Language Learners” as students who have been enrolled in U.S. schools for 6 years or more, are stalled in progressing toward English proficiency without having yet reached a threshold of adequate English skills, and are struggling academically. Long-term English

learners differ from other English learners in that they are not new arrivals, but have been in the United States for 5 to 7 or more years, and many were born in the U.S with the vast having been in U.S. schools since kindergarten. These students exhibit a particular set of linguistic and academic characteristics that *have developed throughout the course of their schooling experience in the United States* by the time LTELs arrive in secondary schools (Olsen, 2010). However, it is important to note LTELs exist within a continuum, extending from students who are failing and whose proficiency is decreasing to those who are just managing to get by in school with very low grades and whose English proficiency has remained at the same level for multiple years to those who have average performance in school and whose proficiency is slowly progressing (Olsen, 2010).

The latter group on the continuum may be students who are simply taking longer to achieve English proficiency but will eventually get there, or they may be students who have become fatigued with taking a language proficiency test annually, do not recognize the implications of their scores, and therefore no longer perform seriously—thus scoring at low levels of English proficiency despite having sufficient proficiency to do well academically in English-taught curriculum (Olsen, 2010). However, the overall number of students that fit this category is most likely not extremely significant. A Californians Together survey conducted by Olsen (2010) asked 13 districts for the number of English learners in United States schools for 6+ years receiving at least two Ds or Fs in core content classes in the past year and to calculate standardized test scores in English Language Arts by number of years the learner has been enrolled in United States schools. While most districts were unable to produce this figure, the addition of the academic failure criteria by those districts able to produce the data reduced the

total count of LTELs only somewhat (Olsen, 2010). Combining inadequate progress toward English proficiency, academic success, and designated number of year in United States schools decreases the percentage of LTELs in California from 59% to 54% of secondary school English learners (Olsen, 2010).

**Enrolled in weak language development program models.** By common definition, English learners enter school without the English skills and proficiency necessary for full access to core curriculum. School consists of learning English while simultaneously attempting to master core content through instruction in a language they do not understand. Programs, support, curriculum, and instruction has the power to impact English language proficiency growth and academic success in these students. Bilingual education theory suggests that subtractive schooling can have negative consequences for students' academic performance whereas academic proficiency in both languages enables students to acquire the full benefits of bilingualism (Menken & Kleyn, 2010). Due to an emphasis on literacy development in English only, elementary and middle school programming for the majority of LTELs in the United States can be characterized as largely *subtractive* "in that their native languages have not been fully developed in school and instead have been largely replaced by English" (Menken & Kleyn, 2010, pp. 399-400).

Twenty-one students in a New York City study conducted by Menken and Kleyn (2010) received both ESL and bilingual education, seven received only ESL, and one student was only educated in bilingual programs while in the United States. Students also moved between language programs, with over half showing a complete gap in their ESL or bilingual services when they received English-only programming in mainstream classrooms for a period of 1-3

years (Menken & Kleyn, 2010). Although most students had participated in bilingual programming at some point in their education prior to high school, they attended ‘weak’ bilingual programs and did not do so consistently (i.e., schooling was interspersed with sustained periods of attending English-only programs) (Menken & Kleyn, 2010). In spite of research stating that such opportunities are correlated with school success, sufficient opportunities to fully develop their native language literacy skills were unavailable for all but one student, posing consequential challenges to academic literacy acquisition in English and the native language (Menken & Kleyn, 2010).

Prior schooling and language policy for the large number of long-term English learners in California secondary schools has also been largely subtractive. Studies of cumulative file records of 48 LTELs in California indicated that three out of four received no services or no language development program at all, with 12% of LTELs potentially spending their entire schooling in mainstream classes with no services (Olsen, 2010). Despite the difficulty in determining the English language services students actually receive in California because service categories and labels change, and because data reported may or may not reflect what actually occurs in the classrooms,

trends in placement into California’s “instructional settings” and “English Learner services” ten years ago and five years ago show that very few students (and a declining number) received primary language instruction, more than a third (and increasing numbers) received no services and were placed in mainstream settings, one out of five just received English Language Development (ELD) with no support for access to content, and the others received English-only instruction. (Olsen, 2010, p. 14)

In addition to the issue of language program model, a history of inconsistent programming is a contributing factor to their designation as still not English proficient and struggling academically. Menken, Kleyn, and Chae (2012) identified one category of LTELs as “students with inconsistent U.S. schooling, whereby the system has shifted them between bilingual education, ESL programs, and mainstream classrooms with no language support programming” (pp. 127-128). Twenty of the 29 LTELs in the New York City study fell into this category, and students within this category were further divided into four sub-categories:

(a) students who change from bilingual to ESL programming or vice versa, when moving from one school to the next, depending on each school’s language policy; (b) students who have received inconsistent programming within the same school, being moved from ESL to bilingual classes, or vice versa, each year, due to incoherent school-based language policies; (c) the absence of ESL/bilingual programming altogether; or (d) students who attend multiple schools, beyond the typical three-school sequence in the United States of elementary–middle–high school. (Menken, Kleyn, & Chae, 2012, p. 128)

Olsen (2010) noted that inconsistency also occurs as students move through grades within a school and experience annual changes to the language programs and instruction provided.

Another category of LTELs identified by Menken, Kleyn and Chae (2012) are “transnational students, who have moved back and forth between the United States and their families’ countries of origin” (p. 128). Though most LTELs are born in the U.S. and have been enrolled in U.S. schools from kindergarten, they may not have necessarily lived in the country continuously (Olsen, 2010). Students in this category spend some time in schools in the U.S.,

and some time in schools in their country of heritage. Menken, Kleyn, and Chae (2012) found that 12 of the 29 students in the New York City study were transnational students and spent longer than a vacation or summer in a country of origin, typically staying at least one academic year. Repeated and prolonged transnational moves throughout the education of LTELs result in gaps in knowledge from non-alignment of curricula across nations, a cessation of both English and home language development, and a pattern of adjustment and readjustment that includes new decisions about language placement and program each time students return to the U.S. (Menken, Kleyn, & Chae, 2012).

For long-term English learners, inconsistent schooling leads to limited opportunities for academic language development in both their home language and English and results in an accumulation of challenges that affects their academic success in school.

**Distinct, highly complex, and dynamic language practices.** While LTELs share some characteristics with other groups of students, native speakers and English learners alike, they have their own distinct challenges with both the English language and their home language. Many students are orally bilingual for social purposes but have limited academic oral and literacy in English and their native language (Menken, Kleyn, & Chae, 2012; Olsen 2010; Olsen & Jaramillo, 1999). Long-term English learners are “still acquiring basic English syntax, grammar, structures, and vocabulary that native English speakers have by virtue of growing up in homes where English was the spoken language” (Olsen, 2010, p. 22).

Jim Cummins (as cited in Zwiers, 2008) used the terms *basic interpersonal communicative skills* (BICS) and *cognitive academic language proficiency* (CALP) to describe the difference between social language and academic language. Social language (BICS) is often

less complex and less abstract; it is accompanied by extra-linguistic clues such as pictures, realia, facial expressions, and gestures (Zwiers, 2008). Because social language is less formal and used to build relationship; it is the language of the playground, the home, and shopping. On the other hand, academic language (CALP) is more complex, abstract, and lacks extra-linguistic support (Zwiers, 2008); it is the language of school necessary to process lectures and lessons. In his observations, Cummins (as cited in Zwiers, 2008) observed that schools assumed academic proficiency in students due to their fluency in social language and placed large numbers of them in mainstream classes where they performed poorly without language support.

Since Cummins' development of the terms BICS and CALP, other ideas of academic language have emerged. Dutro and Moran (as cited in Zwiers, 2008) defined *academic language proficiency* as “the abilities to construct meaning from oral and written language, relate complex ideas and information, recognize features of different genres, and use various linguistic strategies to communicate” (p. 20). Zwiers (2008) described academic language as “the set of words, grammar, and organizational strategies used to describe complex ideas, higher-order thinking processes, and abstract concepts” (p. 20) that can be further divided into the general academic terms of thinking and literacy used across disciplines and the content-specific terms essential to understanding language arts, history, math, and science. Many long-term English learners remain at intermediate levels of English proficiency or below, still working to develop their academic language proficiency, and those at higher levels still have not developed their academic language enough to be redesignated or reclassified as English proficient.

Cummins (as cited in Wright, 2010) contended that it takes English learners approximately 1-2 years to develop BICS, but that it takes 5 years or more for learners to

develop CALP at the same level as their native English-speaking peers. This distinction is helpful in clarifying the difference between English learners and long-term English learners, but it also reveals an implicit power structure in how language proficiency has been defined, or the monolingual view of standardized language. The challenges facing LTELs are compounded by the rigid and “monoglossic” structures (Garcia as cited in Menken, 2013) in the design and practices of secondary schools. Rather than viewing LTELs through a monolingual lens that portrays them as limited or deficient Menken (2013) used the term “emergent bilingual” to emphasize the creative and dynamic ways these students actually use language. Some research has gone so far as to suggest long-term English learners are “dual nonnative speakers” (Singhal as cited in Menken, 2013), or languageless in both their home language and English. Instead, Menken, Kleyn, and Chae (2007) viewed these students as attempting to form an identity within discourses that disregard the complexity of their hybrid existence and their “translanguaging” ability, or a fluidity between English and Spanish or any other language.

Flores, Kleyn, and Menken (2015) argued that the construction of the LTEL category works to marginalize language practices of communities of color, stripping even U.S.-born students of native-speaker status. For example, “in the United States a monolingual English speaker who never mastered academic discourse would not be considered an ELL, and yet somebody who is bilingual must master academic discourse to be considered fully proficient in the language” (Flores, Menken, & Kleyn, 2015). The authors further argued that the system within which long-term English learners are evaluated, academic language and literacy skills, produces institutions such as school that privilege the monolingual White norm and perpetuates supremacy. While categories and labels such as long-term English learner are helpful in

identifying the specific areas of academic support needed for this population, Flores, Menken, and Kleyn (2015) asserted that the LTEL term is more harmful than helpful due to its privileging speakers of one variety of language and discounting students' full linguistic range and its place in school.

**Struggle academically.** When given the Academic Language and Literacy Diagnostic in English and Spanish, students from the New York City study conducted by Menken and Kleyn (2010) read and wrote at 3 years below grade level in English and 3.5 years below grade level in Spanish. The majority of LTELs also remain at intermediate levels of English proficiency or below while others might reach higher levels of proficiency but do not attain sufficient academic language to be reclassified (Olsen, 2010). Because linguistic and academic challenges are closely related, many students also have significant gaps in academic background knowledge. As stated by Olsen (2010), "if students don't know the language used for instruction, they miss some or all of the academic content that is taught in a language they don't comprehend" (p. 26). Long-term English learners often struggle academically. It is not unusual for their grades to plummet, with the typical grade point average being less than 2.0 (Olsen, 2010). In the New York City sample, the cumulative high school grade average of students was 69.2% (equivalent to a D+ average), six students had failing averages in school, and many students had been retained at grade at some point, sometimes repeatedly (Menken, Kleyn, & Chae, 2010). However, the one student educated in bilingual programs throughout his schooling in the U.S. had a cumulative grade average of 90%, the highest of all students in the sample, and eventually went on to pass the statewide English proficiency test and exited the ELL status (Menken, Kleyn, & Chae, 2010). Standardized test scores for LTELs show performance in math and English

language arts as below grade level, with gaps apparent by fourth grade and students demonstrating some of the lowest performance of any student group by eighth grade (Olsen, 2010).

Olsen (2010) reported that policy, program development, curriculum resources, and professional development have worked to address educational access and opportunity by focusing primarily on English learners in the elementary grades. Yet, more than one in three English learners in California schools are in the secondary grades, with the group representing 18% of the total secondary school enrollment. It was projected that by the time elementary English learners entered the secondary grades, they would have developed the skills to participate in academic learning alongside their English proficient peers. This assumption meant that those English learners actually enrolled in secondary schools would be more newly arrived immigrants. However, the current reality is that many English learners in middle and high schools have been educated in United States schools since kindergarten, and as a group are struggling academically, making little to no progress in English proficiency, and face disproportionately high dropout rates in high school.

One issue with the approach in elementary schools for English learners in California is the adoption of materials and programs that provide “universal access” to students instead of curriculum and instruction specifically designed for English learners (Olsen, 2010). In 2002, the State Board of Education implemented English Language Arts textbook programs that provided supplemental materials to help with English learner access, but a study of these materials concluded they “offered little specific English learner assistance to students or teachers” (Calfee as cited in Olsen, 2010, p. 16). Moreover, corrective action for schools showing consistent

underachievement—many of them for their English learners—required the texts be used with fidelity, meaning no deviation from the prescribed professional development and pedagogy. Teachers, administrators, and coaches reported difficulty in following pacing guides normed for native English speakers with fidelity and still meet the particular needs of English learners (Olsen, 2010). Olsen (2010) asserted that inappropriate programs, support, curriculum, and instruction leave students struggling to understand concepts in a language not yet mastered and does not support proficiency in the English language or home languages.

In addition to curriculum inappropriate to their needs, Olsen (2010) found that English learners experienced a lack of exposure to a full and enriched curriculum in California. While by definition an English learner only has partial access to much of the social studies, science, and language arts curriculum due to only partial mastery of the English language, the development of academic language occurs through the use of language to learn academic content and experience the world. Social studies and science are particularly rich content areas for learning English; however, a statewide survey in 2009 showed that almost two-thirds (65%) of schools placed into Program Improvement or High Priority Grant status due to low achievement of the English learner subgroup reported that corrective actions required more hours of the academic day to be spent on English Language Arts and Math (Olsen, 2010). This ultimately resulted in reduced access to science and social studies. Students no longer received science and social studies at all in 17% of the schools; English Learners did not get art or music at all in 28% of the schools; and reduced art and music occurred in almost half of the schools as part of their corrective action.

**Habits of disengagement, invisibility in school, and little development of behaviors associated with academic success.** Statements gathered from teachers participating in focus groups included comments such as:

‘They are well-behaved, but they don’t do the work.’ ‘They come in with their hoods over their head and put their head down on the desk – not causing trouble, trying to not call attention to themselves.’ ‘They try to stay under the radar.’ They never talk, they don’t do their work.’ I have trouble getting them to be active in class.’ (Olsen, 2010, p. 24)

However, long-term English learners themselves do not view their behavior in the same way. In interviews and focus groups conducted with LTELs by administrators, counselors, and teachers, these students reported enjoying school, did not find the work hard, and feel they are being successful students (Olsen, 2010). Furthermore, when one school district surveyed reclassified Fully English Proficient students in Advanced Placement classes and LTELs in Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) class for ELS, behaviors exhibited by the two groups differed with the biggest differences being

in the amount of reading done outside of classes, comfort in approaching academic texts, the habits of writing down what their homework assignments were, the depth of understanding about assignments and expectations, habits of seeing help, and recognition that they were supposed to participate in class discussions. (Olsen, 2010, p. 25)

In an effort to restructure services offered to English learners, Ventura Unified School District in California focused on long-term English learners at the high school level. Their first step in developing pathways to academic success was to gather input from their students. In

addition to interviews with 12<sup>th</sup>-grade English learners in the level-four English Language Development class asking what the school could do better for them, teachers conducted academic behavior surveys to find out more about how English learners use strategies known to support academic success. Results from the surveys were compared to surveys completed by students Advanced Placement U.S. history classes at the school. Findings from the survey showed that high school ELs reported a very low frequency of reading outside school as compared to the Advanced Placement students who reported reading outside school in the middle frequency range (Robles, 2010).

Kim and Garcia (2014) explored the perceptions of long-term English learners about their school history, including program placement and academic outcomes. Two major themes emerged from their individual, semi-structured and in-depth interviews with 13 high school LTELs about their language and academic learning experiences: students viewed themselves as motivated, active learners who no longer identified as ELs and almost all of whom had postsecondary aspirations of attending college to pursue their interests, and they described their school experiences as positive but challenging (Kim & Garcia, 2014). Yet, when analyzing student academic documents, Kim and Garcia (2014) found “a track record of insufficiently developed English proficiency and continuous academic failure through high school, as reflected in their performance on state assessments” (p. 306), revealing a gap between students’ postsecondary aspirations and the reality of their academic performance. Almost half of the participants also had a history of retention or retention recommendation, and student cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) on the *Woodcock–Muñoz Language Survey–Revised*

(WMLS-R) ranged from Level 1 (negligible) to Level 3.5 (limited-to-fluent) (Kim & Garcia, 2014).

It should be noted the study by Kim and Garcia (2014) was conducted with a very small sample size of only 13 students, focusing on depth over breadth, and all researchers relied on students' self-reporting and recollections of school experiences, which could be incomplete and/or selective and contain certain inaccuracies. Similarly, analysis of school records is subject to limitations due to the use of archival data, wherein evidence of actions or deliberations or the absence of information cannot be guaranteed to signify that these events did or did not occur in reality—only that they were or were not recorded. Nevertheless, the research and data provide new and important understandings of students struggling at the secondary school level in spite of 5-7 years of bilingual education or English learner services in the elementary grades, prompting examination of the adequacy of language and academic supports for the English learner student population.

### **English Language Development in Secondary Schools for Long-Term English Learners**

Olsen (2010) and Menken and Kleyn (2010) have determined there are few designated programs or formal approaches designed for long-term English learners. Olsen (2010) reported long-term English learners at the secondary level continue to be placed in programs similar to what they received in elementary school, consisting of “inappropriate placement in mainstream (no program); being placed and kept in classes with newcomer English Learners, being taught by largely unprepared teachers; over-assigned and inadequately served in intervention and support classes; being precluded from participation in electives, and with limited access to the full curriculum” (Olsen, 2010, p. 2). LTELs have neither access to dedicated instruction in English

language development, one of the components of effective English learner education most strongly supported by research, nor exposure to a full and enriched curriculum, impeding their academic language development (Olsen, 2010). At the high schools studied by Menken and Kleyn (2010),

LTELLs take the same classes as all other ELLs and no services are specifically targeted to their needs. As a result, LTELLs in our sample are currently enrolled in ESL programs and/or bilingual education, with the majority only in ESL programs. Many also attend foreign language classes taught in their native language. Not only do LTELLs receive no specialized services, but also many of the services they do receive are mismatched to their actual language abilities and learning needs. (p. 407)

In the foreign language classes mentioned, LTELLs are mixed with non-native speakers and instructed in basic grammar and vocabulary that assumes no proficiency (Menken & Kleyn, 2010). At other times, students were placed in challenging native language literacy classes that do not take into account the absence of strong native language instruction in the prior schooling of LTELLs (Menken & Kleyn, 2010). As Kim and Garcia (2014) discovered in their study, and supported by Olsen (2010), research and district inquiries into LTELLs find that the majority of this population want to go to college despite the fact that academic records and courses they are taking (and not taking) in high school have greatly limited the chances of these students graduating actually prepared to attend college.

**School-wide research and best practices.** To address the challenges presented by older English learners in both content areas and specialized classes such as reading interventions and

language development, Freeman, Freeman, and Mercuri (2002) developed four keys for success for schools. The first key to success involves engaging students in challenging, theme-based curriculum to develop academic concepts. Paralleling practices consistent with research on effective schools, Freeman, Freeman, and Mercuri (2002) emphasized that educators of linguistically and culturally diverse students follow a set of principles issued by the U.S. State Department of Education. The principles include high expectations for both language and content, building on previous experiences of students, considering language and cultural backgrounds in assessment, and recognizing responsibility for the success of English learners as shared among all educators, the family, and the greater community.

Rigorous or intellectually challenging curriculum should draw on personal experiences of students, making the construction of meaning actually meaningful as well as fostering a low-anxiety environment. Meaningful instruction also included organizing curriculum around themes, allowing increased student involvement through the act of becoming “experts” on a subject (Garcia as cited in Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2002). Effective teachers of older English learners also insisted their students become active participants in their education by including drama and cross-age tutoring in their lessons. Furthermore, teachers provided students with multiple opportunities to develop their English language skills by drawing on their first-language strengths.

The second key to school success with older English learners, including LTELs, proposed by Freeman, Freeman, and Mercuri (2002) communicated the need to draw on students’ background—their experiences, cultures, and languages. Acknowledging students’ specific backgrounds, and even the challenges faced at becoming a competent bilingual, is important in

demonstrating that these older students are accepted. Validating the native languages and cultures of LTELs works to frame their background and experiences as assets, not liabilities, for both teachers and the students themselves. Fostering a sense of strength instead of weakness in students helps create a pathway to the third key to success: building students' academic English proficiency. Freeman, Freeman, and Mercuri (2002) cited the need for collaborative activities and scaffolded instructions. Collaborative activities encourage students to work with each other and the teacher to reach instructional goals while also providing students with opportunities to use conversational and academic language appropriately (Chang as cited in Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2002). Scaffolded instructions and instructional conversations also allow students to develop academic concepts and language as well as access the processes involved in academic work.

The fourth key to success is less of a recommendation for effective practice as it is a result of implementing the other three keys: creating confident students who value school and value themselves as learners. Freeman, Freeman, and Mercuri (2002) stated:

In schools where teachers provide challenging curriculum, build on students' backgrounds, languages, and cultures; and organize collaborative, scaffolded instruction to help students build academic English proficiency, the students become more confident. They begin to value themselves as learners and to value school. In the process, they start to close the gap between their current proficiency level and the level schools expect for students their age. (p. 60)

In order for this to truly occur in schools, teachers who are often overwhelmed by the needs of their students must feel supported in their work through professional development, curriculum

development, and policy and guideline development (Paiewonsky as cited in Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2002).

Building upon the four keys to success developed by Freeman, Freeman, and Mercuri (2002) in her research with educators analyzing the data surrounding LTELs, Olsen (2014) identified “Seven Basic Principles for Meeting the Needs of Long Term English Language Learners” (Appendix B). These include a sense of urgency, recognizing distinct needs, providing language, literacy, and academics that address accrued academic gaps, affirming students’ home languages and providing development whenever possible, emphasizing rigor, relevance, and relationships, integration into mainstream classrooms, and active engagement and ownership of education. Understanding the needs of long-term English learners aids educators in the next step of ensuring language development and thereby academic progress in this population: developing a comprehensive course of action for long-term English learners.

**Stand-alone English language development courses.** At the top of “Eight Components of Successful School Programs” (Appendix C), Olsen (2014) listed a specialized English Language Development course designed for LTELs (separate from other English Language Learners) that emphasizes writing, academic vocabulary, active engagement, and oral language. Students should participate in a dedicated class designed to specifically address the language gaps that impede the academic success of LTELs. Rather than acting as an intervention, the course stands alone as a language development and academic language support class (Olsen, 2012). In California, Olsen (2012) studied four sites piloting courses for their long-term English learners after examining the data and identifying large numbers of LTELs in their student populations. While each school or district approached the design and implementation of its

LTEL course differently—district committee or working group versus teacher determination of content and curriculum, where and how the courses fit into the overall schedule and curriculum scheme—the content across the piloted courses contained similar components.

When teachers and administrators involved in designing the classes came together, they identified a set of essential interrelated elements necessary to instruction and curriculum for LTELs: a focus on oral language, a focus on student engagement, a focus on academic language, a focus on expository text (reading and writing), consistent routines, goal setting, empowering pedagogy, rigor, community and relationships, and study skills (Olsen, 2012). From educators' experiences in selecting course materials and curriculum that encompass these ten essential elements, Olsen (2012) emphasized that materials should be relevant to students, students need access to whole books with complex and elegant language, curriculum should explicitly provide opportunities for active engagement, and materials should align and connect to core content. Curricular resources used by the four sites include *The Academic Vocabulary Toolkit Book 1 and 2* and *English 3D: Discuss Describe, Debate* by Dr. Kate Kinsella, *WRITE (Writing Reform Institute for Teaching Excellence)* created by the San Diego County Office of Education, *AVID English Learner College Readiness (ELCR)*, *Academic Conversations* by Jeff Zwiers, *The CSU Expository Reading and Writing Course (ERWC)*, and Socratic seminars. In addition, *SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol)* and *Constructing Meaning* by EL Achieve are resources drawn upon for specific professional development and lesson design models (Olsen, 2012). Building upon the idea of using different teaching strategies to develop potential English ability in long-term English learners, high school teacher Lynn Jacobs (2008) observed more

motivation and confidence in writing when students were able to publish their own stories and poems.

After the first year of offering dedicated courses for LTELs, teachers and district administrators across the four sites reported that, in general, students were becoming more engaged in school and more active participants in using academic language as a result of the classes (Olsen, 2012). Reports from individual schools on student progress showed increased motivation, improved writing and an increase in reading ability by several grade levels, exiting of EL status, gains on the English language arts section of the state standardized test of an average of 88 points, a redesignation rate outpacing rates in other schools that do not offer the course, and a significant increase in overall proficiency on the state standardized test (Olsen, 2012). However, courses are still fairly new and consistent data across sites did not exist at the time. Yet, “when asked whether the classes should continue, every teacher and administrator except one replied, ‘Definitely, yes,’” and “four out of five respondents reported that the class is working well” with others reporting they “couldn’t tell yet” (Olsen, 2012, p. 29).

In the case of the two focus high schools in the Ventura Unified District, one of the sites in the Olsen (2012) study, reclassification rates at both schools exceeded the district average rate of 9.5% (Robles, 2010). Results on the California English Language Development Test showed significant gains in the number of students making progress—over 15%—at Buena High School. Ventura High School showed a gain of over 5% in progress, and both schools reported an increase of approximately 4% for students achieving proficiency. As for English Learners Percent Proficient on Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in Language Arts and Math, Buena High School showed significant increases between 15 and 17%. Ventura High School

showed improvement at a little over 6% in Language Arts while proficiency in math was static. The district serves 949 English learners at the secondary level, with 821 of them considered long-term English learners and 128 of them making expected annual progress in English and academic areas.

Beginning in the 2008-09 school year, programming for students at Buena and Ventura high schools included two-period block courses at ELD levels I, II, III, and IV for students from mixed grades (Robles, 2010). The courses were designed for advancement between levels with students transitioning to regular English courses after completing the sequence. The district implemented Hampton Brown's Edge Program as the standards-based curriculum for the course. Besides ELD courses specifically focused on LTELs, the schools also offered Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) courses that met USC/CU requirements for ELs at each grade as well as advanced Spanish courses.

Based on existing research, Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) identified guidelines for ELD instruction and organized them according to the nature of the evidence (see Appendix D for the full list of guidelines). The authors concluded from relatively strong supporting evidence from English learner research that providing ELD instruction is better than not providing it and that ELD instruction should include interactive activities between students that are carefully planned and executed. From hypotheses emerging from recent English learner research, the authors recommend a separate block of time devoted to ELD instruction on a daily basis. Instruction in this class should emphasize listening and speaking but can also incorporate reading and writing. Dutro and Kinsella (2010) also proposed a dedicated course for teaching English as its own content area where language learning is in the foreground and content is in the

background. The content provides the subject or topic about which students discuss, read, and write.

A separate ELD course is the one dedicated opportunity for explicitly instructing English learners in vocabulary, sentence structure, and grammar not learned outside school and not taught in any other content class (Dutro & Kinsella, 2010). However, it is the language students need to be able to use effectively in both academic and real-world contexts every day. Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) also supported the explicit teaching of elements of English, including vocabulary, syntax, grammar, functions, and conventions. Both Dutro and Kinsella (2010) and Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) expressed the importance of explicit instruction in language functions, or communicative purposes, necessary to make meaning. Essentially, these functions are the cognitive tasks that enable connections between thought and language (Halliday as cited in Dutro & Kinsella, 2010); they are used on a “continuum from simple to complex, orally (express opinion, participate in a discussion) and in writing (persuasion, description), and are determined by the situation and the content concept” (Dutro & Kinsella, 2010, p. 172).

Also based on hypotheses emerging from recent English learner research, Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) stated that ELD instruction should emphasize academic language (CALP) as well as conversational or social language (BICS). Academic language or vocabulary is at the heart of what Dutro and Kinsella (2010) identified as language tools. These tools include appropriate words, grammatical features and sentence structures, and the social knowledge and discourse understanding to synthesize linguistic information for communicative competence, or the ability to communicate effectively. Supporting student in acquiring the necessary linguistic tools involves differentiating and teaching students vocabulary specific to the topic as well as

functional words and phrases that connect content-specific vocabulary (i.e., “bricks” and “mortar”) (Dutro & Moran and Dutro & Levy as cited in Dutro & Kinsella, 2010). “Bricks” refer to that about which one is thinking, talking, reading, and writing while “mortar” allows expression of what one is actually saying about the topic. In other words, students must learn the meanings of “bricks” and how to use “mortar” (Dutro & Kinsella, 2010).

The question remains of how exactly to plan and deliver instruction and application of language in order to develop *accuracy*, error-free language, and *fluency*, language that is produced easily. While it is not possible to determine the exact mix of strategies that will guarantee proficiency for every English learner, research indicates that developing language for academic tasks incorporates structured interaction and interactive listening. Saunders and Goldenberg (2010) also stressed providing corrective feedback on form through prompts rather than recasts. Whereas recasts, rearticulations with corrections, are less likely to interrupt communication between the teacher and student, prompts are more likely to explicitly draw students’ attention to an error and encourage or require an attempt to correct speech. Although emphasizing listening and speaking is a priority, reading and writing should also be included in instruction in order to address all four language modalities.

Hochman and Wexler (2017) made several arguments for the need for explicit instruction in teaching students to write well. Ultimately, good writing takes practice, and the practice must be structured so students learn how the conventions of the written language differ from those of the spoken language. It is understood that students must write at length, but sentences are the building blocks of all writing, and students struggling to compose sentences will not be able to produce a comprehensible essay. One advantage of sentence-level writing is its manageability

for students such as English learners and long-term English learners that are still deciphering grammar, syntax, spelling, and punctuation. In addition, constructing single sentences can require major cognitive demands of even older students when explaining, paraphrasing, or summarizing academic content (Hochman & Wexler, 2017). The authors also stressed that grammar is best taught in the context of student writing. Rather than diagramming sentences in isolation, Hochman and Wexler (2017) suggested students practice sentence combining wherein they need to use conjunctions, pronouns, or an appositive or subordinate clause.

From their work with a panel of researchers, policymakers, and practitioners working in the field of adolescent English learners, including LTELs, convened by the Center for Applied Linguistics, Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) found one challenge in improving literacy is a limited use of research-based instructional practices due to the small body of research on effective instruction for adolescent EL literacy development. However, the authors made a number of recommendations directly supported by the current theory of second literacy development and the relevant characteristics of adolescent ELs. The first six of their potential solutions to the challenge are: (1) integrate all four language skills into instruction from the start, (2) teach the components and processes of reading and writing, (3) teach reading comprehension strategies, (4) focus on vocabulary development, (5) build and activate background knowledge, and finally, (6) teach language through content and themes (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Teaching strategies include anticipatory activities to build background knowledge, structured note-taking and use of graphic organizers to teach how to use reading strategies to improve comprehension, and explicit vocabulary instruction across the curriculum to give students access to content academic literacy.

Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) viewed content and themes as the vehicle for language development and suggest content-based English language classes “taught by language educators whose main goal for students is English language development but who collaborate with different subject area departments to prepare students for the mainstream classroom by integrating content topics” (p. 28). Teachers build background knowledge and vocabulary from core content with the course syllabus consisting of different content areas and topics. This model differs from the research-based Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol model (SIOP), which is taught by content-area teachers using English as the language of instruction. SIOP requires teachers to incorporate many ELD techniques in every lesson, such as language objectives, developing background knowledge, focusing on content-related vocabulary, promoting oral interaction, and emphasizing academic literacy practice (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short as cited in Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). It is crucial to note the difference between the two models; the former focuses on language learning while the latter model is still focused on content-area learning.

**Instruction throughout the day.** Although determining dedicated time for an appropriate ELD course should be a priority for schools concerned with meeting the needs of long-term English learners, researchers also emphasize the importance of instructed language learning throughout the school day. Olsen (2014) listed “clustered placement in heterogeneous and rigorous grade-level content classes (including honors and college-track), mixed with English proficient students and taught with differentiated instructional strategies” (p. 20) as one component of a successful school program after a specialized ELD course designed for LTELs. The author recommended ensuring that LTELs comprise no more than one-third of each class.

Additionally, explicit academic language and literacy development should be incorporated across content curriculum (Olsen, 2014). In their “Blueprint for Instruction of Adolescent English Learners” (see Appendix E for full outline), Dutro and Kinsella (2010) placed instructed ELD alongside English language arts instruction, which might include reading intervention as well as grade-level ELA, and mathematics, social studies, science, physical education, and the arts. Explicit language instruction for content learning is embedded in every class. This involves teaching language, determined by the linguistic demands of the lesson and English level of students, needed to construct meaning and express understanding of subject concepts; content learning is in the foreground.

In both language courses and content courses throughout the day, Menken, Klyen, and Chae (2007) also identified instructional strategies scaffolded for explicit language and literacy development from their research as helpful for long-term English learners besides. Activating and building on prior knowledge or making connections to students’ lived realities is especially important for LTELs who are often disengaged from learning in class. Oral academic language development addresses the fact that LTELs do not struggle in expressing themselves, but in expressing themselves in a more formal register. When teaching academic register, teachers must differentiate language used in different situations instead of discounting the way a student speaks. Speaking in a formal register requires increasing vocabulary, or instruction that focuses on developing a broader academic lexicon in addition to basic or low-level words often used by LTELs in speaking and writing. Incorporating active read alouds into classes provides students with a focus to approach reading, scaffolds their understanding through questioning, and clarifies explicit comprehension strategies. Finally, teacher collaboration across disciplines can help

create connections around language and literacy and support students with a focus on the transfer of skills to different contents and subjects.

Based on interviews, observations, and the work of six long-term English learners in a secondary English language arts classroom using differentiated pedagogical structures, Soto (as cited in Soto, Freeman, and Freeman, 2013) concluded the following:

1. Teacher modeling is effective when teachers involve students and when students understand both what to do and how to do it;
2. Guided discussions help students get ideas from classmates and review key concepts;
3. Group work is only effective when there is positive group interdependence, that is, when students work together effectively with each one making contributions;
4. Partner work is only effective when both students come prepared and understand a task;
5. Independent work should only be assigned when students are well prepared (A Hunger to Learn section, para. 6).

Overall, LTELs are able to benefit from strategies and structures such as teacher modeling and partner work, but they require extra support from the teacher and more time to complete tasks (Soto, Freeman, & Freeman, 2013). These findings align closely with general best practices in any classroom for student engagement and learning. If content area teachers are wondering how to best meet the needs of long-term English learners, considering these basic conclusions and identifying where and how they can incorporate structures to support students is an entry point to a more inclusive and effective classroom, both linguistically and academically, for all students.

**Bilingual and biliteracy programming.** To supplement and support English language development, Olsen (2014) suggested primary language literacy development through native speakers classes (in an articulated sequence through Advanced Placement levels). According to Goldenberg (2008), simultaneous development of home language and English promote literacy overall as skills such as phonological awareness, decoding, and knowledge of specific letters and sounds are likely to transfer across the two languages. Goldenberg (2008) argued that research on primary language instruction has shown modest yet real effects that have shown a meaningful contribution to reading achievement in English. After 2 to 3 years (the typical length of time of the studies) of first and additional language reading instruction, the average student is projected to score 12 to 15 percentile points higher than the average student only receiving additional language reading instruction (Goldenberg, 2008). These effects have been found with secondary as well as elementary students.

Despite the relationship between native language instruction and additional language instruction, the educational experience for the majority of long-term English learners has been linguistically subtractive, wherein their native language is replaced by English and therefore not fully developed. Based on research conducted in their pilot study of long-term English learners in New York City, Menken, Klyen, and Chae (2007) planned and developed a program specifically focused on the development of academic language and literacy in both English and Spanish. The study implemented the program in two high schools serving Spanish-speaking LTELs, and where these students represent a minority of the population with their needs falling outside the central focus of each school. School 1 was the large vocational high school involved in the first phase of research and included 13 participants in the ninth grade. School 2 was a

small high school that included 15 students enrolled in combined ninth/tenth grade classes due to the small size of the school. A third school served as the control, which did not implement the biliteracy program developed, and included fourteen students. A total of 42 students were included in the study across all three schools.

Overall design of the biliteracy program took a three-pronged approach: Spanish language and literacy development for four semesters, ESL course sequence of four semesters, and content area courses with explicit literacy instruction. School 1 offered ESL for LTELs, English language arts (ELA), and Spanish Native language arts to a group comprised only of LTELs, and then included the students in heterogeneous classes for math, science, and social studies. In School 2, LTELs were mixed with new arrival English learners for all classes due to the school's small size. Ideally, LTELs are separated from new arrivals so instruction can be designed for students with strong bilingual skills in social language communicated orally but who need support in literacy development. The goal of the biliteracy program was that LTELs would be able to test out of their English learner status after four semesters.

Over the course of the study, students completed two semesters of the Spanish as a Native Language course and two semesters of the ESL for LTELs course. Teachers of the latter course planned differentiated instruction specifically for LTELs that was also integrated with their ELA and Spanish Native language arts courses. LTELs were simultaneously mixed with other students for math, science, and social studies classes. Academic literacy skills were taught to students through content in these courses in an explicit way, not assuming this information was included in student background knowledge. All teachers involved in the project received professional development from the research team throughout the project period in groups and

one-on-one. Sessions included planning for language and content growth as well as classroom observations and post-observations meetings.

Menken, Kleyn, and Chae (2007) used both quantitative data and qualitative data to assess impact on LTEL literacy skills. The Academic Language and Literacy Diagnostic (ALLD) administered in both English and Spanish and the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) were sources of quantitative data. Classroom observations, teacher interviews, administrator interviews, individual student interviews, and student focus groups were sources of qualitative data. Limitations to the study include the small sample size, the composition of the LTEL sample at School 2—mostly tenth-graders with some ninth-graders compared to all ninth-graders at School 1, and the possibility of intentional failure of the NYSESLAT. Student interviews revealed that some students feel comfortable and supported with students similar to them and by the teachers supporting them.

Major findings from the quantitative data show promise in impacting student growth in both English proficiency and Spanish proficiency, particularly when conditions are aligned to those at School 1 (Menken, Kleyn, & Chae, 2007). ALLD data indicated that both School 1 and School 2 scored on average higher in reading comprehension in English and Spanish than the control school. The schools also made greater gains in English over the course of the school year. LTELs at School 1 showed average scores 3.06 grade levels below on the ALLD pre-test and 1.79 grade levels below on the post-test. School 2 showed LTEL students at an average of 2.76 grade levels below on the pre-test and 1.81 grade levels below on the post-test. Students at School 3, the control, performed worse on the ALLD at the end of the school year than at the start, reporting an average score of 2.89 grade levels below on the pre-test and 3.47 grade levels

below on the post-test. Furthermore, School 1 outperformed both Schools 2 and 3 on the Reading and Writing section of the NYSESLAT. Students improved from “intermediate” to “advanced” between May, 2008, and May, 2009, demonstrating significant gains according to Menken, Kleyn, and Chae (2007). School 1 also outperformed ELL-designated peers at their grade level on the reading and writing section of the May, 2009, NYSESLAT; students in Schools 2 and 3 did not show significant differences.

A framework for long-term English learners developed by the CUNY-New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals (Ascenzi-Moreno, Kleyn, & Menken, 2013) guides educators toward many of the practices suggested by Menken, Kleyn, and Chae (2007) and discussed in other sections of this review. These practices include programmatic structures such as a focused, bilingual academic language and literacy three-period block of ESL, ELA, and HLA (home language arts) and language and literacy across all contents; curricular structures that emphasize rigor as well as appropriate support, connections to home and transnational cultures, and language and content goals; pedagogical strategies such as activating prior knowledge, attention to vocabulary, and connections and collaboration across content areas. In introducing this framework, Ascenzi-Moreno, Kleyn, and Menken (2013) stressed use of the term emergent bilingual instead of long-term English learner, arguing that secondary schools “must accept that reality that emergent bilinguals enter their buildings at all different points along a *spectrum of language and literacy skills*” (p. 2). Additionally, the CUNY-New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals anchored its framework in two central, non-negotiable principles:

1. Utilize students’ bilingualism as a resource in their education. Use translinguaging strategies (intentionally building on students’ home language practices) to engage

- students with educational content, to challenge students cognitively, and support the acquisition of academic language and literacy skills.
2. Provide students with a school wide multilingual ecology where their language practices are visible and valued (Ascenzi-Moreno, Klyen, & Menken, 2013).

Translanguaging describes the fluid language practices of bilinguals wherein there is no separation between English and an additional language. Translanguaging was first described as alternating between languages as a pedagogical strategy in instructing bilingual students (Williams as cited in Menken, 2013). Garcia (as cited in Menken, 2013) used the term to describe the practice of bilinguals who use their linguistic resources flexibly to construct meaning and rejects the monolingual ideologies that position the two languages of bilingualism as separate. Similar to the research conducted by Menken, Kleyn, and Chae (2007), this framework is not intended for newly arrived emergent bilinguals but for those students initially labeled as LTELs, many of whom have come to feel alienated by schools failing to meet their needs and who are disproportionately likely to fail courses and drop out of high school.

### **Chapter 3: Conclusions and Recommendations**

This review of the literature provided an overview of research about students designated as long-term English learners and focuses on recent scholarship about meeting the needs of these students at the secondary level. The study summarizes research describing the distinct linguistic and academic attributes of long-term English learners, much of which maintains a history of subtractive language practices that contribute to challenges in attaining both native and English language proficiency for LTELs. Research about language and literacy for academic purposes highlights that instruction and expectations are typically based in monolingual ideology. This often results in relegating the development of bilingualism and biliteracy to a subordinate status at the secondary level.

In summary, the research investigating best practices in educating long-term English learners includes a combination of previous English learner research, hypotheses emerging from English learner research, and research focused on LTELs. The action research base focused particularly on long-term English learners is still small but has yielded encouraging results. Interventions analyzed range from separate English language development classes designed for LTELs to sheltered instruction to heritage language classes or language classes for native speakers to explicit language and literacy instruction across all content areas. The purpose of this study is to review the literature that examines: (1) the emergence of long-term English learners as a growing population with distinct linguistic and academic needs, and (2) the programmatic and instructional practices developed and implemented to ensure educational access and opportunity.

## Conclusions

Based on the research included in this review, it is evident that long-term English learners, a population with specific characteristics and needs, constitute a significant portion of the English learner population at the secondary school level, and that past practices and a majority of current instruction are failing to support LTELs in achieving both English and native language proficiency and academic success. One challenge to educating long-term English learners has been the tension between monolingual English language development and the importance of promoting bilingualism and biliteracy. Studies examining programs for long-term English learners that include a specially designed English language development (ELD) class as well as a native language literacy or heritage language arts class conclude that ELD classes and native language development classes work together to provide the most effective support for LTELs. Providing both opportunities for students involves commitment on the part of administration and staff, which can be difficult given the competing priorities—standardized assessment in math and reading, STEM, music/arts, and other elective opportunities—and scheduling at the secondary level.

In addition to language and language arts classes designed to the particular needs of LTELs and where language is in the foreground, schools that best support this population ensure grade-level rigor as well as explicit language and literacy instruction occurs across content areas. Instruction includes clear language objectives and literacy strategies, scaffolds, and collaboration between disciplines. Many strategies found to be effective as best practices for good teaching and English learners in general serve as a solid foundation upon which to build robust instruction for long-term English learners. At the most basic understanding of support, providing ELD

instruction with interactive activities is better than not providing it (Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010). Furthermore, educators use materials and strategies to activate prior knowledge that connects to home and transnational cultures in an effort to create a multilingual system where all students can view themselves as learners that value school.

It is also important to consider the use of the long-term English learner label to identify a group of students that exhibit heterogeneity in academic achievement, linguistic ability, and outcomes (Thompson, 2015). While categories and labels such as long-term English learner are helpful in identifying the specific areas of academic support needed for this population, one consequence of the LTEL term is a focus on what students have failed to achieve—proficiency of one language in an arbitrary amount of time. This lens ultimately privileges speakers of one variety of language while discounting the full linguistic range of some students and its place in school (Flores, Menken, & Kleyn, 2015).

### **Recommendations**

Educators at all levels of secondary education need to recognize students exemplifying characteristics of long-term English learners and implement programmatic structures and curriculum designed to intentionally support their distinct needs. District leaders and school administration must commit to systems for monitoring progress such as data chats and testing accommodations, triggering support, and a master schedule open to time for planning and/or collaboration between teachers (content and ELL) and flexibility and movement based on student progress. Support for long-term English learners should first and foremost emphasize placement in English language development courses dedicated to specific language and academic needs. These courses should be supplemented by native language arts courses that promote the

development of literacy and pride and in students' home languages. Olsen's (2012) "Long Term English Learner Dedicated Courses—A Planning Checklist" (see Appendix F) is an extensive tool for helping districts and schools implement classes designed for LTELs while the "Blueprint for Instruction of Adolescent English Learners" (Dutro & Kinsella, 2010) is useful in identifying content of the class and the school-wide context within which it should exist.

Language instruction cannot be confined to designated language classes, but must be adopted school-wide in all content areas. To reinforce this initiative and cultivate effective teachers of long-term English learners, appropriate and supportive professional development should be consistent, ongoing, and include a focus on study skills, metacognition, learning strategies, and the inclusion of relevant texts in curriculum in addition to explicit language instruction. Successful professional development for explicit language instruction provides teachers with tools to identify essential language demands, such as language functions (cognitive tasks) and language tools (vocabulary), and strategies for instruction and application. The Gradual Release of Responsibility Model from Fisher, Rothenberg, and Frey (as cited in Dutro & Kinsella, 2010) drew attention to the mentoring relationship and two-way interaction between teacher and student in explicit scaffolded language development. It utilizes whole class ("I Do"), guided instruction ("We Do"), collaboration ("You Do Together"), and independent practice ("You Do on Your Own"). A particularly comprehensive, detailed, and helpful resource for teachers is Dutro and Kinsella's (2010) "A Model for Explicit Language Instruction" (p. 171). As teachers adapt their instruction to include language and literacy learning strategies, one-on-one observations and conversations and data chats are useful in developing and strengthening support of long-term English learners and monitoring their progress.

Each element of a long-term English learner program works in tandem with every other element in order to support students through classroom instruction but also by building an affirming school climate. An affirming school climate celebrates the diverse linguistic practices of its students and how they are capable of translanguaging—using their native languages and English creatively, dynamically, and fluidly, without separation, to create meaning. Educators that embrace the varied abilities of students contribute to a school-wide multilingual community that recognizes and values all language practices.

### **Implications for the Classroom**

In the 2017-2018 academic school year, the English language learner department at the middle school where I teach was able to more intentionally place students in specific sections of English development courses based upon long-term English learner criteria. The majority of my 40-45 seventh-grade students can be identified as long-term English learners, and while I was able to teach one section of students that were newer to the United States, not necessarily recently arrived within the last year, there were students that fit the same profile but were placed in sections with long-term English learners for various reasons (scheduling and teacher observations as well as language proficiency levels according to standardized assessments). As mentioned in the review of literature, the English learner population consists of distinct groups of students from newcomers to long-term English learners. However, each student is an individual, and as such, may exhibit characteristics that tend more toward another group than that which they have been placed based on quantitative data. Yet, it has become evident that those students not classified as LTELs according to the criteria discussed in this paper needed support that

LTEs did not need, across all language domains and more specifically with building certain background knowledge.

Except for the section of students newer to the United States, every section utilized *English 3D: Discuss, Describe, and Debate*, a curriculum designed and intended for use with long-term English learners. The curriculum incorporates many engagement strategies, language or cognitive functions and tools, and explicit vocabulary building techniques into the classroom through high-interest topics for adolescents, such as female athletes, honesty, video games, and images in the media. While *English 3D* engages students in practicing listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills, it dedicates more time and skill-building to the productive language domains of speaking and writing. Long-term English learner research varies on the focus of stand-alone classes with recommendations ranging from speaking and listening, with an understanding that mastery in these domains supports development in reading and writing, to an even emphasis across all four domains, receptive and productive. In my classroom, I have supplemented the *English 3D* curriculum with listening and reading lessons and activities that also connect to core content learning.

One area of providing robust, rigorous, and appropriate services to long-term English learners with which I struggle, along with the rest of the EL department, is supporting students with language learning in their content classes. The department as a whole provides all-staff professional development on strategies to reach English learners at the beginning of each academic school year and then one more time at some point in the year. Each grade-level EL teacher also communicates and collaborates with at least one content area teacher in a co-teaching experience for one section of core. The goal of this limited co-teaching experience is

for core teachers to replicate strategies used in the co-taught class in their other sections. In my experience, the extensive planning time necessary for truly collaborative co-teaching opportunities has not been provided and/or the urgency and accountability of core teacher participation in effective language learning strategies has not been successfully implemented with staff by administration.

One of the most important takeaways from my research has been that administration and all staff must be supportive and committed to the structures and work necessary to ensuring the linguistic and academic success of English learners. This is especially true for long-term English learners, as they are most likely to be considered similar to their native English-speaking peers because of their fluency in speaking and listening to social language and assimilation to American culture. Although all research on long-term English learners strongly recommends a stand-alone class dedicated to English language development, where linguistic skill-building is in the foreground and content is in the background, a colleague teaching U.S. Studies and I have proposed to administration the option to co-teach two sections of U.S. Studies for English learners in the 2018-2019 academic year.

One reason I suggested co-teaching to my colleague was the nature of U.S. Studies content. From conversations and observations conducted by both my colleague and myself over last year and this year, as well as reflection upon activities related to U.S. Studies topics in the stand-alone ELD class this year, I have concluded that the issues studied in the class are the most relevant and of interest and concern to my students. Therefore, if there were ever a class in which it was possible to flip the usual sheltered-instruction model, it would be U.S. Studies. I have found Olsen's (2012) "Long Term English Learner Dedicated Course—A Planning

Checklist” useful in beginning to consider and develop this ELD U.S. Studies course. However, I recognize that many of the recommendations for the district and the administration from the list will be difficult to discuss and implement. Still, there are recommendations for the classroom that I am eager to make sure are implemented in the ELD U.S. Studies course.

It is critical to note that this particular colleague and I share many of the same teaching philosophies and recognize the urgency in supporting long-term English learners. We hope to create a course that uses U.S. Studies content, particularly the in-depth History Day research project, as the vehicle for strengthening academic language across all four domains. Explicit skill and critical thinking instruction, appropriate pacing, and reading strategies in both fiction and nonfiction for English learners will include practices modeled in the *English 3D* curriculum. Again, the implementation of this model depends on the support and dedication of administration to problem-solve perceived systemic barriers in meeting the needs of our English learners.

As for one of the other prongs of a successful program for long-term English learners—heritage language classes, my school will continue to offer a Spanish for Spanish speakers class next year, for which both my colleague, the rest of the EL department, and I hope to help recruit students. Offering U.S. Studies for English learners returns an elective to students in this course, meaning students would be able to gain access to a language other than English, art, music, or academic support classes in math or literacy. I have also discussed with colleagues the possibility of teaching elective sections of “ELA Topics” that would teach language through essential elements and learning targets for reading literature.

Implementing and supporting language learning across contents in addition to social studies is more challenging as it involves more stakeholders and considerably more time than

currently available. As the EL team begins constructing a plan of service for the 2018-2019 academic year, administration has urged us to consider a model somewhat aligned with the seventh-grade U.S. Studies for English learners course. The request is that one core class rigorously incorporates language-learning strategies at every grade level. This does not necessarily mean that sixth-grade and eighth-grade will have a specific core content class for ELs like seventh-grade. It does mean that the EL teacher at each grade level is expected to co-teach at least one section of a core content. For example, sixth grade would put extra emphasis on language strategies in science, and eighth-grade would put extra emphasis on language strategies in English language arts. These strategies and experiences would then be shared vertically across departments, so every department would be gaining professional development in reaching the needs of English learners even if they do not have the opportunity to co-teach or collaborate extensively with an EL teacher. This would be in addition to the ongoing all-staff professional development provided by the EL department each year.

Finally, it is extremely important to develop a strong academic foundation for long-term English learners through explicit discussion and practice of habits of school and study that contribute to academic and professional success. Topics might include time management, study skills, active and attentive listening, code switching, and exploring expectations, disagreement, or conflict influenced by cultural and racial differences. I have learned that language learning is meaningless and even more unlikely to be internalized without the context of these foundations.

## References

- Ascenzi-Moreno, L., Kleyn, T., & Menken, K. (2013). *A CUNY-NYSIEB framework for the education of 'long-term English learners': 6-12 grades*. New York, NY: CUNY-NYSIEB.
- Californians Together. (2014). *California is the first state in the nation to define and identify English learners who after many years are struggling to succeed*. Long Beach, CA: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.californianstogether.org/california-is-the-first-state-in-the-nation-to-define-and-identify-english-learners-who-after-many-years-are-struggling-to-succeed-2/>.
- Dutro, S., & Kinsella, K. (2010). English language development: Issues and implementation in grades 6–12. In *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches* (pp. 151-207). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.
- Flores, N., Kleyn, T., & Menken, K. (2015). Looking holistically in a climate of partiality: Identities of students labeled long-term English language learners. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 14(2), 113–132. DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2015.1019787
- Freeman, Y. S., Freeman, D.E., & Mercuri S. (2002). *Closing the achievement gap: How to reach limited-formal-schooling and long-term English learners*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does—and does not—say. *American Educator*, 32(2), 8-23, 42-44.
- Hochman, J. C., & Wexler, N. (2017). One sentence at a time: The need for explicit instruction in teaching students to write well. *American Educator*, 41(2), 30-37.

- Jacobs, C. L. (2008). Long-term English learners writing their stories. *English Journal*, 97(6), 87-91.
- Kim, W. G., & Garcia, S. B. (2014). Long-term English language learners' perceptions of their language and academic learning experiences. *Remedial & Special Education*, 35(5), 300-312. DOI: 10.1177/0741932514525047
- Menken, K. (2013). Emergent bilingual students in secondary school: Along the academic language and literacy continuum. *Language Teaching*, 46(4), 438-476.  
doi: 10.1017/S0261444813000281
- Menken, K., & Kleyn T. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English language learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(4), 399-417.  
doi: 10.1080/13670050903370143
- Menken, K., Kleyn, T., & Chae, N. (2007). *Meeting the needs of long-term English language learners in high school* (A report for the Office of English Language Learners of the New York City Department of Education). New York, NY: Research Institute for the Study of Language in an Urban Society. Retrieved from [http://www.edweek.org/media/ltell\\_phase\\_ii\\_report\\_final.pdf](http://www.edweek.org/media/ltell_phase_ii_report_final.pdf).
- Menken, K., Kleyn, T., & Chae, N. (2012). Spotlight on "long-term English language Learners:" Characteristics and prior schooling experiences of an invisible population. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 6(2), 121-142.  
doi: 10.1080/19313152.2012.665822

- Olsen, L. (2010). *Reparable harm: Fulfilling the unkept promise of educational opportunity for California's long term English learners* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Long Beach, CA: Californians Together. Retrieved from <http://www.ctdev.changeagentsproductions.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/ReparableHarm2ndedition.pdf>.
- Olsen, L. (2012). *Secondary school courses designed to address the language needs and academic gaps of long-term English learners*. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together. Retrieved from <http://www.ctdev.changeagentsproductions.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/SecondarySchoolsLTELreport.compressed.pdf>.
- Olsen, L. (2014). *Meeting the unique needs of long term English language learners: A guide for educators*. Washington, DC: National Education Association. Retrieved on October 14, 2016, from [https://www.nea.org/assets/docs/15420\\_LongTermEngLangLearner\\_final\\_web\\_3-24-14.pdf](https://www.nea.org/assets/docs/15420_LongTermEngLangLearner_final_web_3-24-14.pdf).
- Olsen, L., & Jaramillo, A. (1999) *Turning the tides of exclusion: A guide for educators and advocates for immigrant students*. Oakland, CA: California Tomorrow.
- Robles, J. W. (2010). Participatory leadership for English learner success. *Leadership*, pp. 26–29. Retrieved from <http://www.ctdev.changeagentsproductions.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/RoblesEdLeadershiparticle.pdf>.
- Saunders, W., & Goldenberg, C. (2010). Research to guide English language development instruction. In F. Ong & V. Aguila (Eds.). *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches* (pp. 21-81). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

- Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners*. New York: Carnegie Corporation and Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved from [https://www.carnegie.org/media/filer\\_public/bd/d8/bdd80ac7-fb48-4b97-b082-df8c49320acb/ccny\\_report\\_2007\\_double.pdf](https://www.carnegie.org/media/filer_public/bd/d8/bdd80ac7-fb48-4b97-b082-df8c49320acb/ccny_report_2007_double.pdf).
- Soto, M., Freeman, Y. S., & Freeman, D. (2013). In for the long haul. *Language Magazine*, 13(1), 24-28. Retrieved from [http://languagemagazine.com/?page\\_id=11275](http://languagemagazine.com/?page_id=11275).
- Thompson, K. D. (2015). Questioning the long-term English learner label: How categorization can blind us to students' abilities. *Teachers College Record*, 117(12).
- Wright, W. E. (2010). *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy, and practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon, Inc.
- Zwiers, J. (2008). *Building academic language: Essential practices for content classrooms*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

## Appendix A

### Immigrant Student Typologies

<i>Typology</i>	<i>Key Characteristics</i>	<i>Program Implications</i>
<i>Accelerated, College Bound</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In U.S. four years or less</li> <li>• Multiple countries of origin</li> <li>• Schooling in native country usually excellent</li> <li>• Rapid movement through ESL sequence</li> <li>• Academic achievement in terms of grades exceeds rest of school</li> <li>• Often highly motivated</li> <li>• Possibility to graduate in four years</li> <li>• Primary language content courses can assist many in credit accrual</li> <li>• Often successful in mainstream content classes, even with limited English proficiency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counseling to ensure appropriate college-prep course sequence</li> <li>• Credit offered for courses take in native country</li> <li>• Acceleration through ESL sequence</li> <li>• Provision of primary language content courses whenever possible to aid credit accrual</li> <li>• Explicit, targeted instruction to help students meet grade-level standards</li> </ul>
<i>Newly Arrived, in the ESL Sequence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In U.S. 3 years or less</li> <li>• Multiple countries of origin</li> <li>• Little English language proficiency on arrival</li> <li>• Some well-prepared in native language, on grade level; others below</li> <li>• Some arrive with many transferable credits, others with no transcripts or records</li> <li>• Steady progress through ESL sequence</li> <li>• If school offers native-language content courses, credit accrual toward graduation rapid</li> <li>• Difficulty passing minimum proficiencies within 4-year time frame</li> <li>• Academic achievement in terms of grades similar to rest of school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for content-based, literature-based ELD</li> <li>• Need to accelerate literacy across content areas with consistency of approaches and strategies</li> <li>• Provision of primary language content courses to aid credit accrual</li> <li>• Credit offered for courses taken in native country</li> <li>• If arriving at 9<sup>th</sup> grade or beyond, many may need more than 4 years in high school—re-examination of traditional 4-year path</li> </ul>

<i>Typology</i>	<i>Key Characteristics</i>	<i>Program Implications</i>
<i>Underschooled</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In U.S. several years or less</li> <li>• Multiple countries of origin</li> <li>• Little to no English language fluency</li> <li>• Schooling in native country interrupted, disjointed, inadequate, or no schooling at all</li> <li>• Little to no literacy in native language</li> <li>• Three or more years below grade level in Math</li> <li>• Slow acquisition of English—tendency to repeat ESL levels</li> <li>• Tendency to struggle in academic content classes (D's and F's)</li> <li>• Lack of credit accrual over time</li> <li>• Unable to pass minimum proficiency exams</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for native language literacy instruction</li> <li>• Extended time for English language development</li> <li>• Extended time for acquisition of content subject matter</li> <li>• Extended time for passing minimum proficiency exams</li> <li>• Summer programs/after school/other efforts to provide extra time in school</li> <li>• Attention to over-age issues, self-esteem of underschooled adolescents</li> </ul>
<i>Long-Term Limited English Proficient</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In U.S. 7+ years when entering high school</li> <li>• Multiple countries of origin</li> <li>• Usually orally fluent in English</li> <li>• Reading/writing below level of native English peers</li> <li>• Bi-modal academically: some doing well, others not</li> <li>• Some have literacy in primary language, others not</li> <li>• Some were in bilingual programs, most not</li> <li>• Mismatch between student's own perception of academic achievement (high) and actual grades or test scores (low)</li> <li>• Similar mismatch between perception of language ability and reality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for programs designed to accelerate literacy in English</li> <li>• Native language instruction to “rebuild” mother tongue literacy—possible for some</li> <li>• Attention to authentic feedback to students on performance</li> <li>• Counseling crucial</li> <li>• 9<sup>th</sup>-grade interventions</li> <li>• Implementation of career paths, academies for all students</li> <li>• Need to disaggregate data on long-term students—don't make assumptions based on label</li> </ul>

## Appendix B

### Seven Basic Principles for Meeting the Needs of Long-Term English Language Learners

1. **Urgency.** Focus urgently on accelerating LTEL progress towards attaining English proficiency and closing academic gaps.
2. **Distinct needs.** Recognize that the needs of LTELs are distinct and cannot adequately be addressed within a “struggling reader” paradigm or a generic “English Language Learner” approach, but require an explicit LTEL approach.
3. **Language, literacy, and academics.** Provide LTELs with language development, literacy development, and a program that addresses the academic gaps they have accrued.
4. **Home language.** Affirm the crucial role of home language in a student’s life and learning, and provide home language development whenever possible.
5. **Three R’s: rigor, relevance, and relationships.** Provide LTELs with rigorous and relevant curriculum and relationships with supportive adults (along with the supports to succeed).
6. **Integration.** End the ESL ghetto, cease the sink-or-swim approach, and provide maximum integration without sacrificing access to LTEL supports.
7. **Active engagement.** Invite, support, and insist that LTELs become active participants in their own education.

(Olsen, 2014, pp. 18-19)

## Appendix C

### **Eight Components of Successful School Programs**

The most effective secondary school programs for LTELs incorporate the previous seven basic principles and the following eight key components:

1. **Specialized English Language Development course designed for LTELs (separate from other English Language Learners), emphasizing writing, academic vocabulary, active engagement, and oral language**

Provide LTELs with an Academic Language Development (ALD) course that focuses on powerful oral language development, explicit literacy development, instruction in the academic uses of English, high-quality writing, extensive reading of relevant texts, a focus on active student engagement and accountable participation, and an emphasis on academic language and complex vocabulary.

Concurrently enroll LTELs in a grade-level English class (taught by the same educator as the ALD course) where they are mixed heterogeneously with strong native English speakers. Structure the course around a set of consistent routines, and engage students in setting goals and developing study skills. These classes are based on English Language proficiency standards and are aligned with grade-level Language Arts standards to scaffold the language demands and language development needed for LTELs' success.

2. **Clustered placement in heterogeneous and rigorous grade-level content classes (including honors and college-track), mixed with English proficient students and taught with differentiated instructional strategies**

Place LTELs in rigorous, grade-level classes, with many English-fluent peers. Cluster LTELs with like LTELs among the English proficient students, but make certain LTELs comprise no more than one-third of the class.

Make sure educators in these classes have information about the language gaps and specific needs of the LTEL cluster. Provide educators with professional development in Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) strategies to scaffold access to the content (SDAIE is an approach, not a class filled with English Language Learners). The success of LTELs in these classes is carefully monitored, with extra academic support triggered as needed (e.g., Saturday School, tutors, homework support, online tutorial support).

3. **Explicit academic language and literacy development across the curriculum**

Design all classes for explicit language development, with a focus on comprehension, vocabulary development, and advanced grammatical structures needed to comprehend and produce academic language. Focus on academic language as needed for studying the specific academic content of the class.

Design lessons around carefully structured language objectives for integrating subject matter content, focusing on content-related reading and writing skills and carefully planned activities that encourage students to actively use language, with an emphasis on meaning making and engaging with the academic content.

**4. Primary language literacy development through native speakers classes (in an articulated sequence through Advanced Placement levels)**

Wherever possible, enroll LTELs in a high-quality primary language development program. Developed for native speakers, these classes include explicit literacy instruction aligned to English literacy standards and are designed for skill transfer across languages. Native speakers' classes also provide solid preparation and a pathway to Advanced Placement language and literature, and include cultural focus and empowering pedagogy.

Place LTELs of less-common languages (for whom an articulated series of native language development classes is not feasible) into a language-based elective (e.g., drama, journalism) or computer lab with software that focuses on native language development.

**5. Systems for monitoring progress and triggering support and a master schedule designed for flexibility and movement as students progress**

Use a master schedule to facilitate accelerated movement needed to overcome gaps and earn credits and adjust a student's placement to provide increased supports. For example, all ninth grade English and English Language Development classes can be scheduled at the same time. A formal monitoring system reviews mid-semester assessments and grades for each LTEL to determine whether placement needs to be adjusted and what kind of supports might be needed to improve student success.

**6. School-wide focus on study skills, metacognition, and learning strategies**

Develop and strengthen LTELs' study skills and learning strategies by implementing College Board and Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) techniques in

classes in which LTELs are enrolled. (AVID is a college readiness system for elementary through higher education designed to increase school-wide learning and performance.)

Provide supports (e.g., afterschool or Saturday sessions, tutoring) to help LTELs understand and complete homework assignments. Some schools offer a series of semester-long, after-school courses that provide project-based ELD support for LTELs and students at risk of becoming LTELs.

#### **7. Data chats and testing accommodations**

To build student responsibility for their education, provide students and their parents with information and counseling about how students are doing (English proficiency assessments, grade-level standards-based tests, grades, credits) along with discussions about the implications of this data. Students need to know where they are along the continuum towards English proficiency and what they must do to meet the criteria for proficiency.

Handle English proficiency testing with the same seriousness as other testing (should be administered by classroom educators, calendared on the schedule, located in quiet rooms, etc.) Use allowable testing accommodations on standards tests—such as translated glossaries, flexible settings, and hearing directions in the home language for Long Term English Language Learners, as for other English Language Learners.

#### **8. Affirming school climate and relevant texts**

Build an inclusive and affirming school climate to engage LTELs in full school participation, healthy identity development, and positive intergroup relationships.

Schools can enhance school climate by employing literature and curricular material that

speaks to the histories and cultures of the students, diversifying extracurricular and club activities through intentional outreach, providing awards or multilingual designations on the diplomas of students for bi-literacy, and offering elective courses that focus on the histories and contributions of the diverse cultures represented among the student body.

End the social and structured isolation of English Language Learners through activities that build relationships across groups. Empowering pedagogy incorporates explicit leadership development components that help young people develop as responsible members, cultural brokers, and bridges of their communities.

(Olsen, 2014, pp. 19-23)

## Appendix D

**Table 1.1 Guidelines for ELD Instruction**

### Guidelines Based on Relatively Strong Supporting Evidence from English Learner Research

1. Providing ELD instruction is better than not providing it.
2. ELD instruction should include interactive activities among students, but they must be carefully planned and carried out.

### Guidelines Based on Hypotheses Emerging from Recent English Learner Research

3. A separate block of time should be devoted daily to ELD instruction.
4. ELD instruction should emphasize listening and speaking although it can incorporate reading and writing.
5. ELD instruction should explicitly teach elements of English (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, grammar, functions, and conventions).
6. ELD instruction should integrate meaning and communication to support explicit teaching of language.
7. ELD instruction should provide students with corrective feedback on form.
8. Use of English during ELD instruction should be maximized; the primary language should be used strategically.
9. Teachers should attend to communication and language-learning strategies and incorporate them into ELD instruction.
10. ELD instruction should emphasize academic language as well as conversational language.

11. ELD instruction should continue at least until students reach level 4 (early advanced) and possibly through level 5 (advanced).

Guidelines Applicable to ELD but Grounded in Non-English Learner Research

12. ELD instruction should be planned and delivered with specific language objectives in mind.
13. English learners should be carefully grouped by language proficiency for ELD instruction; for other portions of the school day they should be in mixed classrooms and not in classrooms segregated by language proficiency.
14. The likelihood of establishing and/or sustaining an effective ELD instructional program increases when schools and districts make it a priority.

(Goldenberg & Saunders, 2010, pp. 27-28)

## Appendix E

Figure 3.2 Blueprint for Instruction of Adolescent English Learners

	English Language Arts Instruction		Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, Physical Education, Arts
Instructed ELD	Reading Intervention	Grade-Level ELA	
<p><b>Goal</b> Develop a solid English language foundation needed to fully engage in academic and real-life situations</p> <p><b>Purpose</b> Teach students language necessary to move from one assessed English-proficiency level to the next. Language is in the foreground</p> <p><b>Content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English is taught in functional contexts following a scope and sequence of oral and written language skills, balancing focus on form and focus on meaning.</li> <li>Determined by students' ELD levels and linked to ELD standards.</li> <li><b>Beginning/Early</b> Intbasic foundation, everyday topics</li> </ul>	<p><b>Goal</b> Gain literacy skills needed to accelerate achievement (for students currently performing below grade level)</p> <p><b>Teachers Need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding of how to diagnose and teach skills of reading and writing</li> <li>Pedagogical knowledge for accelerating learning and achievement</li> </ul>	<p><b>Goal</b> <i>Achieve grade-level content standards</i></p> <p><b>Teachers Need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding of how to assess and teach skills of reading and writing</li> <li>Pedagogical knowledge</li> </ul>	<p><b>Goal</b> Achieve grade-level content standards</p> <p><b>Teachers Need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of content being taught</li> <li>Pedagogical knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>Explicit Language Instruction for Content Learning</b>			
	<p><b>Purpose</b></p> <p>Teach language needed to construct and express meaning of content concepts. Content learning is in the foreground.</p>	<p><b>Content</b></p> <p>Determined by demands of lesson and students' knowledge of English.</p>	
	<p><b>Teachers Need</b></p> <p>Tools to identify essential language demands of lesson</p> <p>Tools to plan language instruction for content learning</p>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Intermediate</i></b> increasing specificity, building toward ELA standards</li> <li>• <b><i>Early Adv/Advanced</i></b> increasing precision, in- depth genre work for ELA standards</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Teachers Need</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of L2 levels, L2 learning, and pedagogy</li> <li>• Tools to assess and plan instruction</li> <li>• Collaboration time</li> <li>• Scheduled time to teach language</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--

(Dutro & Kinsella, 2010, p. 165)

## Appendix F

### Long-Term English Learner Dedicated Courses—A Planning Checklist

#### Getting Started/Laying the Groundwork

- A district working group has analyzed and reflected upon data on our Long Term English Learner population, identified the extent and magnitude of the issue, and conducted an inquiry to understand the needs of this group.
- A district (or site) Long Term English Learner action plan has been developed and which may include either the Long Term English Learner dedicated course or (in cases where there is a high percentage of the student population who are Long Term English Learners) a whole school approach to meeting their specific language needs throughout the curriculum.
- Teachers have been intentionally selected to pilot the Long Term English Learner course based upon wanting to work with this population, compassion and high expectations, willingness to roll up their sleeves and participate in a pilot situation that requires reflection and refining in the process of teaching the class, and knowledge of back English Learner needs and strategies.
- We have established a written description of the pathway for Long Term English Learners and the role of the course in that pathway. It specifies that the course be dedicated for Long Term English Learners. There is a clear definition of a Long Term English Learner, and explicit placement, entry, and exit criteria.
- Site administrators and counselors in piloting schools have received an orientation to the purposes of the Long Term English Learner course, the needs of Long Term English Learners, and the placement criteria.
- A working group that includes teachers of the courses is/has collaboratively planned the Long Term English Learner course. Teachers are not left on their own to come up with curriculum, materials or approach.

#### Designing the Course and Planning the Components

- We have planned for how we will focus on oral language development. Key strategies and routines have been identified for building a coherent oral language component into the class that leads to writing fluency. We know what curriculum materials we will use for this purpose

- We have planned for how we will incorporate a focus on active student engagement. Key strategies, routines and interactive structures have been identified for eliciting and supporting active student engagement in class. We will know what curriculum materials we will use for this purpose.
- We have planned for how we will incorporate a focus on academic language development. Key vocabulary and discourse patterns have been identified. Key strategies and routines have been identified for academic language development. We know what curriculum materials we will use for this purpose.
- We have planned for how we will focus on developing reading fluency and building upon that fluency to engage Long Term English Learners in reading and writing expository text successfully. Key strategies, routines and materials have been identified for engaging students in making sense of academic text and writing expository genres. We know what curriculum materials we will use for this purpose.
- We have planned for consistent routines and approaches to be used in the course.
- We have planned for how we will engage students in understanding where they are in the trajectory towards English proficiency and towards high graduation and college preparation. Teachers have data on their students, and we have created the formats for engaging students in goal-setting. The curriculum includes explanations of standardized language proficiency tests and implications of proficiency levels and the appropriateness of course placement in career/college acceptance. We have designed our approach, curricula and materials for the goal-setting process.
- We have discussed the kind of empowering pedagogy we expect to see in the course, and teachers have planned for how they will elicit student voice, and student's lived experience in order to build relevance in the class.
- We have planned how we will build rigor, critical thinking and creative thinking into our curriculum. Key strategies, routines and materials have been identified for this purpose.
- We have planned how we will approach building a sense of safety and community in the course. Key strategies, routines and materials have been identified for this purpose.
- We have planned how we will support students in developing study skills and habits. Clear expectations have been framed. Key strategies, routines and materials have been identified for engaging students in focusing on metacognitive learning and organizational processes, and teaching skills of note-taking, time management, and other key study skills.

- Teachers have had individual time to review the materials for the class, and collaborative time prior to beginning the course to work together to write the syllabus and fluid pacing guides that weave together the various components of the curriculum.
- Overall, the materials we have selected or developed are high interest, challenging and relevant.
- We have incorporated whole books, actual literature and real-life expository written materials into the course.
- The district has made resources available for the purchase of supplementary materials as needed to implement a comprehensive academic language development course for Long Term English Learners.

### **Structuring the Course**

- We have considered whether it might be possible to staff the class at a smaller teacher to student ratio, and committed to that smaller ratio if at all possible.
- We have established a fluid pacing guide that builds in time for the community/trust building needed at the start of the class, and the goal-setting and monitoring components of the curriculum in addition to the focus on academic language.
- We have defined a regular process of monitoring the appropriateness of placement into the Long Term English Learner class, and monitor movement out of the class as soon as appropriate.
- Prior to beginning to teach the course, teachers have received professional development on the purposes of the class and the needs of Long Term English Learners.

### **Professional Development and Support**

- Prior to beginning to teach the course, teachers have received professional development on using any of the course curriculum programs or materials that have professional development support components.
- At regular intervals during the first pilot year, teachers involved in piloting the Long Term English Learner courses have paid, collaboration time to reflect on how the course is going, to refine the curriculum, to problem-solve and for additional professional development.
- At regular intervals subsequent to the pilot year, teachers have paid, collaborative time to plan, refine the curriculum, and problem-solve.

- Counselors and administrative staff have received specialized professional development on the needs—social, psychological and academic—of Long Term English Learners, as well as placement issues, family counseling and engagement strategies, and monitoring of Long Term English Learner progress outside the specialized Long Term English Learner course.
- A teacher on special assignment or coach is assigned to observe the pilot classrooms, provide feedback and support to teachers, model strategies, and facilitate collaborative planning and reflection sessions.

### **Measuring Impacts**

- There are clearly articulated desired outcomes for the course, as well as assessments and processes for measuring progress towards those outcomes.
- Monitoring of implementation includes shadowing Long Term English Learner students for degree of active engagement and active use of academic language, and observations of classrooms.

(Olsen, 2012, pp. 41-44)