Examining the Place of English Language Learners within the Teacher Education Curriculum

Laura Baecher[1,*]

[1]Hunter College of the City University of New York, New York, NY 10065, United States

*Correspondence: Hunter College of the City University of New York, New York, NY 10065, United States.

E-mail: lbaecher@hunter.cuny.edu

Received: October 27, 2012 Accepted: November 6, 2012 Online Published: November 15, 2012

doi:10.5430/jct.v1n2p8 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/jct.v1n2p8

Abstract

Preparing teachers to support effective instruction of English language learners (ELLs) is an important dimension of today's teacher education programs, yet often difficult to enact. This paper reports on a comprehensive curriculum analysis of a range of teacher preparation programs at one urban college of education. This contributed to a comprehensive understanding of the needs of faculty and candidates in their beliefs and experiences with ELL pedagogy. Implications for modifying the delivery of programs to strengthen more effective instruction for ELLs is discussed.

Keywords: *School leadership, ELL; Needs assessment, Curriculum; Leadership programs; Needs assessment*

Of the many challenges facing teacher education today, one of the greatest is to ensure that teacher candidates are familiar with the needs of English language learner students (ELLs) and are prepared to provide instruction that will support their linguistic, social, and academic growth. Teacher education programs have struggled to keep apace (Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, & Driscoll, 2005; Maxwell, Lim, & Early, 2006) as the number of ELLs in primary and secondary schools in the US has been steadily increasing (Hernández, Denton, & Macartney, 2007). This has been evidenced among pre- and in-service teachers, who report feeling inadequately prepared to teach ELLs (Nieto, 2002; Polat, 2010). This lack of preparation is especially problematic both because of a tendency for untrained teachers to hold deficit attitudes about ELLs (Reeves, 2006; Smith, 2004; Walker, Shafer, & Iams, 2004), and because ELLs are so dependent upon high-quality school experiences for academic English learning (Goldenberg, 2008; Thomas & Collier, 2002). Students whose home language is not English are the most vulnerable to dropping out or failing academically (Fry, 2008; García, Jensen & Scribner, 2009), hence the role of teacher preparation in supporting ELLs' development and learning is critical.

The purpose of this study was to explore the extent to which the current teacher education curricula at one institution were addressing the instructional needs of ELLs. Curricula were defined as including all the required activities, from readings, assignments, projects, to fieldwork teaching and observation, across each course in a program. To achieve this end, an examination of curricula was conducted via three vantage points: evaluation of syllabi, reports from faculty and reports from teacher candidates. Research questions guiding this investigation were:

(1) What were faculty and candidates' prior experiences with English language learners and language learning?

(2) To what extent were ELLs a focus in teacher preparation courses across multiple program areas?

(3) How did programs vary in their attentions to ELLs?

Two greater aims of this research were to gain a clear understanding of which components of the curricula addressed ELLs and which did not, in order to subsequently design and pilot interventions and modifications to the teacher education curriculum, and to serve other institutions of teacher education by sharing an approach to such an exploration that could be used more broadly.

1. Preparing Teachers of English Language Learners

In spite of the vast increases in ELL student populations across urban, suburban, and rural US schools, many teachers are not prepared to deal with the challenges faced by ELL students and the complex issues concerning linguistically and culturally relevant education (Herrity & Glassman, 1999; Rosa, 2010). Suttmiller and Gonzalez (2006) state "few school districts have the leadership or instructional capacity to understand the needs of ELLs. The education of ELLs appears to have been isolated and designated to a few educators" (p. 168). Furthermore, in their survey of teachers, Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly and Driscoll (1995) teachers "noted the need for school and district administrators to gain more understanding about the challenges of, and solutions to, working successfully with support and guidance for teachers and programs for English (language) learner students" (p. 13). Too often, educators have the mistaken impression that ELL pedagogical practices are "just good teaching" (Harper & De Jong, 2005; Faltis, Arias & Ramírez-Marín, 2010). In fact, ELL pedagogy is more than just good teaching, and it is more than being culturally sensitive (Yates & Muchisky, 2003).

While still a work in progress, the knowledge and skills needed to prepare classroom teachers of ELLs have been increasingly defined. In short, teachers require a wide variety of skills to be effective with ELLs, such as the ability to scaffold instruction, make culturally relevant curricular decisions, employ knowledge of second language acquisition in their instruction, and encourage strong home-school partnerships with ELL families (Lucas, 2011; Téllez & Waxman, 2006). In addition to the basic expectations for all classrooms, teaching ELLs has to particularly attend to language development, language comprehensibility, and cultural awareness. Since English language development co-occurs with subject matter teaching in US P-12 classrooms, teaching ELLs requires two types of content knowledge (the English language and the subject area), as well as the pedagogical content knowledge both for teaching that subject (e.g. mathematics PCK) and teaching ELLs (Leung & Creese, 2010; Lyster, 2007). Lucas and Villegas' (2011) description of the PCK base for mainstream teacher preparation for ELLs includes an understanding of the processes of second language acquisition, the recognition of the role of language in completing academic tasks, and scaffolding instruction to provide access to content-area learning.

How has the research on effective ELL instruction been infused into teacher preparation programs? What steps have teacher education programs taken to effectively prepare today's teachers who will likely encounter ELLs in their schools? One approach has been to encourage bilingual candidates into the teaching profession. In their study of a successful teacher education program targeted for Latino/a teachers, Lohfink, Morales, Shroyer & Yahnke (2012) conclude that "recruitment of minority teacher candidates into teacher preparation programs who share similar social, cultural, and historical backgrounds with their students is…imperative" (p. 52). However, it is not easy to find cadres of teacher candidates who are representative of the local schools' linguistic and cultural heritages.

Another approach is to look for ways to build teacher capacity for working with ELLs regardless of whether or not candidates share the linguistic and cultural heritage of their learners. All candidates need an understanding of the processes of second language acquisition, the role of language in completing academic tasks, and knowledge about the ways scaffolding instruction can provide access to content-area learning (Lucas & Villegas, 2011), and these can be developed within the teacher education curriculum. This approach targets the content-area teacher candidate directly, through the creation of specific required courses on ELLs to improve candidates' beliefs in their efficacy to teach ELLs (Jimenez-Silva, Olson, & Jimenez Hernandez, 2012; Walker & Stone, 2011), or designing collaborative activities linking content and bilingual teacher candidates (Sakash & Rodriguez-Brown, 2011).

A third approach targets the faculty rather than the candidates, since the development of candidates' skills depends upon professors with the knowledge, prior experience, or expertise upon which to draw in crafting courses that particularly address the issues and needs of ELLs. As Costa, McPhail, Smith & Brisk (2005) stress in their experience implementing a professional development initiative for faculty on ELLs at their institution:

The responsibility lies with the faculty first, rather than with the students of TE [Teacher Education] programs. Teacher educators need to learn and to assimilate knowledge of language and culture into their disciplines to pass it on to their students. TE programs must regenerate themselves to prepare their graduates to create responsive classroom environments for all of their pupils (pp. 116-117).

Several effective initiatives to infuse a focus on ELLs into the teacher education curriculum via faculty have been documented, from faculty professional development (Alamillo, Padilla & Arenas, 2011; Brisk & Zisselsberger, 2011; Gebhard, Willett, Caicedo & Piedra, 2011), inviting TESOL faculty to visit pre-service classes for simulations or workshops (Washburn, 2008), and joining content and TESOL faculty in peer-to-peer co-planning and teaching (De Oliveira & Shoffner, 2009; Meskill, 2005), of which the latter two serve as informal faculty-to-faculty professional learning. Research on these initiatives indicated that after receiving professional development on ELL

instruction, introducing change into individual syllabi was shown to be highly achievable, especially when faculty volunteered for the task, were compensated for their time, and received one-on-one support from trusted colleagues with expertise (Costa, McPhail, Smith & Brisk, 2005). At the same time, bringing attention to ELLs up to the scale of whole programs or across multiple programs is challenging due to the complexities, fragmentation, and cultures of institutions of teacher education (Howey, 1996, Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Grossman, Hammerness, McDonald & Ronfeldt, 2008).

Athanases and De Oliveira (2011) described their attempts to explore the how ELLs were addressed within a large program at a California university, and in so doing, they "map a framework to examine program-wide attention to preparing teachers to teach and advocate for ELLs" (p. 198). This analysis conceptualized ways programs can self-examine the extent to which ELLs are included in program content, course and clinical activities, and how constituents' (faculty, candidates, school personnel, ELL families) voices may be included in this examination. Their conceptual framework (p. 199) serves as a base for this study, with particular focus on the aspects of program content and activities in relation to ELL instruction. Their study, as this one, attempts to first survey the landscape of the teacher education curriculum and invite faculty and candidates to participate in this data-mining endeavor prior to attempting to institutionalize any reforms.

2. Methods

2.1 Research Context

This teacher candidate preparation research took place at one university's school of education (SoE), located in a large urban city in the northeast US. This nationally accredited SoE enrolls approximately 2,800 students, mostly graduate, in teacher education, school counseling, educational psychology and school leadership programs. The six teacher preparation programs that participated in this research included Elementary Education (Elementary Generalist/Common Branch K-5) and Early Childhood Education (Birth-Grade 2), as well as Secondary Specialist Programs (Grades 6-12) in Social Studies, English, Mathematics, and Science. All of these programs lead to state teaching certification. Syllabi from all of the courses offered in these programs were reviewed for attention to ELLs, and questionnaires regarding attention to ELLs in the curricula were administered electronically to all faculty and teacher candidates in these programs.

2.2 Participants

Teacher education faculty who participated in the questionnaire included full and part-time professors who were instructors of at least one course in the programs under study in Fall 2011 or Spring 2012. Out of a possible 108 faculty members, 59 consented to participate in this study (response rate of 55%). Three had been teacher educators for less than 1 year (5.3 %), 11 (19.3%) had 1-3 years of experience, 10 (17.5%) had 4-6 years of experience, and 11 (19.3%) had more than 6 years of experience as university-level teacher educators. The number of faculty participants is representative of the relative size of each of the program areas included in this study. Twenty-three faculty participants (44.2%) prepared teachers to be Elementary educators, 11 (21.2%) prepared candidates to be Early Childhood educators, ten (19.2%) prepared secondary English teachers, and 8 (15.4%) mathematics, 8 (15.4%) social studies, and 6 (15.4%) prepared science teacher candidates. These faculty were members of one of three departments at the SoE: Curriculum and Teaching, Educational Foundations, or Special Education.

Teacher education candidates who participated in the questionnaire were enrolled in one of the six preparation programs leading to state certification included in this study. All candidates were graduate-level students in their final semester of their program and registered in a supervised teaching practicum in Spring 2012. Out of a possible 286 teacher candidates, 249 consented to participate in this study (response rate of 87%). While 201 (80.7%) were student teachers, 48 (19.3%) were full-time teachers who had been employed between one and three years. Full-time teachers were pursuing a Masters degree, additional certification, or were enrolled in alternative licensure programs and were pursuing initial certification under internship waivers. Their numbers were also representative of the size of the programs, with 105 (42%) from Elementary education teacher candidate participants, 47 (19%) in Early Childhood, 30 (12%) in Secondary English, 21 (8%) in Secondary Social Studies, 28 (11%) in Secondary Mathematics, and 18 (7%) in Secondary Science.

2.3 Data Sources and Analysis

Syllabi review. The first part of the study consisted of analyzing existing syllabi from across these teacher preparation programs to assess the extent to which ELLs were addressed in the program's curricula. In order to do this, a research assistant downloaded syllabi from a central online repository accessible within the SoE community,

with permission from the dean. All syllabi were accessed from all courses in the programs studied, which were taught in Fall 2011 or Spring 2012, which were the two most recent semesters prior to conducting the research. Analyzing the most recent syllabi was done to see the most current versions of every course offered in the program. Some courses had more than one section offered, and all variations of syllabi by section were included while duplicates were removed. From this master set of syllabi, every other syllabus was chosen. The research assistant de-identified course instructors' names on the syllabi and replaced them with a numerical code to preserve confidentiality. This yielded a total of 119 syllabi reviewed: 19 from the Early Childhood program, 23 from the Elementary education program, 21 from Secondary English, 12 from Secondary math and science, and 9 from secondary social studies.

The syllabi were then coded by the author using a rubric specifically designed for the purpose of assessing the degree of attention provided to ELLs in the syllabus, and then cross-coded with two research assistants, using a rubric specifically designed for the purpose of assessing the degree of attention made to ELLs in the syllabus. The rubric used, the *Innovation Configuration on Instructional Practices for Mainstream Teachers of ELL Students*, was developed by the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (McGraner & Saenz, 2009) as a tool to support teacher educators in evaluation their curricula in terms of its attention to ELLs. The rubric was slightly adapted from the original in order for terminology to be more relevant to the local context (see Appendix A).

Four categories of focus on ELLs--"domains"--were included in the rubric:

(1) the sociocultural and political foundations of teaching ELLs, such as the identification, placement, and instructional programs for ELLs; strategies for addressing issues of discrimination against immigrants and people who speak English as a second language; strategies to communicate with ELL families, and federal policy implications on ELL programming;

(2) foundations of second language acquisition, such as the difference between social and academic language; the instructional needs of ELLs who were either born in the U.S. or have been in the U.S. for at least 6-7 years, but are still not fully English proficient; and the nature of both conversational and academic English in relation to ELLs;

(3) effective instructional practices for teaching content to ELLs, such as strategies for planning and carrying out instruction that supports the acquisition of academic English, differentiated instruction specifically for ELLs, strategies for teaching content (e.g., reading/language arts, math, science, history/social science) to students learning English, lesson design that considers content as well as language objectives, models of collaboration with ESL teachers, such as push-in, pull-out, co-teaching, and strategies for organizing patterns of interaction in the classroom that promote ELLs' verbal participation and access to content; and

(4) assessment and testing accommodations, such as bias in testing for ELLs, formal and informal assessment of ELLs, and the instructional needs of ELLs who are also receiving special education services.

These categories constituted the content and pedagogical content knowledge candidates would need to prepare them for their roles as teachers of ELLs. For each category, the syllabus was evaluated on a scale of 1-4. A score of 1 indicated there was no evidence in the syllabus that the concept was addressed; 2 indicated that the concept was mentioned in the syllabus; 3 indicated that the concept was mentioned and there was a related assigned reading; and a score of 4 indicated that the concept was mentioned in syllabus, readings, and at least one other activity, such as observation assignments, journal responses, fieldwork, or special projects. Where there was more than one syllabus for a single course, the ratings were averaged.

Faculty and candidate questionnaire. In the second part of the study, faculty and candidates responded to an anonymous, online questionnaire related to their beliefs and practices regarding ELL pedagogy. This questionnaire was administered in the Spring of 2012 through SurveyMonkey. Faculty checked off their relevant program area, and results could therefore be sorted to only include faculty in particular program areas, without any faculty names. The survey monkey link was sent by email, and faculty and candidates were asked to complete the survey within two weeks. The researchers had no way to identify the participants, since it was completed via an encrypted version of the online program.

This online questionnaire, designed for this study, included items (1) to measure prior personal or teaching experiences with ELLs, adapted from the *Teacher Education Language Learner Survey* (Ruiz, Lotan, Lozano, Berta-Avila, & Arellano, 2008); (2) to assess attitudes towards teaching ELLs, based on the instrument used by Reeves (2006); (3) to address the aspects of their courses which related to ELLs, and (4) to investigate areas of interest for future professional development. The instrument therefore captured demographic information about the

participant, such as their prior and current teaching experience, experience either teaching ELLs, their own history of language learning, and whether they had received any prior training on ELLs. It also prompted the participants to evaluate (from strongly disagree to strongly agree) statements related to their beliefs about language teaching and learning, self-efficacy in working with ELLs, and interest in teaching this population. The format of the questionnaire consisted of 18 questions, 14 of which were forced choice (12 single-option response and two multiple-option response), one was likert-scale rating, and three were ranked choices.

In total, 59 faculty members and 249 candidates responded to the questionnaires administered. Questionnaire items 1-18 were quantitatively analyzed using descriptive statistics, with responses to similar items within and between faculty and administration candidates cross-tabulated and tallied.

Using a multi-method approach--qualitative review of the syllabi and both qualitative and quantitative analysis of the questionnaire responses--contributed to a fuller understanding of these program's curricular orientation to ELLs. An intrinsic case (Stake, 1995) was formed to understand candidates' perceptions within the particulars of one institution of teacher education. An intrinsic case study positions the researchers as seeking greater insight into an issue in a certain place, though similar findings may emerge in a different context.

Limitations to the study must acknowledge the inherent flaws in syllabi review, since these are documents that vary in their detail and most certainly do not capture the full range of topics that are actually or spontaneously generated within a course. Syllabi review does not provide a complete picture of the curriculum, as Hess and Kelly (2007) state in their survey of syllabi in school leadership programs. "While syllabi cannot convey the tone of classroom instruction, they enumerate what topics professors will cover and what students will read. Ultimately…syllabi are like blueprints: they reveal structure and design, even if they do not fully reflect what real life instruction looks like" (p. 246). Efforts to constrain the limitations of syllabi analysis and to strengthen validity were made by using triangulation with the views of faculty and candidates.

3. Findings

Findings from the syllabi review and questionnaire analysis indicated that overall there was little formal attention to ELLs in the curricula, although candidates believed that some of the topics had been briefly addressed in their course activities. First, findings from faculty and candidate questionnaires regarding prior experiences as language learners or teachers of ELLs, and where in the program they believed there had been attention to ELL needs, are presented. Next, the results of syllabi analysis provide a more complete snapshot of the teacher education curricula in terms of addressing ELLs. Finally, faculty-reported needs, interests, and challenges in bringing in a greater focus on ELLs are reported.

3.1 Faculty and Candidate Experience with Language Learning and ELLs

Questionnaire results were compared across faculty and candidate participants in order to investigate prior experiences as language learners, or experiences teaching ELLs. Interestingly, the teacher candidate population overall reported more such experiences in their background than did faculty (see Table 1).

Table 1: Faculty and Candidate Participants by Program Area

**percentages shown*

Program Areas	Grew up using a language other than English		Immigrated to the US from non-English speaking country		Have at least one parent who immigrated to the US from non-English speaking country		Studied outside of the US in a language other than English		Had taught English language learners in P-12 classrooms	
Faculty (n=59) Candidates (n=249)	F	C	F	C	F	C	F	C	F	C
Early Childhood Education	27.3	16.7	18.2	0	27.3	16.7	10.0	16.7	91.0	33.3
Elementary Education	21.7	41.7	8.7	20.8	26.1	33.3	8.6	16.7	91.3	33.3
Secondary English	20.0	40.0	10.0	0	30.0	60.0	20.0	30.0	90.0	10.0
Secondary Mathematics	0	28.6	0	14.3	12.5	28.6	12.5	14.3	75.0	28.6
Secondary Science	0	33.3	0	16.7	16.7	33.3	0	0	66.7	33.3
Secondary Social Studies	0	37.5	0	25.0	12.5	57.1	12.5	14.3	75.0	57.1
Average by Descriptor	23.0	33.0	12.3	19.2	20.9	38.2	12.7	17.8	81.5	32.6

For instance, 33% of the teacher candidates indicated they were learners of English as an additional language, versus 23% of faculty; 38% of candidates reported having a parent who spoke a language other than English in the home versus 21% of faculty; and only 12.3% of faculty versus 19.2% of candidates had immigrated to the US. In the Secondary Science program, 38% of the teacher candidates report growing up speaking a language other than English, in contrast with none of the faculty. This could mean that in an urban campus such as where this research took place, teacher candidates may bring linguistic diversity that exceeds that of the faculty population. Also of note is that among faculty in the Early Childhood, Elementary, and English programs there is much greater linguistic diversity than in Secondary Science, Social Studies, or Mathematics, whereas among teacher candidates themselves there is a spread across all programs ranging from 17-31%, in speaking a language other than English.

Faculty and candidates also reported on prior experiences studying academic subject matter through a language other than English, and only 12.7% of faculty and 17.8% of candidates had done so. These results indicate that overall among faculty and candidates, very few had personally experienced the need to acquire a new language for academic survival. Again, however, faculty in Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary English education appeared to have more such experiences than did faculty in the other program areas.

When asked about prior training and experience directly teaching ELLs in P-12 classroom settings, less than 10% of faculty had taken university coursework to do so, yet most (81.5%) had taught ELLs. While few candidates had any training, only 32% reported having taught ELLs, which is likely due to their mostly novice status. Again, faculty from Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary English preparation programs reported experience teaching ELLs in higher numbers, averaging 90.8% in contrast with an average of 72.2% among Mathematics, Social Studies and Science faculty. Candidates across the program areas somewhat evenly reported having experienced teaching ELLs, although social studies candidates were the highest, with 57.1% indicating they had worked with ELLs, though none had taken coursework focused on ELL instruction.

3.2 Faculty and Candidates Reporting on the Focus on ELLs in Curricula

In the questionnaire, faculty and teacher candidates were asked to review a series of ELL-related possible course topics, and rank them from 1 to 4 according to the extent to which they believed these topics had been addressed in their coursework, readings, or clinical experiences. The majority of the responses indicated that most of the possible topic choices presented in the questionnaire were touched on at some point in their program, several were discussed in depth, yet very few were connected to more extensive activities such as fieldwork journals or

observations. In Table 2, a comparison of faculty and candidate responses is presented.

Table 2: Focus on ELL Education across Preparation Programs: Faculty (F) and Candidate (C) Reports and Syllabi (S) Analysis

Average rating on scale from 1 (No focus on ELLs) to 4 (Explored in depth)															
Program Areas	Sociocultural & Bilingual Foundations of Education			Second Language Acquisition Processes			Instructional Methods of Teaching ELLs			Assessment Modifications for ELLs			Average Rating for Program Area		
	F	C	S	F	C	S	F	C	S	F	C	S	F	C	S
Early Childhood Education F (N=11) C (N=47) S (N=19)	2.86	2.34	1.58	2.59	1.84	1.47	2.89	2.31	1.47	2.61	2.00	1.21	2.74	2.12	1.43
Elementary Education F (N=23) C (N=105) S (N=49)	2.38	2.07	1.27	2.38	1.93	1.39	2.53	2.49	1.41	2.29	1.81	1.16	2.40	2.08	1.31
Secondary English F (N=10) C (N=30) S (N=21)	2.00	2.48	2.00	2.08	2.41	1.76	2.12	2.57	1.86	1.95	2.23	1.29	2.04	2.42	1.73
Secondary Mathematics F (N=8) C (N=28) S (N=12)	1.75	1.81	1.58	2.17	1.67	1.42	1.97	1.80	1.42	2.06	1.72	1.00	1.99	1.75	1.36
Secondary Science F (N=6) C (N=18) S (N=12)	1.67	1.94	1.58	1.78	1.83	1.42	1.59	1.75	1.25	1.67	1.37	1.00	1.68	1.72	1.31
Secondary Social Studies F (N=8) C (N=21) S (N=9)	1.71	1.81	1.78	1.75	1.52	1.56	1.56	1.67	1.34	1.57	1.50	1.00	1.65	1.63	1.42
Average Rating by Domain	2.06	1.74	1.49	2.13	1.87	1.43	2.11	2.10	1.45	2.03	1.56	1.18	2.08	1.95	1.39
Overall Average Rating by Domain	1.76	1.81	1.89	1.59	1.76										

In Table 2, the highest number of responses from both faculty and candidates across the same item prompts from the questionnaire are bolded. A review of these indicates that there is a good deal of consistency between the two groups' perceptions of the attention paid to ELLs in coursework, with faculty more likely to report there was some attention made to ELLs than candidates were, except in the case of the Secondary English program. This may

be because in-class conversations, peer-to-peer dialogue, student presentations and resources shared, which arose spontaneously and were not part of the official course syllabus or texts, did address ELLs and were recalled by faculty. It could also mean that the Secondary English faculty had higher standards about what constituted adequate attention to ELLs and were more critical. Overall, areas which faculty believed were unaddressed in the program were the same ones for which candidates indicated a lack of preparation; conversely, those areas which faculty believed were addressed in the program, candidates also indicated being discussed. Domains that received average score rankings of 2-3 (indicating they had been discussed in class and had included an assigned reading on ELLs) by both faculty and candidates were limited to the Early Childhood and Secondary English programs, in three of the four domains, and in the Elementary education program, in two of the four domains. None of the remaining programs received a 2 or higher from both faculty and candidates in any of the domains, meaning that most of the possible foci on ELLs presented in the questionnaire were reported as receiving little to no attention in the curriculum.

Comprising each of the four domains were four specific topics which faculty and candidates ranked in the questionnaire prompts. Three specific topics (out of 16), which were ranked lowest by both faculty and candidates, related to: (1) addressing special populations of ELLs, such as those dually labeled learning disabled and ELL, ELLs with interrupted formal education, and long-term ELLs; (2) discussing models of collaboration in ESL program models (e.g. co-teaching, push-in, pull-out instruction); and (3) supporting the development of writing skills among ELLs. Candidates rated the following three topics with the highest scores, indicating they had experienced some attention to these in their programs: (1) Discussing strategies for making content comprehensible to ELLs; (2) Considering the difference between social and academic language, and (3) designing lessons with both language and content objectives.

4. Results of Syllabi Analysis

Results of the syllabi review are consistent with the findings from the faculty and candidates' reports, in that some indicate attention being made to ELLs, with other syllabi containing no mention of ELLs. The vast majority of the course syllabi did not specify readings, assignments, projects, or clinical (field-based) assignments relative to ELLs, and received lower scores than reports made by faculty and candidates (see Table 2). Across all four domains, the rating average for syllabi inclusion of ELLs ranged from a low of 1.18 out of 4 in the area of assessment and accommodations, to 1.49 in the area of second language acquisition processes. For instance, in every domain, and in every program, syllabi ratings for ELL infusion are lower than ratings made by candidate and faculty reports, respectively. Faculty ratings are consistently the highest of the three. In general, syllabi did not refer to ELLs, thus the average rating received by program area (see Table 2) is a result of the contributions of less than 10% of the syllabi in each program. The majority of "points" earned came from a small percentage of syllabi. These points were given because there were readings as well as field-based assignments that targeted ELLs in these course syllabi.

Just as with faculty and candidate reporting on the extent ELLs were addressed in their courses, which showed the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary English programs with higher ratings than the other secondary programs, syllabi ratings indicated that these same programs had a higher number of readings, assignments, and course activities specific to ELLs. For example, one assignment in an Early Childhood course required students to "reflect on contextual factors (political/policy) that impact the school and how the teacher deals with ELL populations and plans for differentiated instruction" in a journal entry from their clinical experiences, and another assignment is a case study of the oral and written language development, that asks for socio-cultural linguistic backgrounds of subjects. In the Elementary Education program, candidates are required to create lesson plans differentiated for ELLs, and several readings on language policy, bilingualism, and second language literacy. In the Secondary English program, there are class sessions devoted to the development of literacy in a second language, with assigned readings, and sessions on differentiated instruction for ELLs. In the Secondary Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies programs, which share a common course in adolescent development, most of the attention to ELLs occurred here, although as a part of topics on multiculturalism and culturally responsive pedagogy.

5. Discussion

Taking inventory of the data yields three main considerations, which may explain why there was, overall, little attention to ELLs across the curriculum—and why in a few cases, there was much greater attention.

First, the structures and staffing within higher education do not promote the sharing of practice across faculty

members within a program, let alone across multiple programs (Pugach, Blanton & Correa, 2011; Tierney, 1997). The few course syllabi which contained a high degree of attention to ELLs were as likely taught by an adjunct faculty member as a full-time one; yet, with 70% of courses being taught by adjuncts, the likelihood that these syllabi would be collaboratively developed, and then made consistent across sections, would be small. The inconsistency of syllabi across one course section may explain why faculty and candidates also had varied experiences. Without a common purpose or mission to prepare teachers for work with ELLs, as Costa, McPhail, Smith, & Brisk (2005) found in their work, their presence in the curriculum will be left to chance.

Second, the background experiences of faculty may be a contributing factor to the extent of attention paid to ELLs in the curriculum. Although the teacher candidates may have had experiences as language learners or familiarity with learning academic content in another language, fewer faculty did. In particular, faculty from the secondary subjects other than English were the least likely to have infused their courses with ELL subject matter, and also the least likely to themselves have a background in language learning. As Pettit (2011) reinforces in her literature review on teachers' beliefs about ELLs, there is a strong connection between personal experiences and subsequent empathy for and interest in ELLs in one's classroom. If teacher education faculty lack such empathy-building experiences, they may simply be unaware of the ways their curriculum absents ELLs. In addition to focusing on pre- and in-service teachers' beliefs, this type of research may need to take place among teacher educators.

Third, the particular culture and stance towards learners and their needs within teacher preparation will likely color the content of a program's curriculum. For secondary subject area faculty, content knowledge may take pre-eminence in their preparation curriculum over learner characteristics, while in programs like Early Childhood and Elementary education, the focus of courses may tend to be more on the whole child rather than on subject matter. The role of literacy and language learning within and in relation to content-area learning is likely more of a focus in English, Early childhood and elementary education programs. In addition, an orientation to social justice, multiculturalism, or culturally responsive pedagogy—which appeared to be components of the secondary education preparation courses-- may in many cases not include a focus on language development as the role of the classroom teacher. The need for greater language awareness among secondary subject matter teachers has been widely discussed in the literature (Faltis, Arias & Ramírez-Marín, 2010), yet even within preparation for ESL specialists, Yates and Muchisky (2003) assert that a focus on learners' life experiences and acculturation has led to the marginalization of language itself in teacher training. They argue that at the core of teacher education for language learners should be knowledge of second language acquisition.

Thus, various systems, such as state certification bodies, institutions of higher education, and departments, necessarily interact with individual faculty member's beliefs and priorities—resulting in multiple challenges that may hinder opportunities to focus on ELLs in the curriculum.

6. Implications for Teacher Education Programs

As credentialing programs prepare future teachers for the contexts and demographics they are likely to encounter in US public schools, a focus on ELLs can no longer be seen as optional (Goodwin, 2002). Institutions of teacher education committed to the academic and social welfare of ELLs must scrutinize existing curricula to ensure ELLs are not marginalized—or absent altogether—from preparation curricula. As was done in this initiative, one approach is to examine the responses provided by faculty, candidates, and syllabi around the key content components of preparation for ELL pedagogy, in order to map the curriculum teacher education.

Although findings from this study revealed that the extent to which ELLs were a focus of course and clinical activities was minimal, at the same time, there was willingness, interest, and some meaningful curricular components already taking place that could enhance this preparation. Building upon those aspects that integrated a focus on ELLs into course curricula that were evidenced in this study, possible means to address ELLs might include:

1) *Collaborative, cross-departmental alliances*. Teaming faculty may offer rich opportunities to enhance knowledge about effectively working with ELL populations. Encouraging a culture of collaboration at the higher education level can lead to inter-class visitation, shared online course activities, and common assignments that focus on ELLs.
2) *Targeted video review*. The creation of a video library of lessons taught to ELLs could provide a resource that can be used both for teacher development with the added benefit of faculty being able to screen, select, control for, and anticipate key findings, impossible in live clinical observations at school sites.

3) *Joint fieldwork assignments*. Candidates from across elementary or secondary programs could be placed in classrooms with ELLs, teachers with ELL expertise, or even partnered placements with Bilingual or TESOL candidates. This would offer the opportunity to dialogue about the cultural and linguistic challenges faced by ELLs via field-based assignments focused on these students.

4) *Capitalizing on candidates' linguistic heritage*: If candidates enter programs with prior experiences as learners of English, their "funds of knowledge" (Moll, 1992) could become a resource that could be harnessed for the benefit of the whole teacher education community. For instance, digital stories in which teacher candidates recount their personal life histories and challenges as a non-English speaker could be powerful peer-to-peer learning experiences for their classmates.

To effectively prepare teachers for the critical work they need to do in our increasingly diverse schools, several factors need to come together in teacher education programs. First, faculty involved in the design of programs might opt to conduct a needs assessment, to evaluate how and where candidates learn about ELLs in coursework and field experiences. Inviting teachers who have graduated from programs to comment on the challenges they face in working with ELLs in their classrooms back to campus, or conducting focus groups with local administrators are other sources of feedback and support for program faculty. Providing professional development for faculty, which offers them the time, space, and resources to learn more about second language acquisition, the linguistic demands of content area texts and tasks, and strategies for making content comprehensible to ELLs are a few of the topics that might be offered. Within schools of education, faculty with specialized expertise from TESOL or Bilingual programs may be invited to share expertise, offering suggestions about how to enrich program content and delivery. Ultimately, teacher education faculty must support candidates in understanding what appropriately designed education for ELLs entails. To achieve these ends, continuous professional learning about ELLs for faculty is both essential and timely.

References

Alamillo, L., Padilla, F., & Arenas, R. (2011). Focus on faculty: Improving the preparation of teachers of English learner students. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 10*(3), 261-276. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2011.581115

Athanases, S., & De Oliveira, L. (2011). Toward program-wide coherence in preparing teachers to teach and advocate for English language learners. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classroom*s (pp. 195-215). New York, NY: Routledge.

Brisk, M.E., & Zisselsberger, M. (2011). "We've let them in on the secret": Using SFL theory to improve the teaching of writing to bilingual learners. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classroom*s (pp. 111-126). New York, NY: Routledge.

Costa, J., McPhail, G., Smith, J., & Brisk, M.E. (2005). Faculty first: The challenges of infusing the teacher education curriculum with scholarship on English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(2), 104-118. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022487104274119

De Oliveira, L., & Shoffner, M. (2009). Addressing the needs of English language learners in an English education methods course. *English Education, 42*(1), 91-111.

Faltis, C., Arias. M.B., & Ramírez-Marín, F. (2010). Identifying relevant competencies for secondary teachers of English learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 33*(3), 307-328. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2010.529350

Fry, R. (2008). *The role of schools in the English language learner achievement gap.* Washington, DC: The Pew Hispanic Center.

Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Listening to teachers of English language learners: A survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.

García, E., Jensen, B.T., & Scribner, K.P. (2009). The demographic imperative. *Educational Leadership, 66(*7), 8-13.

Gebhard, M., Willett, J., Caicedo, J.P.J., & Piedra, A. (2011). Systemic functional linguistics, teachers' professional development, and ELLs' academic literacy practices. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classroom*s (pp. 91-110). New York, NY: Routledge.

Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners. What the research does—and does not—say. *American*

Educator, *32*(2), 8–23.

Goodwin, A. L. (2002). Teacher preparation and the education of immigrant children. *Education and Urban Society, 34*(2), 156–172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013124502034002003

Grossman, P., Hammerness, K.M., McDonald, M., & Ronfeldt, M. (2008). Constructing coherence: Structural predictors of perceptions of coherence in NYC teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(4), 273-287. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022487108322127

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

Hernández, D.J., Denton, N.A., & Macartney, S.E. (2007). *Children of immigrants-The U.S. and 50 states: National origins, language, and early education in child trends*. Center for Social and Demographic Analysis, University at Albany, SUNY. 20047 Research Brief Series, Publication #2007-11, 1-9. Retrieved from www.albany.edu/csda/children

Hess, F.M., & Kelly, A.P. (2007). Learning to lead: What gets taught in principal-preparation programs. *Teachers College Record, 109*(1), 244-274.

Howey, K. (1996). Designing coherent and effective teacher education programs. In J. Sikula, T.J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 143-170). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Jimenez-Silva, M., Olson, K., & Jimenez Hernandez, N. (2012). The confidence to teach English language learners: Exploring coursework's role in developing preservice teachers' efficacy. *The Teacher Educator, 47*(1), 9-28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2011.632471

Leung, C., & Creese, A. (2010). *English as an additional language: Approaches to teaching linguistic minority students*. London: Sage.

Lohfink, G., Morales, A., Shroyer, G., & Yahnke. S. (2012). Growing effective CLD teachers for today's classrooms of CLD children. *Action in Teacher Education, 34*(1), 41-54. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2012.642287

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A.M. (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classroom*s (pp. 55-72). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Maxwell, K. L., Lim, C.I., & Early, D. M. (2006). *Early childhood teacher preparation programs in the United States: National report*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina FPG Child Development Institute.

McGraner, K.L., & Saenz, L. (2009). *Preparing teachers of English language learners.* Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from: http://www.tqsource.org/pdfs/PreparingTeachersofELLsprelim%20ed.pdf

Meskill, C. (2005). Infusing English language learner issues throughout professional educator curricula: The training all teachers project. *Teachers College Record, 107*(4), 739-756.

Moll, L. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132- 41. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534

Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives for a new century*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pettit, S.K. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about English language learners in the mainstream classroom: A review of the literature. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 5*(2), 123-147. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2011.594357

Polat, N. (2010). A comparative analysis of pre-and in-service teacher beliefs about readiness and self-competency: Revisiting teacher education for ELLs. *System, 3*8(2), 228-244. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.03.004

Pugach, M.C., Blanton, L.P., & Correa, V.I. (2011). A historical perspective on the role of collaboration in teacher education reform: Making good on the promise of teaching all students. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 34*, 183-200. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0888406411406141

Reeves, J. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research, 99*(3), 131-142. http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JOER.99.3.131-143

Ruiz, N.T., Lotan, R., Lozano, A., Berta-Avila, M., & Arellano, A. (2008). *The Teacher Education English Learner Survey (TEELS)*. California State University: Sacramento.

Sakash, K., & Rodriguez-Brown, F. (2011). Fostering collaboration between mainstream and bilingual teachers and teacher candidates. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classroom*s (pp. 143-159). New York, NY: Routledge.

Smith, P.C. (2004). Pre-service teachers‘ attitudes regarding ESL students. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 8(1). Retrieved from http://www.thefreelibrary.com/_/print/PrintArticle.aspx?id=116450609

Téllez, K., & Waxman, H. C. (2008). Preparing quality teachers for English language Learners: An overview of critical issues. In K.Téllez & H. C.Waxman (Eds.), *Preparing quality educators for English language learners: Research, policies and practices* (pp. 1–22). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Santa Cruz, CA: University of California, Santa Cruz, Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence. Retrieved from http://repositories.cdlib.org/crede/finalrpts/1_1_final

Tierney, W.G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68(*1), 1-16. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2959934

Villegas, A.M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 20-32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053001003

Walker, A., Shafer, J., & Iams, M. (2004). "Not in my classroom": Teacher attitudes towards English language learners in the mainstream classroom. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 2*1(1), 130-160.

Walker, C.L. & Stone, K. (2011). Preparing teachers to reach English language learners: Pre-service and in-service initiatives. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classroom*s (pp. 127-142). New York, NY: Routledge.

Washburn, G.N. (2008). Alone, confused, and frustrated: Developing empathy and strategies for working with English language learners. *The Clearing House, 81*(6), 247-250. http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/TCHS.81.6.247-250

Yates, R., & Muchisky, D. (2003). On reconceptualizing teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(1), 135-147. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588468

Appendix A

Rubric to Evaluate Infusion of ELL Pedagogy

	Code = 0	Code = 1	Code = 2	Code = 3
Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria specified from 0 to 4. Score and rate each item separately. Descriptors and examples are bulleted below the components	**No evidence that the concept is included in the class syllabus**	**Concept mentioned in class syllabus**	**Concept mentioned in syllabus and required readings**	**Concept mentioned in syllabus, readings, and one of these:** • **Observations** • **Lesson plans** • **Classroom demonstrations** • **Journal response** • **Fieldwork/Student Teaching** • **Projects**
A. Sociocultural and Political Foundations for Teaching ELL Students • Effects of globalization and immigration • Social and cultural contexts of educating nonnative speakers • Federal policy formation related to ELL teaching and learning, including development and implementation of standards based ELL instruction • Relationships among political constituencies and subsequent influences on instructional policy				
B. Foundations of Second Language Acquisition • Theories second language acquisition • Stage models of second language acquisition • Factors influencing variation in second language acquisition • How bilingualism is achieved and degrees of bilingualism • Differences between academic and social language proficiency • The role of language and culture in overall learning • Misconceptions and myths related to second language learning				
C. Effective Instructional Practices for Teaching Academic Content to ELL • Sheltered instructional strategies • Making content comprehensible • Linguistic demands of academic texts • Language objectives in content learning • Differentiated instruction • Social interaction for learning				
D. Assessment and Testing Accommodations • Challenges of assessing content with limited language proficiency • Testing bias • Appropriate use of classroom accommodations, such as English and bilingual dictionaries and glossaries, extra time, dual language tests				