INTESOL Journal Volume 12, Issue 1 Summer 2015

Table of Contents **Page Number**

From the Editor 3-6

Susan R. Adams

From Hoosier created to nationally developed: The Move from the Indiana English language proficiency standards to the WIDA English language development standards 7-28

Trish Morita-Mullaney

Moving on Up with WIDA: Helping Near-Proficient English Learners Reach Full Proficiency 29-50

Faridah Pawan and Anita Seralathan

Talking Points and Strategies to Get Your Administrators on Board with WIDA 51-62

Donna Albrecht

English through Inquiry: Implications of WIDA for Secondary Science Education Professional Development 63-83

Catherine D. Bhathena

Getting with Program: An ACCESS Success Story 84-91

Nicholas Fine

Indiana Department of Education Perspectives on the Transition: How We Got Here, What We Should Remember, and What We Hope for 92-100

Charlie Geier, Rachel Davidson, and Nathan Williamson

IINTESOL Journal Special Issue: WIDA in Indiana Volume 12, Issue 1

Indiana Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

Volume 12, Issue 1 Summer 2015

INTESOL Journal

Founded 1979

INTESOL Journal

A Journal for Indiana Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

Volume 12, Number 1
Special Issue:
WIDA in Indiana
Summer 2015

Editor

Susan R. Adams
Butler University

Editorial Advisory Board

Trish Morita-Mullaney, President
Purdue University

Rachel Davidson, Immediate Past President
Indiana Department of Education

Meg Troxel, Vice President
Indianapolis Public Schools

Nathan Williamson, Treasurer
Indiana Department of Education

Charlie Geier, Executive Secretary
Indiana Department of Education

Bree Ausenbaugh, Recording Secretary
Indiana Department of Education

Marsha Manning, Adult and Community Education
MSD Perry Township

Emilija Zlatkovska, University, IEP Representative
University of Southern Indiana

Robin Bigham, MSD Lawrence Township, K-12 Representative

Susan R. Adams, At Large Representative and *INTESOL Journal* Editor

Annie Garcia, Graduate Student Representative

Tiffany Ann Ellis, Newsletter Editor
Ball State University

Philip R. Boltz, Webmaster
Ball State University

ISSN: 2373-8936

TABLE OF CONTENTS **PAGE**

From the Editor 3-6
Susan R. Adams

From Hoosier created to nationally developed: The Move from the Indiana English language proficiency standards to the WIDA English language development standards 7-28
Trish Morita-Mullaney

Moving on Up with WIDA: Helping Near-Proficient English Learners Reach Full Proficiency 29-50
Faridah Pawan and Anita Seralathan

Talking Points and Strategies to Get Your Administrators on Board with WIDA 51-62
Donna Albrecht

English through Inquiry: Implications of WIDA for Secondary Science Education Professional Development 63-83
Catherine D. Bhathena

Getting with Program: An ACCESS Success Story 84-91
Nicholas Fine

Indiana Department of Education Perspectives on the Transition: How We Got Here, What We Should Remember, and What We Hope for 92-100
Charlie Geier, Rachel Davidson, and Nathan Williamson

Information for Contributors 101-103

FROM THE EDITOR

SUSAN R. ADAMS,
Butler University

Baby Steps for Sustainable Changes in Our Practice

I was privileged to participate in the April 2015 WIDA Train the Trainers sessions at the Central Indiana Educational Service Center (CIESC). During the three days we spent with trainer, Allyson Newton, I found myself pivoting between a sense of optimism for what I firmly believe is embedded support and a strong rationale for improved instructional design for English Language Learners (ELLs) and the simultaneous sinking sensation that mainstream educators might find themselves overwhelmed by the sheer volume of information, materials, and unfamiliar terms of WIDA (MPI's, Can Do Standards, ACCESS®, etc.). Whereas the old Indiana English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards were limited to listing performance indicators aligned to the English/Language Arts Standards, at least they provided exemplars for mainstream teachers of what one might expect of an ELL by grade level and by language proficiency level. In other words, once the teacher located an appropriate parallel skill, it was a relatively simple matter to adjust the indicators to fit the content area and the skills being assessed. WIDA has elected to provide only exemplar Model Performance Indicators to encourage educators to create building- or district-specific standards across content areas, grade levels, and language levels.

Indiana's original ELP Standards were the result of immense labor and constituted a significant innovation when they were released in November of 2003. However it is sadly true that very few mainstream educators actually *used* the ELP standards during their twelve years of

existence, hard as many ENL teachers and administrators worked to persuade their colleagues otherwise. Perhaps there was something about the title, or maybe the origins, of the ELP standards that convinced many mainstream educators that those ELP standards were only for ESL classrooms and somehow did not apply to mainstream instruction. I am encouraged that there seems to be a fresh commitment from school leaders and administrators to expect implementation and to support mainstream teachers as they familiarize themselves with WIDA resources. I also anticipate local school districts will partner with our colleagues at the Indiana Department of Education to provide meaningful, productive professional development that builds capacity for thoughtful implementation of locally created Model Performance Indicators (MPI's) for content area courses.

In my years of teaching, I have learned that I can only sustain new habits and new practices if I think in terms of baby steps, of doing one small thing for a very long time until it becomes second nature. I cannot commit to writing full-blown MPI's for every lesson I teach every day, but I can commit to writing MPI's for two lessons a month for a year. And I can share those MPI's with my colleague and can take advantage of MPI's developed by my colleagues each month so our efforts are maximized. I probably will not blow up every lesson I taught this year and start from scratch, but I can commit to adding one new visual element per week to support the comprehension of ELLs and visual learners. If I have a long habit of lecturing in my teaching, it is unlikely that I will stop overnight; I could, however, start using a timer to stop myself every ten minutes to allow students to engage in a turn-and-talk pair/share in English or in the L1 to encourage oral academic language development for all of my students. Real change takes time. We must begin first by building reasonable, achievable implementation timelines and

then must jointly commit to small, measurable steps to provide access to the full curriculum, to enrich classroom engagement, and to insist on equitable outcomes for ELLs.

If we encourage our mainstream colleagues to join us in making baby-step, measurable and doable commitments, I am convinced we will see real, positive, and sustainable change in instruction for ELLs over the next academic year. And if we find creative ways to celebrate those small successes, we will build capacity for mainstream teachers to build on their own success in subsequent years. ESL coaches or administrators could print custom certificates of awesomeness, invite shout-outs during faculty meetings, make mention of creative approaches in newsletters, or invite teachers to share innovations during lunch and learn sessions. And when we find a mainstream teacher who is a strong adopter of WIDA approaches, we can offer to co-present a session at the 2015 INTESOL conference next fall, so be watching for a call for proposals very soon.

In spite of our collective failure to convince our colleagues to make good use of them, I remain grateful to the original Indiana ESL Taskforce Members who blazed the trail and created the first ELP standards that ever existed in Indiana. As WIDA now moves into ascendance, let us collectively archive our tattered copies of the original ELP standards with much appreciation for the work of the Indiana ESL Task Force:

- Darlene Slaby
- Lauren Harvey
- Sheila Ewing
- Tom Good
- Peggy Harrington
- Donna Hernandez
- Kristin Hoyt-Oukada
- Dinah Michels
- Trish Morita Mullaney
- Janice Newton
- Cindy O’Brien
- Maritza Robles
- Sharon Smith
- Debbie Thomas
- Marilee Updike
- Brenda Ward
- Wendy Wildman Long

Some of these respected and beloved folks have since moved on to well-deserved retirement. Sadly our beloved colleague, Sheila Ewing, a quiet, but fierce champion for all of Indiana's children, has since passed away. Many of these leaders and pioneers continue to advocate, to expand our collective capacities, and to blaze new pathways for Indiana's ELLs, for which we are collectively grateful.

The INTESOL Statewide Leadership group and the INTESOL Advisory Board have partnered in advocacy to bring the WIDA Standards and ACCESS® assessments to Indiana. This special WIDA in Indiana issue of the *INTESOL Journal* hopes to provide background and documentation on this historic time of transition, as well as provide educators in the field with substantive, practical, and accessible ideas for implementing WIDA approaches locally. I am grateful for each of the authors of this issue who humbly and courageously shared their initial WIDA learning at this early juncture of Indiana's journey. We are all enriched by their contributions and by their generous leadership. It is to these bright, committed, and tireless colleagues I dedicate this special issue of the *INTESOL Journal*.

From Locally Created to Nationally Sanctioned: The Move from the Indiana English Language Proficiency Standards to the WIDA English Language Development Standards

TRISH MORITA-MULLANEY,
Purdue University

The creation of the English Language Proficiency/Development Standards (ELP/D) in Indiana was a result of the federal school accountability law of No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001). ELP/D standards are intended to be connected and/or aligned with academic content standards and are intended to guide instruction and assessment and to demonstrate how English language learners (ELs) can meet the demands of those standards at each English proficiency level. With the transition from the Indiana ELP/D standards adopted in 2003 to the newly adopted World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Development standards in 2013, this paper explores the history of ELP/D standards in Indiana. This ten-year retrospective examines how the standards have impacted the overall instructional conditions for ELs.

Keywords: WIDA, English language proficiency standards, English language development standards, English language proficiency assessments, ELs, alternative assessment, parallel assessment, formative assessment

Introduction

English Language Proficiency/Development (ELP/D) standards can be connected and/or aligned to academic content standards, yet English Language (EL) educators are more likely to understand their explicit connections, as they are often the responsible providers of the related

English language proficiency assessments and instruction. Most policymakers, school leaders and teachers lack the necessary knowledges and pedagogies to examine the explicit connections between content standards and ELP/D standards. Further, ELP/D standards primarily guide the instruction and assessment cycle that happens formatively within a classroom in preparation for summative academic content exams. Because ELP/D standards use a criterion-referenced performance framework that honor students' academic knowledges at their varying levels of English proficiency, the ELP/D standards' place and position within academic standards is unclear. Academic content standards are understood by most general education teachers, which leaves the profession of EL educators with the unique challenge of articulating the purposeful connections of the ELP/D standards to academic standards and their ***aligned*** content and English language proficiency assessments.

Methodology

This study uses a narrative review approach to investigate the phenomena of educational reform and its implications for ELs (Creswell, 2014; Davies, 2000). A narrative review gathers primary documents related to the policy inquiry question. This approach allows for a more comprehensive analysis to be realized, whereas a single policy document or event limits the scope.

Data Collection

Primary documents were gathered from the US Department of Education (USDoE), the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE), the Indiana Teachers for English to Speakers of Other Languages (INTESOL) academic journal, *INTESOL Journal*, and World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) documents. These documents span the time period of 2003-2015 and provide a comprehensive review of ELP/D literature.

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using an open coding technique that examined consistent and diverging themes. The constant-comparative method was used beginning with open coding with axial coding following (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Meaning units were themed and examined. This investigation of Indiana's ELP/D standards addresses this central research question:

> *What are the central differences between the Indiana 2003 ELP/D standards and the WIDA ELP/D standards?*

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research has been done with building principals and central office leaders implementing academic content standards and the challenges and successes they face in the era of NCLB accountability, but discussion and research with ELP/D standards relative to academic achievement have been far more limited and recent (Bailey & Carroll, 2015; Bailey & Huang, 2011; Boals et al., 2015; Sireci & Faulkner-Bond, 2015; Téllez & Mosqueda, 2015). A review of historic literature will situate this study in the larger national landscape of federal, state and local accountability by discussing the genesis of ELP/D standards and their evolution in response to alignment with English proficiency assessments and connections to academic content standards.

Before NCLB: TESOL PK-12th grade ELP/D Standards

The federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) was a relatively diffuse law that largely kept the tide of school reform at bay with locally generated autonomy and accountability (Tyack & Cuban, 2007). In the late 1990s, Goals 2000 was instituted under the ESEA Act with a new focus on standardization and academic criterion was established, resulting in the birth of

academic content standards. Within the development of new standards in the subject area of English language arts (ELA), ELs were neither mentioned nor discussed (Short, 2000) with the presumption that ELA criterion was sufficient for all students.

In response to this oversight, in 1997, the international organization, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) developed a set of PK-12th grade standards focusing on the social, academic and pragmatic application of language to content areas (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1997). Preceding NCLB, there was no federal requirement to use such standards, but due to the growth of ELs throughout the globe, classroom and EL teachers consulted TESOL standards for use in framing their instruction.

TESOL conceived their ELP/D standards by grade level clusters, stating that there is great variation in English proficiency progression within grade levels and having a broad window of expectation is appropriate and responsive to English acquisition and development. For example, a 3rd grade teacher could consult the 3rd to 4th grade cluster expectation of a level 3 EL student. A teacher would see the range of what could be produced by a level 3 student within this two-year grade span.

TESOL standards were the first to address the construct of academic language, rather than merely focusing on social language (Short, 2000). Bailey and Carroll (2015) stated that this movement promoted interest in the area of the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994), content based instruction (Mohan, 1986) and the Structural Instructional Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Echevarria, Short, & Vogt, 2008; Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2000, 2004, 2006; Short, Vogt, & Echevarria, 2008; Vogt & Echevarria, 2008). These models illuminated the importance of focusing on academic language

and how it can be instructed and assessed for ELs (Bailey & Huang, 2011; Gottlieb, 2006; Gottlieb & Nguyen, 2007).

Shortly after the evolution of the TESOL standards, the state of California with a great density of ELs, added English language development standards in conjunction with their English language arts (ELA) standards. As a result of this addition and explicit connection between ELD standards and ELA standards, California report cards came to include ELP/D standards as a supplement for ELs and in some districts, student report cards included feedback on ELA and ELP/D standards for ELs.

Implementation of NCLB: ELP/D Standards aligned to content standards

Once NCLB (2001) was fully authorized and implemented, the USDoE office of Title III became the federal division overseeing EL and bilingual education, with preference given to EL program models. The NCLB law and subsequent policies required an articulation of the distinctions and interrelationships between academic content standards and English language proficiency standards (Table 1). Further, the NCLB law required alignment between the ELP/D assessment and the ELP/D standards.

	Pre NCLB	**NCLB (2001)**	**NCLB ESEA (2012) flexibility waiver** ***Indiana flexibility Waiver***
Academic Standards	ELA and Math: State Driven	ELA, Math & Science: Federally driven	ELA, Math, Science & Social Studies
ELP/D Standards	TESOL: By choice	Indiana ELP/D Standards	WIDA Standards
Summative assessments	ISTEP in ELA and Math	ISTEP+ in ELA, Math and Science	ISTEP+ in ELA, Math, Science & Social Studies

Metric of accountability for academic summative assessments	% Passing	Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) *Subgroups*	Annual Growth Targets (AGTs) *Super Subgroup*
Metric of accountability for ELP/D summative assessments	Locally determined Local autonomy	AMAOs with LAS Links™ ELP/D instrument	AMAOs with ACCESS ELP/D instrument

Table 1: Content and ELP/D Standard relationships

Title III was intended to enhance the provision of EL services for ELs throughout the US by providing professional development for educators, EL specialist support staff and EL curriculum materials (Tanenbaum et al., 2012). Although receiving Title III dollars was new for Indiana school districts to use along with state EL funding, the institution of the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) soon followed. AMAOs had three indicators that were measured for district's effectiveness in meeting EL student English and academic learning outcomes. AMAO 1 measured English progress as identified by the ELP/D assessment. AMAO 2 calculated the percentage of students being reclassified as fluent. Lastly, AMAO 3 measured the overall performance of ELs in English language arts and Math. Now, in addition to being responsible for raising EL scores on standardized tests (e.g. ISTEP+ and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), districts were also responsible for EL growth and attainment in their English proficiency (AMAOs).

Historical Background of Indiana's ELP/D Standards

Once NCLB (2001) was enacted, all 50 states and the District of Columbia were expected to have ELP/D standards and a related ELP/D assessment for English proficiency in place for their ELs (Table 2). Given state autonomy most states swiftly developed them to be in compliance with NCLB requirements. Indiana began creating its own ELP/D standards in 2002 and

concluding with their publication in November 2003 after the Indiana State Board of Education granted its approval (Indiana Department of Education & Indiana ESL Taskforce, 2003).

The IDOE had formed an EL Taskforce in 2XXX which consisted of ELL Directors from around the state. The Taskforce was lead by the IDOE's Division of Language Minority and Migrant Programs and met on a bi-monthly basis. The goal of the EL taskforce was to provide feedback on educational policies and their local impact on ELs. Conceiving the ELP/D standards in comparison to the TESOL (1997) standards and connecting them to the Indiana academic ELA standards (2000), the IDOE Education's EL Taskforce embarked on their own discovery of what ELP/D standard could and should be. During the initial development of the ELP/D standards in 2002, taskforce members struggled to see the distinctions between the ELP/D standards and the ELA content standards. With minimal direction, they developed different drafts by grade clusters, modeling after the TESOL template, which differed from the layout and conception of Indiana academic ELA standards that were done by each grade level. Taskforce members examined a content area standard in ELA and then looked at the same content area standard in another grade level and fashioned it into an ELP/D standard (Table 3).

Reading Comprehension Standards Indiana Academic Standards and ELP/D alignment Initial Conceptions		
Grade 7: English Language Arts Standard	**Grade 7-8:** Related English language proficiency standard *Level 1 student*	**Grade 7-8:** Related English language proficiency standard *Level 3 student*
Comprehension and analysis of grade-level-appropriate text: • Identify and trace the development of an author's	Comprehension and analysis of grade-level-appropriate text: • Identify and trace the development of an author's	Comprehension and analysis of grade-level-appropriate text: • Identify and trace the development of an author's

argument, point of view or perspective in a text (Indiana Department of Education, 2000)	argument, point of view or perspective in a text *by using a text that is up to 3 years below given grade level* (ELP/D initial brainstorming drafts)	argument, point of view or perspective in a text *by using a text that is up to 1 year below given grade level* (ELP/D initial brainstorming drafts)

Table 2: Sample--Original conception of ELA academic standards and ELP/D alignment before publication

The IDOE invited WestEd, an educational agency in California to advise the EL taskforce (US Department of Education, 2006). At the time, WestEd was one of the sole sources for this type of counsel and with their history in the development of the California ELP/D standards, they were invited to assist the ESL taskforce (L. Harvey, personal communication, April 10, 2015). The first set of WestEd feedback asked the taskforce to conceive the standards not as benchmarks at grade level, but as alternative performances that were respectful of their linguistic repertoires and of the English language learning proficiency level (Gottlieb, 2006; Gottlieb & Nguyen, 2007; Morita-Mullaney, 2007).

Due to California having the most developed set of ELP/D standards aligned with ELA standards, the Indiana ELP/D standards closely followed the California model. In the latter stages of Indiana's ELP/D standards. The English language proficiency levels of 1-5 were borrowed with permission from the California Department of Education (Indiana Department of Education & Indiana ESL Taskforce, 2003, p. iv).

The Indiana Superintendent of Public of Instruction did not accept maintaining a structure that mirrored the TESOL framework by grade level cluster of PK-2, 3-4, 5-6, 7-8, 9-12 in early 2003. Instead the ELP/D standards were required to have a one-to-one alignment per academic ELA standard relative to each ELP/D level and each grade level. For instance, a single reading

comprehension content standard for 2nd grade would have five different performance manifestations with the ELP/D 1-5 continuum (Figure 1). Further, this resulted in the numeric labeling within the ELA content standards not matching the ELP/D standards, making the numeric consultation and comparison of the two standards more cumbersome.



Figure 1: ELA and ELP/D alignment by grade level and by English proficiency level (2003)

A provision of NCLB (2001) within the Title III law required the alignment of ELA, math and science content standards to ELP/D standards (Boals et al., 2015). Although it was argued by some that the original Indiana ELP/D standards could be used locally as a pattern for individual districts to develop ELP/D math and science standards in alignment with the ELP/D standards (US Department of Education, 2006), this was never formally completed at the state level.

The 2003 Indiana ELP/D standards were distributed throughout the state, but their implementation was only monitored through desk audits of districts by the IDOE. EL teachers were the ones that were most acquainted with the content, the organization, and with the

instructional skills necessary to employ the ELP/D standards. However, even EL teachers complained that the ELP/D standards were difficult for them to figure out; classroom and content area teachers struggled even more to decode them for practical application (L. Harvey, personal communication, April 11, 2015).

ELP/D Standards aligned to ELP/D English proficiency assessment

The LAS Links™ Era

Another NCLB (2001) requirement of the ELP/D standards was that they must be aligned to a related ELP/D test measuring ELs' English progress and attainment in fluency (Level 5). Prior to the 2005-2006 school year, ELs participated in locally determined ELP/D assessments that were commercially available, such as the Language Assessment Scales, Individual Proficiency Test, or the Woodcock Muñoz and guided by the IDOE's Division of Language Minority and Migrant Programs (Indiana Department of Education, 1990). None of the above tools was aligned to the 2003 ELP/D standards and the ELP/D standards of 2003 were still only aligned to ELA content standards.

During 2004-2005 school year, a group of EL stakeholders was gathered to work by the IDOE's Division of Language Minority and Migrant Programs with the ELP/D standards in hand to consider different vendors through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process to select a standardized ELP/D assessment that would be used by all school districts throughout the state.

Most of the EL stakeholders who directed districts with large EL programs had just piloted the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA), which was part of a multi-state consortium group under the supervision of the Council of Chief School Officers (CCSCO) to which Indiana belonged (Indiana Department of Education's Division of Language Minority and Migrant Education, 2005). During the pilot, EL teachers and administrators were perplexed by

the long administration time of four to six hours per student. The CCSCO consortia had committed to create responsive ELP/D instruments that would be newly developed and not a regurgitation of a shelf ready test. Further, consortiums had largely reconceptualized what English language proficiency meant which was different from commercially available ELP/D assessments (Boals et al., 2015). Nonetheless, the Indiana EL stakeholder group recommended LAS Links™, a shelf test for adoption, which, while not a consortium-developed tool, was an assessment that was sanctioned by the CCSCO consortia. Although the 2003 ELP/D standards were developed, they were not consulted extensively during the ELP/D assessment adoption process. LAS Links™, the adopted shelf test, was first administered in 2005-2006 school year. Like previously used ELP/D assessments, LAS Links™ was not aligned to the 2003 ELP/D standards, only to the ELA content assessment.

Shelf tests such as the LAS Links™ are considered static exams, merely shifting between a form A and form B, meaning the exam is the same every other year. Although this allows for consistency among test administrators, it provides no assurance that the ELP/D assessment is aligned to ELP/D standards, a new expectation within the NCLB law (2001). In the case of Indiana, the LAS Links™ was not aligned to the 2003 Indiana ELP/D standards.

In the Fall of 2007, a group of EL teachers were solicited by the IDOE and the CTB McGraw Hill, the vendor of the LAS Links™, to establish cut scores for the LAS Links™ after national cut scores were used as a barometer during the first two years of administration. This process resulted in an overall reduction of cut scores for English proficiency at each grade level creating a large proportion of eligible for exit from EL programming because the cuts scores were lowered significantly. This decision to lower of cut scores was not a transparent process and took EL leaders by surprise when their funding was later impacted due to the higher rate of

exit. Further, EL leaders expressed concern that the earlier exit was sending students into mainstream classrooms without support prematurely. The level and rate of exit was most precipitous at the elementary level with the easiest grade level of exit being 4th grade, followed by 2nd and 1st grades.

The Indiana ELP/D standards were consulted more rigorously during this cut score process, coordinating the LAS Links™ with the Indiana ELP/D standards. Because of this connecting done by cut score participants,, we can ascertain that standards alignment occurred but in response to a pre-existing test and not to inform its development. As per the Indiana consolidated NCLB performance plan, this bookmarking process was an assurance offered to the US Department of Education, complying with the federal provision of NCLB (2001) (US Department of Education, 2006). In 2007-2008, the same LAS Links™ was administered, but the cut scores were precipitously lower.

The ACCESS Era with WIDA

Unlike the LAS Links™, which was a single test that six other states implemented between 2004 and 2006 (Zehr, 2006). WIDA was part of a larger consortium of mostly lower incidence EL states. Within a consortium, Indiana entered a network of other states who had a long standing history with their dynamic ELP/D test called Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS) as well as their ELP/D related standards, the WIDA standards. The ACCESS assessment is regarded as dynamic because 30% of its content changes annually. Further, in all grade level clusters, a tiering occurs before test administration. Tiering is determined by local practitioners who determine the levels of relative proficiency from low to moderate to high. Different items are

offered to students at each tier within a grade level cluster, instead of just one assessment per cluster like the LAS Links™.

In 2012, the Indiana Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (INTESOL), the state chapter of the international organization, began discussions to consider WIDA's ELP/D standards and its related ELP/D assessment, ACCESS in lieu of the 2003 Indiana ELP/D standards and the LAS Links™. A White paper was developed with the INTESOL leadership group that consisted of various EL leaders throughout the state (Morita-Mullaney, 2012). Dissatisfied with the low benchmark of the LAS Links™ and the growing stagnation of the current ELP/D standards, the INTESOL leadership wanted a dramatic shift that focused on rigorous exit criteria that was more consistent with the shifting and inclining academic standards and a replacement set of ELP/D standards aligned to ELA and math, science and social studies. The INTESOL leadership group believed that the WIDA standards and its accompanying ACCESS assessment fit these expectations (Table 3).

Recommendation for English Language Proficiency Standards and Assessment

ACCESS: WIDA
The World Class Instructional Design (WIDA) standards are the recommended and proposed ELP/D standards for Indiana. Its coordinated and aligned ELP/D tool, ACCESS is more robust, holistic and aligned with common core standards* and has a foundation of scholarly developers. The below reflects the qualitative feedback from school and program administrators and teachers throughout the state:

- WIDA has ELP/D standards that are aligned in all Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science. They are currently aligning them to the Common Core. LAS Links™ and Indiana's ELP/D standards are **only aligned in Language Arts and are outdated.**
- ACCESS and the coordinating WIDA ELP/D standards would be immediately applicable to instruction and programming.
- ACCESS focuses explicitly on academic language whereas the LAS Links™ focuses mostly on social and surface level language.

***Indiana did not adopt the common core state standards, but at the time of this White paper, these academic standards were reflected in the ESEA flexibility waiver for implementation.*

Table 3: Excerpt from INTESOL Leadership Group White Paper (2012)

Connecting the ELP/D standards with ELA, science and math standards and coordinating the ELP/D standards with ELP/D assessments were the original aims of the NCLB (2001) legislation under the federal provision of Title III. Since the implementation of Indiana ELP/D standards in 2003 and the shift to the 2013 version of the WIDA ELP/D standards, it is important to examine if such aims have been realized in Indiana.

FINDINGS

Lack of alignment to academic content standards

Alignment references the degree to which content standards match what is actually being tested. This allows educators to appropriately prepare their students for related assessments and be able to identify areas of student need and where the teacher needs to instruct differently. Alignment between instruction and assessment is not a new educational concept, but alignment relative to ELP/D standards has been experienced and implemented differently in Indiana (Table 4).

ELP/D Standards	Content assessment	Aligned?
Indiana ELP Standards	ISTEP+	Only to ELA
WIDA ELD Standards	ISTEP+	No

Table 4: ELP/D Standards and Content Assessment alignment

Indiana ELP/D Standards. One of the core requirements of NCLB (2001) was that ELP/D standards aligned to the academic content standards of ELA, math and science. Alignment involves connections between the content standards and ensuring that a related ELP/D standard offers linguistically appropriate ways for ELs to perform that standard formatively.

With the first set of ELP/D standards developed by the EL taskforce this alignment was done explicitly with the ELA standards. Each content standard had five different indicators for

an EL perform depending on their ELP level of 1-5. Although it was also claimed that the ELP/D standards could be aligned to math and science, this was at a district's discretion and not something dictated nor lead by the IDOE. Further, the Office of Title III responsible for overseeing the implementation of ELP/D standards did not follow up on the explicit connections with the content standards with local departments of education.

WIDA ELP/D Standards. Unlike the Indiana ELP/D standards of 2003, WIDA's standards are not aligned to Indiana academic content standards. Their ELP/D standards are a framework that allows local educators within their 36 state consortium to determine the connections and relationships between their academic content standards and their ELP/D standards. WIDA conceives this process as generative and contingent upon the collaboration of local stakeholders to make the standards accessible and appropriate for their distinct EL communities. Their framework of creating model performance indicators of language functions, content stems and related scaffolds is a robust way for content area educators to prepare and conceive EL student performance. Alternatively, some educators view this process as overwhelming and perceived as an additional burden of accountability.

Thirty-six WIDA consortium states and the four related academic content standards of ELA, math, science and social studies would encompass 144 different sets of ELP/D standards. While this robust task could be done, it would needlessly standardize instructional design and outcomes and silence the voices of local stakeholders whose EL communities range in size, academic need and linguistic diversity.

Alignment to ELP/D assessment

Content standards and related exams such as the Indiana Statewide Test of performance (ISTEP+) are aligned. The same can be said about other states that are part of the WIDA

consortium. Alignment between academic content standards and related summative assessments is an expectation and is largely vetted at the state level before a summative exam is implemented. This same alignment is not always the case between ELP/D assessments and ELP/D standards (Table 5).

ELP/D Standards	ELP/D assessment	Aligned?
Indiana ELP Standards	LAS Links™	No
WIDA ELD Standards	ACCESS	Yes

Table 5: ELP/D Standards and ELP/D Assessment alignment

LAS Links™. During the 2006-2007 school year, when a bookmarking study was conducted to establish Indiana cut scores for the LAS Links™, Indiana educators consulted the 2003 Indiana ELP/D standards. But, the LAS Links™ was not created or redeveloped in response to Indiana's 2003 ELP/D standards. The use of the ELP/D standards was to establish cut scores and there was no vetting of test items, just a negotiation of thresholds of proficiency with each grade level cluster and each language domain. The consultation of the Indiana ELP/D standards of 2003 cannot be described as meeting the robust criterion for standards alignment.

ACCESS. The ACCESS, which was first administered in 2015 to measure English proficiency is aligned to the WIDA standards. The WIDA standards examine academic language as expressed in listening, speaking, reading and writing and how it relates to developmentally and linguistically appropriate performances. Further, WIDA's five standards of social instructional language, language of ELA, math, science and social studies are the pillars by which the ACCESS assessment is aligned. This alignment provides greater credibility that their ELD instruction has been conceived within a standard that will later be assessed.

IMPLICATIONS

Content standards alignment is the gold standard for Indiana's ISTEP+ content exam, the metric by which schools are evaluated and graded. It also is a part of the new teacher evaluation, RISE, which connects ISTEP+ performance to teacher's presumed effectiveness and in many cases, teacher salaries. LAS Links™ and the new ACCESS test, the ELP/D assessment is the metric by which schools are judged for their AMAOs, but this metric is often a less privileged accountability mechanism in that student performance is not tied to teacher evaluation or to school or district grades.

With weaker connections to teacher evaluations and to institutional (school/district grades) metrics, understanding about alignment of ELP/D standards to content standards and related ELP/D standards is not often on the radar of Indiana educators. This often relegates the work of examining such ELP/D assessment outcomes and how they connect, relate and align to the new WIDA ELP/D standards and ultimately, how they inform EL and classroom content instruction to EL teachers and EL administrators.

The INTESOL EL leadership group, representing K-12 Indiana EL leaders, has worked directly with the IDOE and WIDA staff to realize a swift implementation of the standards and adoption of the WIDA ELP/D assessment, ACCESS. While this specialized group of educators is hopeful that WIDA and its aligned ELP/D assessment will result in an increased focus and intentionality on EL students, they are cognizant that the first wave of ELP/D standards awareness predominantly reached the EL teaching community only.

CONCLUSION

The WIDA standards and the ACCESS have only been in place since 2013; the first set of ACCESS scores were released in May 2015. Although its Indiana beginnings are new, WIDA has been implemented during a time of swift school reform, which includes teacher evaluation,

high stakes reading exams at the 3rd grade, and high stakes End of Course Assessments (ECAs) at the high school level. School letter grades (A-F) connected to ISTEP+ performance are also creating schools of preference and choice; real estate values are routinely shaped by this school evaluation metric. While these reforms are swift and daunting, WIDA and ACCESS hold hope and potential for Indiana EL educators to center ELs in mainstream classrooms and as a result, to improve their instruction and outcomes for Indiana's ELs.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Trish Morita-Mullaney is an ELL Assistant Professor at Purdue University, where she teaches ELL licensure and certificate courses. She also provides professional development for the Wabash Valley Educational Center and other regional education center throughout Northern Indiana. She formerly served as an ELL district administrator in the MSD of Lawrence Township in Indianapolis, Indiana and the IDOE's division of English Language Learning. Her research interests examine the intersection between the field of ELL and educational leadership.

Inquiries should be directed to tmoritam@purdue.edu

REFERENCES

Bailey, A.L., & Carroll, P.E. (2015). Assessment of English language learners in the era of new academic content standards. *Review of Research in Education, 39,* 254-294. doi: 10.3102/0091732X14556074

Bailey, A.L., & Huang, A. (2011). Do current English language development/proficiency standards reflect the English needed for success in school? *Language Testing, 28*(3), 343–365. doi: 10.1177/0265532211404187

Boals, T.J., Kenyon, D.M., Blair, A., Cranley, M.E., Wilmes, C., & Wright, L. (2015). Transformation in K–12 English language proficiency assessment: changing contexts, changing constructs. *Review of Research in Education, 39,* 122-164. doi: 10.3102/0091732X14556072

Chamot, A.U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). *The CALLA handbook : implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*. Reading, MA: Longman.

Corbin, J.M., & Strauss, A.L. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research : techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, John W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

CTB McGraw-Hill. (2007). *LAS Links™: Connecting assessment, language, and learning [Brochure]*. Monterey, CA: CTB McGraw-Hill.

Davies, P. (2000). The relevance of systematic reviews to educational policy and practice. *Oxford Review of Education, 26*(2 & 3), 365-378. doi: 10.1080/3054980020001882

Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Vogt, M. (2008). *Implementing the SIOP model through effective professional development and coaching*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2000). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners : the SIOP model*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English learners : the SIOP model* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2006). *Administrators' resource guide for the SIOP model*. Glenview, Ill: Pearson.

Gottlieb, M.H. (2006). *Assessing English language learners : bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Gottlieb, M.H., & Nguyen, D. (2007). *Assessment and accountability in language education programs : a guide for administrators and teachers*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Pub.

Indiana Department of Education. (1990). Procedures to assess language proficiency resource manual. Indianapolis, IN: Author.

Indiana Department of Education. (2000a). Indiana's Academic Standards: English language arts Teacher's Edition. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Department of Education.

Indiana Department of Education. (2000b). Indiana's Academic Standards: teacher's edition English language arts. Indianapolis, IN: Author.

Indiana Department of Education & Indiana ESL Taskforce. (2003). Indiana's English Language Proficiency Standards. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Department of Education.

Indiana Department of Education's Division of Language Minority and Migrant Education (2005, March 1). [English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Field Test].

Mohan, B.A. (1986). *Language and content*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Morita-Mullaney, T. (2007). Assessment: Collaboration in assessment: Secondary and ELL teachers teaming together In F. Pawan & G. Sietman (Eds.), *Helping English Language Learners succeed in middle and high school* (pp. 85-101). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Morita-Mullaney, T. (2012). *English language proficiency standards and assessments: WIDA and ACCESS proposal from the EL leadership group* Indiana Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Leadership Group. Indianapolis, IN.

No Child Left Behind, Pub.L. 107–110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2001).

Short, D. (2000). The ESL standards: bridging the academic gap for English language learners. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Short, D., Vogt, M., & Echevarria, J. (2008). *The SIOP model for administrators*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Sireci, S.G., & Faulkner-Bond, M. (2015). Promoting validity in the assessment of English learners. *Review of Research in Education, 39*, 215-252. doi: 10.3102/0091732X14557003

Tanenbaum, C., Boyle, A., Soga, K., Le Floch, K.C., Golden, L., Petroccia, M., . . . Taylor, J. (2012). National Evaluation of Title III Implementation: Report on State and Local Implementation. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (1997). *ESL standards for pre-k-12 students*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Téllez, K., & Mosqueda, E. (2015). Developing teachers' knowledge and skills at the intersection of English language learners and language assessment. *Review of Research in Education, 39*, 87-121. doi: 10.3102/0091732X14554552

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (2007). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

US Department of Education. (2006). Consolidated state performance report: parts I and II--state by state reports. In US Department of Education (Ed.), *State formula grants programs under the elementary and secondary education act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 for reporting on school year 2005-2006*. Washington, DC.: Author.

Vogt, M., & Echevarria, J. (2008). *99 ideas and activities for teaching English learners with the SIOP model*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

World-class Instruction Design and Assessment. (2014). Can-Do Descriptors of English Language Proficiency Standards. from http://www.wida.us

Zehr, M.A. (2006). New era for testing English-Learners begins. *Education Week, 25*(42), 28-29.

Moving on Up with WIDA: Helping Near-Proficient English Learners Reach Full Proficiency

FARIDAH PAWAN,
Indiana University, Bloomington

ANITA SERALATHAN,
Indiana University, Bloomington

Most (48%) of all the English learners (ELs) in the state are at Level 4 or the near proficient level/advanced level. However, there is much consternation that ELs struggle to move to the Fluent English Proficient (FEP) level or Level 5, which is necessary for them to be successful participants in mainstreamed classrooms. Indiana's recent adoption of the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) standards for ELs is timely because of its focus on two central elements critical for the students' progression, namely maintaining language and academic achievement simultaneously and the assumption of shared responsibility of ESL and content area teachers in teaching the students. This article revisits teachers' concerns for Level 4 students and suggests pathways of practice aligned with WIDA's standards for classroom instruction and professional development.

Keywords: WIDA, English language learners, Fluent English Proficient (FEP), mainstream instruction

Introduction: Setting the scene in Indiana



Office of English Learning and Migrant Education, IDOE, 2014

At the Indiana State English Learner Conference in October of 2014, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) shared the above chart which demonstrates that most (48%) of all the English learners (ELs) in the state are at Level 4 or the near proficient level/advanced level. However, there is much consternation that ELs struggle to move to the Fluent English Proficient (FEP) level or Level 5, which is necessary for them to be successful participants in mainstreamed classrooms.

As the number of ELs in schools continues to rapidly rise, there has been research that focuses on improving the skills and abilities of lower proficiency students on one end of the spectrum and gifted and talented students on the other end. Research on how to improve instruction for lower proficiency students exists (e.g. Mayville, 2012) as well as research that focuses on gifted and talented students (e.g. Pereira & Gentry, 2013). What is limited in current research, however, is a focus on high proficiency ELs. Research that addresses the instructional needs of students at near proficient levels of English is of particular interest to many teachers, as advancing their students towards that final stage of proficiency is often found to be a challenging task.

Hence, Indiana's recent adoption of the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) standards for English learners is timely as evidenced by its mission statement:

> WIDA advances academic language development and academic achievement for linguistically diverse students through high quality standards, assessments, research, and professional development for educators. (Gottlieb, 2013)

The statement is centered on maintaining ELs' language and academic achievement simultaneously, and as stated in WIDA's essential action statements, the accomplishment of which can only take place with the assumption of a shared responsibility between English as a New Language (ENL) teachers and content area teachers in instruction. These two elements are central for the near proficient students (Level 4) to progress as they will soon be or are already mainstreamed to compete academically with native English speaking peers and will no longer have institutionalized support from ENL teachers as they are deemed ready to exit the ENL program.

In implementing WIDA, current concerns of teachers need to be revisited and pathways of practice reconsidered. These are identified in this article based on a survey of 15 ENL teachers across central Indiana whose districts were a part of the Tandem Certification Program (TACIT) at Indiana University, Bloomington.

Making connections between language and content

Students at level 4 can navigate social situations well and may appear on the surface to be fluent at times. However, they usually lack specific knowledge of English in academic language, writing, reading in the subject areas and so on.

The juxtaposition of language and content instruction is thus called for to address the situation. The pedagogical positioning and the practices from frameworks such as the Content-

Based Language Instruction (CBI) approach (Brinton, Snow & Wesche, 1989), Sheltered Instruction (Echevarria & Graves, 2010) and Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) (Chamot & O'Malley, 1996) can be referred to for assistance. Within these approaches emphasis is placed on the intersection of two critical elements:

- Content-compatible: The objectives specify what other language skills are compatible with the concept to be taught
- Content obligatory: The objectives specify the language required for students to develop, master and communicate, given content material

The intersection of these two elements could be accomplished through several means, the most immediate of which is incorporating and sustaining content and language objectives throughout a lesson. The lesson plan below (Figure 1), is WIDA-based in demonstrating the incorporation of language and content objectives into lesson planning.

Figure 1: WIDA-based science lesson

Week of 3.9.15 - 3.13.15

step by step lesson plan is located below schedule

Time	Monday 3.9	Tuesday 3.10	Wednesday 3.11	Thursday 3.12	Friday 3.13
7:30-8:00	Breakfast and Morning Routine	Breakfast and Morning Routine	Breakfast and Morning Routine	Breakfast and Morning Routine	Breakfast and Morning Routine
8:00-8:30	Advisory	Get up and Move	Advisory	CPR with Homeroom	8:00-8:55
8:30-9:30	Language Lab with Fluency/Corrective Reading	Language Lab with Fluency/Corrective Reading	Language Lab with Fluency/Corrective Reading	Language Lab with Fluency/Corrective Reading	8:55-9:50 -
9:30-10:30	Use pretest to see if they learned something: Solar System Study Day Language Objective: -SWBAT define terms from Solar System unit: axis, rotation, orbit, inner/outer planets. Support through visuals and text: note cards: interactive notebook	Solar System Assessment -Posttest same as pretest (from Acuity) with additional questions from continued learning	Use of Science World article related to technology/ inventions. -SWBAT compare and contrast four types of inventions modeled after living beings in nature. Language Objective: -SWBAT write down two ways in which an invention is similar to a living being in nature, and one way it is a	-SWBAT read Achieve3000 article "How Ideas Become Real"? and answer technology enhanced questions. Language Objective: -SWBAT write a paragraph description to the prompt: Is genius 1 percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration? Support your answer with reasons and evidence from this lesson. Background information:	9:40-10:40 - 10:40-11:30 - Persuasive writing Writing to CPA (8th grade school) principal for next year. SWBAT write a persuasive essay to the following student created prompt: -healthier/better tasting lunches -shoes/uniforms -uniforms -cell phones Interaction: Published and

Another immediate means to maintain the connection between language and content is through content compatible and obligatory vocabulary instruction advocated by CBI. The teacher quote below demonstrates the importance of such instruction:

> I follow the LAS Links Proficiency Level Descriptors. Students at level 4 are almost at the same academic level as a Native Language speaker. However, I would say that the language is a minimal barrier for learning [but] for tier II and tier III vocabulary.
>
> (EL teacher, northwestern Indiana, November, 2013)

Tier II and Tier III vocabulary are common core vocabulary designations (National Governors, 2010), with Tier II (content-compatible) being high frequency words that usually appear in print form only and are used by proficient speakers across content areas, and Tier III (content-obligatory) words not frequently used except in content areas and academic contexts. Content compatible words are communicative in nature, enabling students to ask questions, explain understanding and so forth in their content area class. Content compatible are process words and are "how-oriented." Content obligatory words, on the other hand, are "what-oriented" words that are functional for students to gain knowledge of a curricular subject. These are content-specific technical vocabulary, special expressions, syntactical features, and so on that are essential to acquire concepts and demonstrate mastery and learning in the specific subject matter.

CALLA would add the teaching of content-area specific strategies to be included in instruction that connects language and content. This is underscored by the quote below:

> Level 4 students have the ability to participate in class alongside their peers with hardly any problems. They do struggle though with…multi-step tasks…and steps to take to complete a project but make minor errors when speaking or writing that do not impede understanding. Although these subtle struggles seem minor, if teachers and students are not proactive in addressing these areas, their grades will reflect these weaknesses.
>
> (EL teacher, north-western Indiana, November, 2013)

The teacher quote points to the need for content strategy instruction when language instruction is undertaken through content. For example, in teaching science at the macro level, CALLA would suggest the teaching of science problem-solving steps, which focus on asking a question, formulating a hypothesis, collecting and recording data, and answering the question posed. At the micro level, students can be taught strategies to deconstruct academic texts. For example, in

science texts to accompany the lesson seen in Figure 1 above, strategies that entail reading section headings, illustrations, and captions to get an overall picture and the teaching of more specific strategies of recognizing writing patterns in science textbooks are critical for science text comprehension. These include the classification pattern, the process description pattern, the factual statement pattern, the problem solving pattern, the experiment-instruction pattern, the combination pattern and so on. In this regard, students at Level 4 can greatly benefit from utilizing learning strategies from approaches such as CALLA if they are to mirror the abilities already demonstrated by students in Level 5, which according to one teacher are students who "know the thinking process within the subject area."

In making the connection between language and content in ESL instruction, teachers are engaging students in learning language in context as opposed to in isolation, and this ties in with WIDA's Action 4, which is making connections with language and content so that learning is meaningful and relevant (p. 11), and to WIDA's principle of seeing ELL's academic language and academic content language development as processes that are intertwined (Indiana Department of Education, 2014, p. 8). More importantly, in linking language and content, students see learning a language as a means to learn, which in itself can impact motivation. Motivation is key in helping students make that move forward to the next level, and it arises from engaging in something meaningfully and authentically.

Enacting differentiation through "just-in-time" inquiry and self-assessment

> [What] I noticed about many Level 4 students was that they were strong in one or two of the language domains, which boosted their overall/averaged score on the LAS-Links assessment, but still needed much improvement in other domains. More specifically, I noticed that many of the Level 4's I worked with were able to

> effectively communicate orally and/or in written form, while reading and/or listening presented more of a challenge. A recurring discussion I had with my students and their content area teachers involved looking at the breakdown of students' language domain scores, as they were instructive for academic goal setting and lesson planning.
>
> (EL teacher, central Indiana, October, 2013)

The teacher's quote above calls for the differentiation of instruction and converges with WIDA's Action 3. Differentiation is no doubt difficult to achieve but is the essence of effective instruction when teachers are able to address and instruct to the specific needs and abilities of students. In the teacher quote above, it is clear that moving Level 4 students to Level 5 will require teachers to take differentiated actions for individual students.

Though it is a challenge, differentiated instruction is assisted by the hyper-mediatized environment currently in place whereby learning is considered horizontal and heterarchical rather than hierarchical, where knowledge is readily available as long as its use can be identified (Pawan & Honeyford, 2007). Differentiated instruction for the purposes of higher-order thinking can be achieved by engaging students in open-ended inquiry and by providing students with "just-in-time" support as they engage in the inquiry. This approach enables students to take ownership by utilizing their strengths and seeking help in their areas of needed improvement, as well as to acquire and use information to undertake the task. One example of inquiry-based lessons is constructivist WebQuest lessons (www.webquests.org). See Figure 2.

Figure 2: WebQuest Lesson Search Page

The lessons always begin with inquiry into ill-defined and open-ended problems (e.g. an investigation into who killed King Tutankhamun). The differentiation in well-designed WebQuest lessons is when teachers create options for students to assume roles that would enable them to solve the problems as well as options in the types of task they want to assume, depending on their abilities and interests. Students' efforts are scaffolded by teachers through the just-in-time rather than just-in-case provision of multi-modal resources for students to use as they work through the problems. Rubrics also assist students in monitoring their progress. The end point for these lessons is not already predetermined, and this opens up opportunities for students to push themselves to the next level. Figure 2 above displays the search page for the website and Figure 3 below is Pawan's (2000) WebQuest, *Alexander's Gordian Knot,* which focuses on familiarizing students with, and having them use, creative problem solving approaches. "Task" is where problems are described, "Process" contains the steps to be taken

and the resources to be used, and the "Evaluation" are where the rubrics can be found. The "Teacher Page" provides information as to how teachers could use and modify the lessons.

Figure 3: Pawan's (2000) WebQuest



The inquiry activities allow for differentiation in instruction, but they work best when students are able to also identify their own abilities and areas where help is needed.

> One of the biggest struggles for Level 4 is getting them…to seek help when they don't understand…Level 5 students are independent…and when they need any help, they speak with confidence in the class.
>
> (EL teacher, north-western Indiana, November, 2013)

In order for students to self-advocate for themselves, Level 4 EL students need to be able to self-assess. Similar to all higher-order thinking skills, this ability needs to be taught; Linguafolio, a self-assessment framework aligned to standardized proficiency levels, could be a template to

follow. Andrea Brandt Melnyk, formerly at IUPUI, has worked on the implementation of LinguaFolio, which provides some structure for learners to self-assess their language growth and development in a systematic, ongoing way, and to document evidence of language performance. See Figure 4.

Figure 4: Linguafolio

The folio consists of students' language learning experiences, learning styles, intercultural encounters, language proficiency, and performance. Students can assess themselves and also keep track of their achievement. The "can-do" statements in the folio that are similar in spirit to that of WIDA's can-do statements provide an opportunity for students to set goals for themselves and assert their expertise while simultaneously self-acknowledging their needed areas of growth. The acquisition of the skill will give students a means to take charge of their own learning and at the same time develop a higher-order thinking skill to meta-evaluate their own performance, a skill targeted in WIDA's Action 8 (Gottlieb, 2013, p. 11).

Using culture as academic scaffolding

> I think one of the biggest disadvantages that level 4's face is that they…still lack an awful lot of background knowledge and especially cultural knowledge and that often comes up through their CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) understanding. Think about reading Dante's Inferno or the Scarlet Letter with little to no understanding of Christianity or the bible...while your language might be up to the task, it is untranslatable to you.
>
> (EL teacher, south-central Indiana, November, 2013)

The teacher quote above asserts that cultural/personally-relevant knowledge stands in the way of Level 4 students' progress. This is the case not just for EL students but for others as well. For example, Albrecht (2013) discusses the needs of gifted children and how they need to see themselves culturally and personally in the curriculum, materials, and assignments to stay invested in school. The importance of cultural and personally relevant instruction is reflected in WIDA's Action 1 (utilizing the resources and experiences that ELLs bring to school), Action 3 (using ELL's background knowledge) and Action 7, which involves designing "language teaching and learning with attention to the sociocultural context" (Gottlieb, 2013, p. 11). In other words, students' cultural backgrounds (personal and social) are not only valued but also to be used to support classroom instruction. However, such scaffolding is a goal to be achieved. In Pawan's (2008) study using Virgina Collier's Prism Model (Thomas & Collier, 2002), four types of scaffolding used by teachers for ESL students were identified: linguistic, conceptual, procedural and socio-cultural (see Table 1). However, only 6.3% of the overall scaffolding used by the teachers in the study was cultural in nature.

Table 1: Scaffolding types (Pawan, 2008)

Scaffolding Types							
Linguistic: Simplifying and making the "English" language more accessible	**%**	**Conceptual:** Providing supportive frameworks for meaning providing organizational charts, metaphors etc.	**%**	**Social- Cultural** Mediating and situating students' learning in a social context involving the engagement and support of others (expert and novice, peer and peer) (Social). Also using artifacts, tools and informational sources that are specifically culturally and historically situated within a domain familiar to learners (Cultural)			**%**
▪ Free journaling ▪ Prewriting ▪ Oral presentation of materials ▪ Reading out loud* ▪ Conversational mode in lesson delivery ▪ Written instructions ▪ Simplified language ▪ Slowed pacing* ▪ Direct instruction of form and meaning ▪ Direct instruction of form Vocabulary teaching ▪ Reading instruction		▪ Modeling* ▪ Show instead of explain* ▪ Body language* ▪ Think alouds ▪ Structured step & choices* ▪ Pre-teaching difficult concepts ▪ Frequent practice test sessions ▪ Bookmarking relevant websites ▪ Explicit connections between in class and out of class experiences (life experiences) ▪ Explicit/Transparent expectations ▪ Sourcebooks ▪ Condensed material ▪ Computer s ▪ Realia/Authentic artifacts ▪ Visuals* ▪ Charts ▪ Checklists ▪ Posters ▪ Pictures ▪ Simulation ▪ Experiments ▪ Games		Social ▪ Teacher One-to-One assistance and encouragement* ▪ Pairing ELLs with NS ▪ Combination of individual and group work ▪ Peer-Coaching on assignments ▪ Specific role assignment in small groups		Cultural ▪ Students' prior Knowledge ▪ Literature from students' culture ▪ Students' learning styles ▪ L1 Peer Work ▪ Spanish speaking teacher colleagues for translation and instruction	
Total: 21.6%		**Total: 47.2%**		**Total: 23.4% (Social)**	**Total: 6.3% (Cultural)**		
					Total Postings: 408 (298+110)		

The finding makes a strong statement regarding the importance of supporting teachers' ability to develop, incorporate and use knowledge of their students' cultural background to scaffold instruction. According to Windschitl (2002), "in classrooms where teachers are unaware of students' interests and life experiences, they not only fail to build on local knowledge but essentially offer 'disinvitations' to participate in classroom discourse" (p. 18). Consequently the lack of knowledge and the cultural mismatch between teachers and their ethnically diverse students often leads to the latter's underperformance, a phenomenon well-documented in research. For the trend to be reversed, students' cultural knowledge must be seen as a permanent feature of instruction necessary for building meaningfulness and sense-making through effective scaffolding.

In this regard, to guide the incorporation of cultural scaffolding, Gay's (2000) culturally relevant pedagogy or Ladson-Billing's (1992) or Bank's (2004) culturally responsive teaching is useful. This type of teaching acknowledges cultural heritages, builds bridges between home and school experiences, uses wide varieties of different learning styles, teaches students how to know and praise their own and that of other people's cultures and incorporates multicultural resources and information in instruction. Most importantly, the instruction acknowledges and uses "funds of knowledge" (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992), which students bring with them to the classroom. For example, Professor Emeritus Eugene Garcia, formerly of Arizona State, used to begin his science lessons in a culturally responsive way by asking students about the folktales they heard at home relating to a particular phenomenon, like the possibility of rain in the forecast. Students gave examples, such as their grandmothers reporting bone aches and so on, and students subsequently spent the rest of the class time uncovering the scientific premises of

the tales. Another example comes from the book project, *Different Worlds*, that Michelle Greene and her middle school ELs in Indiana wrote together. The book consists of stories about the students' difficult journeys to the US. Writing the stories engaged students fully in the writing process as they were both personally and culturally validating. In the context of these experiences , as per the teacher's quote above, perhaps, by them as a background to teaching Dante's Inferno, the poem's central idea of reaching redemption through unthinkable challenges might be better understood,

Continuing the WIDA quest through Professional Development

WIDA's Essential Actions 13-15 refer to the professional development (PD) and teacher education needed for the implementation of WIDA standards. In particular, they call PD programs that support ENL and content area teacher collaboration so that all teachers assume shared responsibilities in EL instruction. For such PDs to be successful, they have to engage both sets of teachers in learning from each other, relevant language and content instructional and assessment approaches toward joint certification in EL instruction. Indiana University has had four such programs including the Interdisciplinary Collaborative Program (ICP), the Tandem Certification of Indiana Teachers (TACIT), the Interdisciplinary Collaboration for Content Area Teachers (ICCATs) and the ESL Professional Communities for Expertise and Leadership Development (EPiC). These programs are effective in providing opportunities for ENL and content area teachers to work together to sustain curriculum cohesion and thus curriculum pressure simultaneously on language and content. An example of such effort is the integrated ENL/content area (Math) curricula, illustrated below in Table 2.

Table 2: Bobbi's and Jeanna's Integrated Curricula (Pawan & Ward, 2007)

UNIT	CAT (Math Lab)	ESL	EVALUATION
	• Computation of food prices • Computation of sales tax	• Taking food orders • Ordering food	• Simulation of a restaurant

What's For Dinner? Restaurant Theme	• Computation of tips • Computation of percents • Given X amount of money, what could you buy? How much will sales tax be? How much tip will you need to include? How much money will you have remaining?	• Naming different foods • Deciding what is at various restaurants • Using real menus to act out restaurant scenes	interaction/experience in both skill areas: Math and ESL
Exploring Your City	• Calculate time passage • Decide on movie times • Read schedules for various leisure activities: movies, shows, museums, malls, etc. • Calculate admission prices for the various places they will visit • Calculate elapsed time • Calculate how much money they would make if they worked at the city museum	• Reading schedules • Vocabulary for navigating through the various leisure activities they've chosen • Read work schedules • Students will learn how to "Clock in" and "clock out" • Emphasis on timeliness and work ethic • Emphasize leisure time • Time management	• Plan a 3-event day with appropriate rest time and travel time built in, costs figured, for 2 people. • Plan a typical day working an 8-hour shift. How much money would you make? How much money in taxes would be withheld?
Frankfort Home Makeover	• Calculate square feet in a house • Calculate how much paint is needed to paint the rooms in the house • Calculate how much wallpaper is needed to paper one room in the house • Calculate how much carpet is needed to cover specific rooms in the house • Calculate how much tile is needed for the kitchen and bathroom	• Vocabulary: Name furniture • Learn how to compare prices at different furniture stores • Comparative shop for paint, carpet, tile, etc. • Make phone calls to the gas and electric company to inquire about billing history	• Create a design mat showing a layout of furniture, pictures of furniture, carpet samples, fabric samples, paint samples, wallpaper samples. Calculate how much is needed of each, if the size of the furniture is appropriate, and where it will be located.
You Are What You Eat!	• Grocery store visit • Pricing food for specific recipes • Enlarging recipes • Halve recipes • Making the recipe for the group	• Vocabulary: Naming foods and food groups • Healthy food choices • Comparative shopping using advertisements from the newspaper	• Plan a healthy, well-balanced menu for a week for different sized groups
All Around the World… Travel	• Calculate gas mileage • Calculate miles (distance) • Estimate cost for travel • Decide to take the train, plane or automobile • Exchange cost into pesos or yin	• Discover main attractions from a specific city • Decide on mode of travel • Use the map to create driving directions • Use the internet to find out prices for renting a car, travel, and activities while there.	• Give students "money" to plan a trip. How will they travel? Where will they stay? What will they do? What is their timeline for their trip?

Another requirement for success is for PD programs that simultaneously engage ENL and content area teachers to showcase successful collaboration configurations, such as those provided by Honigsfeld and Dove (2010). Table 3 shows three representative model types out of the seven described by Honigsfeld and Dove's collaboration models. The models describe how ESL and content area teachers work with the same group, two different or multiple groups of ELs. In each of the models, "teachers share not only space but also responsibility for the students" so as to overcome not only the fragmentation of knowledge but also the social isolation that ELs experience that can result from the interruptions of separate service delivery and pull-out instruction (Honigsfeld et al, p. 9).

Table 3: Honigsfeld and Dove's Collaboration Models

Model Type	Description	Examples
One student group: One lead teacher and another teacher teaching on purpose	The mainstream and ESL teachers take turns assuming the lead role. One leads while the other provides mini-lessons to individuals or small groups in order to pre-teach or clarify a concept or skill.	While the mainstream teacher introduces the mathematical conventions for reducing fractions, the ESL teacher clarifies the meanings of numerator and denominator, and helps students understand the concept of equal fractions with visually depicted fractions and math manipulatives.
Two student groups: Two teachers teach the same content	Students are divided into two learning groups; the teachers engage in parallel teaching, presenting the same content using differentiated learning strategies.	In a middle school technology class, the topic of bridges and their associated forces is explored. One group works at the computer stations conducting research and creating a PowerPoint presentation while the other engages in labeling and matching activities using line drawings.
Multiple student groups: Two Teachers monitor and teach	Multiple groupings allow both teachers to monitor and	Teachers collaboratively set up several learning stations in

	facilitate student work while targeting selected students with assistance for their particular learning needs.	a high school social studies class. Students at each station are assigned a different authentic document from the Cold War with a matching, differentiated, and scaffolded activity sheet.

In engaging ENL and content area teachers in collaboration, much research has been dedicated to methods and techniques. PD programs must also have a means to evaluate the collaboration and Davison (2006) provides a useful evaluative framework for such a purpose. Table 4 describes the first and last stages in detail below as examples. The elements in the framework demonstrate that the success and failure of collaboration are based on teacher attitude, effort, perception and expectation of gains, achievement and longevity of collaboration. As Davison points out, the study and the framework that emerged from the study indicate that collaboration is "neither easy nor unproblematic" (p. 472). However, it is effective in addressing the lack of criteria in evaluating collaboration and thus helps us to answer the question as to how and when we know we are undertaking it well and effectively.

Table 4: Davison's (2006) Evaluation framework for teacher collaboration.

Level	Distinguishing characteristics (attitude; effort; achievement; expectations of support)
1. Pseudocompliance or passive resistance	• An implicit or explicit rejection of collaboration and preference for status quo (generally after a short 'attempt'); • little or no real investment of time or understanding by teacher; • no positive outcomes (may have been counter-productive, i.e. entrench existing negative attitudes); • expectation is that 'this too will pass.'
2. Compliance	
3. Accommodation	
4. Convergence (and some co-option)	

5. Creative Co-Construction	• A very positive attitude, collaboration normalized and seen as preferred option for ESL teaching; • teachers' roles become much more interchangeable, yet more distinct, high degree of trust of other evident, responsibilities and areas of expertise continually negotiated, informing documents seen as actively co-constructed and teacher-developed, conflicts in roles seen as inevitable, accepted, even embraced, as a continuing condition which will lead to greater understanding; • achievements demonstrated across whole curriculum; • normalization of teacher-based professional development such as action research and critical reflection, accompanied by extensive reading in area to extend understanding of specific theoretical concepts, possibly some formal study in each other's areas.

Conclusion

All in all, WIDA standards are a timely intervention to address the long standing challenge to move Level 4 students to Level 5. For the standards to take root, expertise has to be drawn from multiple sources, and ENL and content area teacher collaboration is essential. As exemplified by an old Chinese saying: One tree cannot make a forest, one string cannot make music, and one bee cannot make honey.

Acknowledgement

We thank the Indiana teachers who responded to our survey for input. These teachers are undertaking work that makes an immediate and long-term difference in the lives of so many.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Faridah Pawan is an associate professor in Literacy, Culture and Language Education, Indiana University, Bloomington. Her areas of research is in language teachers' professional

development through inter-disciplinary teacher collaboration, teachers' sociocultural knowledge and in the pedagogy in online instruction.

Inquiries should be directed to fpawan@indiana.edu

Anita Seralathan is an advanced doctoral student in Literacy, Culture and Language Education, Indiana University, Bloomington. Her area of research is in the professional development of EFL teachers in India. She has taught ESL in California and EFL in Hungary.

Inquiries should be directed to aseralat@indiana.edu

REFERENCES

Albrecht, D. (2013, November). Identifying and teaching high ability English learners: Meeting the needs of an under-identified group. *INTESOL Conference.* Presentation conducted from Indiana University Purdue University Indiana, Indianapolis, IN.

Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (1989). *Content-based second language Instruction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1996). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A model for linguistically diverse classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, *96*(3), 259-273.

Davison, C. (2006). Collaboration between ESL and content teachers: How do we know when we are doing it right? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *9*(4), 454–475.

Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M.G. (2010). *Collaboration and co-teaching: Strategies for English learners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Echevarria, J. & Graves, A. (2010). *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching students with diverse abilities* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106-116.

Gottlieb, M. (2013). *Essential actions: A handbook for implementing WIDA's framework for English language development standards.* Madison, WI: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System. Retrieved from https://www.wida.us/get.aspx?id=712

Indiana Department of Education (2014). *Indiana's WIDA Implementation Guide for English Learners.* Indianapolis, IN: Office of English Learning and Migrant Education. Retrieved from http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/standards/indianas-wida-implementation-guide.pdf

Ladson-Billings, G. (1992). Reading between the lines and beyond the pages: A culturally relevant approach to literacy teaching. *Theory into Practice*, *31*(4), 312-320.

Mayville, H. W. (2012). *Six traits of writing for English language learners: A guide to effective writing instruction for low-proficiency ELLs.* Charlotte, NC: CreateSpace.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, *31*(2), 132-141.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards.* Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_ELA%20Standards.pdf

Pawan, F. (2000). *Creative problem solving: A webquest for advanced ESL students at the college level.* Retrieved from http://www.usca.edu/education/courses/aete731/ss02/Trainer/Creative%20Problem%20Solving.htm

Pawan, F. (2008). Content area teachers and scaffolded instruction for English Language

Learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(6), 1450-1462.

Pawan, F. & Ward, B. (2007). Integrated curriculum development through interdisciplinary collaboration between ESL and content area teachers. In F. Pawan & G. B. Sietmann (Eds.). *For all our students: Collaborative partnerships among ESL and classroom teachers* (pp. 5-30). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Pawan, F., & Honeyford, M. (2009). Academic literacy. In R. F. Flippo & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study strategy research* (2nd ed., pp. 26-46). New York: Routledge.

Pereira, N., & Gentry, M. (2013). A qualitative inquiry into the experiences of gifted English language learners in midwestern schools. *Journal of Advanced Academics, (24)*3, 164–194.

Pereira, N., & de Oliveira, L. C. (2015). Meeting the linguistic needs of high-potential English language learners: What teachers need to know. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 47*(4), 208-215.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, University of California at Santa Cruz.

Windschitl, M. (2002). Framing constructivism in practice as the negotiation of dilemmas: An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical, cultural, and political challenges facing teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 72*(2), 131–175.

Talking Points and Strategies to Get Your Administrators on Board with WIDA

DONNA ALBRECHT
Anderson University

This article provides strategies and key talking points when approaching administrators on issues of WIDA implementation, staying legal, and most importantly, meeting the needs of English learners. It offers tips on analyzing the pathways to decision-making in organizations, along with how to influence decision makers on issues of professional development and meeting EL students' needs. Some key points of discussion are: Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) requirements that schools implement the WIDA Standards and train teachers; Indiana's A – F Accountability system's inclusion of student observed growth in equal proportion to student achievement; the resurgence of focus on laws and the rights of ELs to a free and appropriate public education; preparing a menu of training options to share with the leadership team; research on the importance of the school corporation supporting, including and providing training opportunities for ENL leaders; and key areas supporting ELs that the superintendent can influence.

Keywords: WIDA Standards; leadership; strategies; implementation; accountability; training; support.

INTRODUCTION

The individuals who are put in a position of responsibility for the English Learners (ELs) in school corporations go by many names. Some are called English as a New Language (ENL) coaches, directors (of ENL or of many areas), ENL coordinators, ENL teachers, community liaisons, para-professionals, and so on. For many of these individuals, their role does not carry cabinet level leadership status, which can make it challenging to ensure that the needs of the ELs

are being met because they do not have a place at the decision making table. This article will provide some strategies and key talking points when approaching administrators on issues of WIDA implementation, staying legal, and most importantly, meeting the needs of ELs.

It will depend on the person's position in the corporation hierarchy, but there are some general approaches to take. Start by analyzing the pathways to decision-making in the organization. What is the process for getting an item on an important agenda? Is it possible to make a presentation to the school board? Determine a big event in the lives of the EL students, their progress, a special program, or an award they are receiving, and get this put on the agenda. Use pictures or bring the students themselves, if possible. Make it personal, but make it short, maybe 10 minutes. Follow up by sending key individuals links to articles such as the series that ran in The Indianapolis Star recently, *Lost in Translation* (Wang, 2015). Officials need to know that this group of students is getting visibility and "air-time" in the media and community. There is somewhat of a marketing strategy that must occur in order to get recognition. The message needs to be one of hope and must promote the additive value of ELs and EL programming, as opposed to the usual subtractive approach.

Ultimately, it is essential to identify which group or individual makes decisions on issues of professional development and meeting students' needs. These may be two different groups or individuals, but they are related when it comes to meeting the needs of ELs. Identify individuals who have a voice that is listened to by decision-makers and target them for support. This may not be a cabinet level administrator, but perhaps a teacher who has the ear of the principal, or a principal who has the ear of the superintendent. Find the opportunity to have lunch with that person in the faculty lounge, or ask for a meeting if this is a person you do not normally have access to. Agenda items and talking points for these meetings will be discussed below, but the

first step is to build a relationship with key individuals. In doing so, there is a delicate balance between being the squeaky wheel that needs to be greased, and the wheel that will be left in the garage where it will not be a nuisance any longer. In other words, provide helpful and useful information and assistance that is likely to build a reciprocal relationship, but do not badger the individual until they run the other way when they see you coming. The militant approach may work in the beginning, but it tends to backfire in the end. Making allies builds a much more lasting outcome in the end.

How to Get Started

Here are some talking points centered on information that will cause decision-makers to listen and on what they need to know:

1. Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) has required that schools implement the WIDA Standards and train teachers. The percentage of teachers trained must be reported to the IDOE. Additionally, a training plan is required as part of Title III funding and there are links to Title I. The IDOE has a resource page with promising practices for implementation (http://www.doe.in.gov/elme/english-learner-resources), and another page dedicated to WIDA (http://www.doe.in.gov/elme/wida-english-language-development-eld-standards-framework).

2. Indiana's A – F Accountability system has been updated to include student observed growth in equal proportion to student achievement (Indiana Department of Education, http://www.doe.in.gov/accountability/indiana-student-centered-accountability). Growth is now considered as important as passing state mandated assessments. According to an article in Chalkbeat Indiana by Shaina Cavazos (May 7, 2015), "Schools will be required to show any group of vulnerable children that score below the rest of the school — such as ethnic minorities, children in special education and English language learners — is catching up, or the highest

grade they can earn is a B (http://in.chalkbeat.org/2015/05/07/a-to-f-changes-pass-after-more-state-board-drama/#.VVn7DflVhBc)." This is especially important for our EL population because this group has tremendous potential to demonstrate growth, even if they have not yet reach the English language proficiency level necessary to pass the state tests. Schools will receive credit for this group that can certainly show progress with the support and attention they need. In fact, school corporations in Indiana have, on the whole, passed Annual Measurable Achievement Objective Part 1 – Making Progress for students improving their English language proficiency levels, and passed all of the AMAOs in the 2013-14 academic year (Indiana Department of Education Compass, 2013-14).

College and career readiness is another area that is measured on the school report card. The United States labor market is experiencing a growing need for competent individuals with postsecondary education while the state of Indiana has a low percentage (34.4%) of individuals holding postsecondary 2 or 4 year degrees. It is predicted that by 2020, approximately 60% of the job vacancies in Indiana will require some form of postsecondary education (Indiana Commission for Higher Education). The current emphasis on college and career readiness as promoted in state education standards, and touted by politicians and business leaders clearly reflects this imminent demand for individuals to be prepared for the next step once they graduate from high school. In the A-F accountability system, schools are graded according to the percentage of students who earn passing scores on Advanced Placement exams, International Baccalaureate exams, three college credits, and passing scores on industry approached certification exams. With the recent requirement by the Indiana Department of Education for all schools to incorporate the WIDA English language development and academic language proficiency standards in all classrooms involving English learners, it is clear that our

linguistically diverse students are an important part of the equation to move Indiana's economic future forward. It will be vital that ELs are provided equal opportunities to High Ability, AP, IB, Early College, Dual Credit classes, and career and technical training opportunities, with the added support WIDA implementation can provide.

3. The law, as it pertains to ELs, has been around for as long as the Civil Rights Movement, however, there is a resurgence of focus on these laws and the rights of ELs to a free and appropriate public education brought on by changes in demographics, among other reasons. The number of English Learners (ELs) in schools in the United States is increasing and will continue to do so at exponential rates. Indiana has seen 409.3% growth of English learners (EL) who currently represent five percent of learners (U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition, 2010). An achievement gap of 19.7% in Math and 28.4% in English Language Arts exists between ELs and non-EL students tested in Indiana in 2012-13 (Indiana Department of Education Compass, 2012-13). Even with these astounding statistics and growing realization, it seems that the world of ENL in terms of laws, policies and leadership development is years behind other subgroups of high need students, such as students with disabilities (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2009). If action is not taken until this situation becomes dire with 40% of the school-aged population in United States public schools being English learners (projected by 2030), it will be too late for several generations of students, not to mention the damage that would be done to society and the economy (Thomas & Collier, 2002). The education field needs to be proactive and not wait for law suits and legislators to make decisions that will dictate how decisions are made rather than doing what is best for kids now. The adoption of the WIDA Standards is a good start, but the field of English as a New (or Second) Language is lagging behind the need for serving these students. All school personnel

must be aware of the law. A few key laws to emphasize can be found in the Indiana Department of Education's Director's Toolkit for English Learners 2014-2015 http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/elme/full-directors-toolkit-timeline-events-8-26-14.pdf. This also provides guidance on everything a school corporation needs to know to stay within the law and meet policy requirements. WIDA is one tool that schools can use to be in compliance with the law as it pertains to ELs.

4. Have a menu of training options prepared to share with the leadership team, or key individuals who are decision makers in the organization.

- Start with 1 hour introductions in all buildings. Focus half day training at priority school buildings and those with a high incidence of ELs - breaking down learning into manageable parts, then reach out to the lower incidence buildings. The next step will be to offer more advanced training with stipends outside of the school day. (Beth Williams and Brad Sheppard - Elkhart Community Schools)
- Train counselors as one piece of the puzzle (or those in charge of scheduling) and look for a cohort of teachers to cluster students with - this could be a "team" approach. This would focus training on a smaller group of teachers and ideally, a group that is willing and supportive. This would also cover all content areas from the beginning. This would work for schools that have perhaps under 30%. If there are so many ELs that they are inevitably in all classrooms, another approach would be needed. (Donna Albrecht - Anderson University)
- Training on WIDA with admin team - do a short language learning simulation in a language other than English to stimulate buy-in, then talk about why WIDA is important, 20 minutes (with Superintendent involved). Then ask for a 1 hour

training with administration as a follow up. Train administration on assessment report and what it means, paired with language levels. Vital to their work with parents and community. (Pam Storm, Anderson Community Schools & Donna Albrecht, Anderson University)

- Work with preschool and KG to provide training to teachers and parents about the importance of developing bilingual students, not subtractive bilingualism. Support home culture and language along with learning a new culture and language. Partner with other organization doing parent training to reach out to ENL parent community. (Donna Albrecht - Anderson University)
- Train ENL staff to a high level using a 1 day training during school in the fall – could partner with other corporations. The ENL staff are vital to implementation as coaches to the other staff. (Donna Albrecht - Anderson University)
- Half day each quarter or before/after school once a month training with a representative group of teachers from key buildings to focus on how to use WIDA as a way to frame differentiation for ELs (stronger teaching practices that are research based - good for all students, but vital for ELs). (Donna Albrecht - Anderson University)
- Work with High Ability programs to identify CLDs/ELs and incorporate them into these programs at representative levels, as is required by law. (Donna Albrecht - Anderson University)
- Train career and technical tracks, Early College, Dual Credit, AP and IB teachers. (Donna Albrecht - Anderson University)

5. Share research on the importance of the school corporation supporting, including and providing training opportunities for ENL leaders, whatever their titles may be. Much research has been conducted on leadership in the school setting, pointing to a strong correlation between leadership and student outcomes, teacher efficacy, and teacher performance (Waters, Marzano & NcNulty, 2003; Leithwood, et al., 2004). It is clear that strong leadership of programs serving English learners is vital. A recent study supported the importance of having experience and training when it comes to effective leadership of ENL programs (Albrecht, 2014). Another finding of this study, as reported by the survey respondents who are in the ENL leadership role, was that ENL leaders felt relatively competent on the management side, but less so with instructional leadership. While they can check off all the boxes and fill out the forms properly, schools are still not meeting Annual Measureable Achievement Objective (AMAO) requirements as mandated by the state and federal governments. Findings from the study show that ENL program leaders (formal or informal) in Indiana are frustrated that many mainstream teachers are not equipped to meet the needs of ELs in their classrooms, that they are generally not adequately supported to effectively lead the program, and that ENL programs are not adequately funded from the state and corporations (Albrecht, 2014).

School superintendents can help by being aware that the level of involvement the ENL leader has in the design and development of the ENL program significantly affects the implementation of that program (as determined by self-reported performance on AMAO requirements and other factors) (Albrecht, 2014). Furthermore, this study showed that the ENL leader's knowledge of second language acquisition and program design, along with efficacy for leadership, all significantly affect program implementation. The study indicates that the person charged with leadership in this area needs to have a level of responsibility, confidence,

knowledge in the field, and a place at the leadership table. Even if the district has a low incidence of ELs, leadership development must be promoted for the individual responsible for supervising services for ELs.

Key areas supporting ELs that the superintendent can influence are:

- providing instructional leaders with appropriate training, support, and encouragement – superintendents can seek professional development in this complex field, provide PD opportunities for ENL leaders/coaches/teachers, principals, and for general education teachers - a body of knowledge exists that is unique to this field in terms of second language acquisition and research on effectiveness of instructional programming that is not gained in a traditional administrative program or without specific studies in this content area;
- giving ENL leaders/coaches a place at the leadership table – superintendents can assess where their ENL leader fits into the overall hierarchy of the school system and ensure that representation is provided for the ENL leader (or a knowledgeable person on staff that can advise about serving ELs appropriately and effectively); and,
- championing the fact that demographics are changing, that English learners have rights that must be upheld by law, and that supporting them will lead to ultimate gains in society and the economy.

(Albrecht, 2014)

An article outlining the points in number five above that ENL leaders can share with their district leaders is located in the April 2015 edition of The Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents (http://www.iapss-in.org/iapss-newsletters/april-2015-iapss-newsletter/april-2015-article-english-learners-matter-what-superintendents-need-to-know/).

Conclusion

As Leithwood et al. (2004) found, the effects of leadership are seen the most in areas where there is the most need. The changing demographic makeup of this nation indicates that educating English learners is a growing area of high need. The WIDA initiative is a powerful statement and action step towards providing an effective and inclusive free and appropriate public education to our English learning students, a group for whom the need is certainly great.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Donna Albrecht has taught and administered in local and international PK-12, and university settings for 25 years. She has taught IB courses, social studies, high ability and ESL students. Donna has designed and administered ESL programs in Egypt, the United Arab Emirates, and in Indiana. Before joining Anderson University, Donna was the intermediate school principal at the International School of Indiana. In her current role, Donna directs and teaches in the English Language Teaching Program and conducts Professional Learning Community groups, focusing on culturally and linguistically diverse students, and high ability learners in Madison, Hamilton, and Marion County schools. Donna has an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, and Ed.S. degree from Ball State University in School Superintendency; an M.A. in Teaching English as a Foreign Language from The American University in Cairo, Egypt; and a B.A. from Anderson University in political science and economics. Donna is licensed as a superintendent, building level administrator, and teacher (ESL, High Ability, PK-12; and social studies 5-12) in Indiana.

Inquiries should be directed to dlalbrecht@anderson.edu

REFERENCES

Albrecht, D. L. (April, 2015). English learners matter: What superintendents need to know. *Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents eNewsletter.* http://www.iapss-in.org/iapss-newsletters/april-2015-iapss-newsletter/april-2015-article-english-learners-matter-what-superintendents-need-to-know/

Albrecht, D. L. (2014). *Attitudes, backgrounds, and leadership efficacy of English as a second language program directors in Indiana Schools: implications for policy, leadership, and professional development* (Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University).

Cavazos, S. (May 7, 2015), A-F changes pass after more state board drama. *Chalkbeat Indiana*. Retrieved from http://in.chalkbeat.org/2015/05/07/a-to-f-changes-pass-after-more-state-board-drama/#.VVn7DflVhBc

Indiana Commission for Higher Education (2012) *Reaching higher, achieving more.* Retrieved on October 23, 2014 from http://www.in.gov/che/files/2012_RHAM_8_23_12.pdf

Indiana Department of Education Compass (2012-13) *State of Indiana ISTEP+ selected year detail.* Retrieved on February 25, 2014 from http://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/enrollment.aspx?type=state

Indiana Department of Education Compass, (2013-14) *Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) State of Indiana report.* Retrieved on May 15, 2015 from http://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/amao.aspx?type=state

Indiana State Board of Education (2012) Teacher Training and Licensing. Title 511, Article 10.1. Retrieved from http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/sboe/proposed-teacher-licensing-rule.pdf

Leithwood, K, Louis, K.S., et. al. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning.* New York: The Wallace Foundation.

Milner, H.R. (2013). Policy Reforms and De-professionalization of Teaching. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved [date] from http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/policy-reforms-deprofessionalization. National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *The Condition of Education 2012.* Retrieved March 1, 2014 from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_ell.asp#info.asp

Ravitch, D. (2013). *Reign of error: The hoax of the privatization movement and the danger to America's public schools*. USA: Random House LLC.

Thomas, W.P., & Collier, V.P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement.* Santa Cruz and Washington, DC: Center on Research, Diversity & Excellence.

Waters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership ™: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Denver, CO: McREL.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students, National Clearinghouse on English Language Acquisition. (2010). Indiana *rate of EL growth 1997/1998-2007/2008.* Retrieved July 15, 2010 from http://www.ncela.us/files/uploads/20/Indiana_G_0708.pdf

Wang, S. (2015, April 20 – 24). Lost in Translation. *The Indianapolis Star*. Retrieved from http://www.indystar.com/story/news/education/2015/04/20/schools-tested-rise-immigrants-learning-english/26041505/)

English through Inquiry: Implications of WIDA for Secondary Science Education Professional Development

CATHERINE D. BHATHENA,
Indiana University, Indianapolis

The adoption of the WIDA standards in Indiana provides the state with an opportunity to create professional development for secondary science teachers that could transform how English language learners in the state of Indiana learn science. A review of recent literature in both language and multicultural education indicates inquiry can be used as a framework to structure such professional development, with special attention to how science teachers address academic language development, contextualize content to students' prior knowledge, and, perhaps most importantly, design instruction that allows students to question the status quo in science knowledge and practice. Such transformation could lead to student science learning that exceeds the expectations outlined in Indiana's English language development standards and state science standards.

Keywords: WIDA, multicultural education, science education, academic language development, professional development, inquiry, equitable education

Introduction

> This mandate for change is both simple and profound. It is simple because it demands for ethnically different students that which is already being done for many middle-class, European American students—that is, the right to grapple with learning challenges from the point of strength and relevance found in their own cultural frames of reference. It is profound because, to date, U.S. education has not been very culturally responsive to ethnically diverse students. Instead these students have been expected to divorce themselves form their cultures and learn according to European American cultural norms. This places them in double jeopardy—having to master the academic task while functioning under cultural conditions unnatural (and often unfamiliar) to them (Gay, 2002, p. 114).

Educating English language learners (ELLs) in secondary classrooms is a complicated endeavor (Janzen, 2008; Calabrese Barton & Lee, 2006; Buck, Mast, Ehlers, & Franklin, 2005). Not only are there language issues to be addressed, but issues of student context such as race, culture, class, and gender (Bashir-Ali, 2006; Taylor, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Kubota, 1999; Spencer & Lewis, 1986); addressing these issues is critical for enacting the mandate for equitable education for all learners that Gay (2002) describes. While the current literature has identified this complex task, most research on how to prepare teachers to address it has focused on elementary school settings (e.g. Stoddart, Bravo, Solis, Mosqueda, & Rodriguez, 2011; Lee, Lewis, Adamson, Maerten-Rivera, & Secada, 2008), leaving a gap concerning how to best address this complex task in secondary science classrooms. This is important because it is at the secondary level that students encounter an increase in content literacy demands within their science courses (Fang, 2006) and high school graduation requirements that include successful completion of three science courses (IDOE, 2015a). Additionally, ELLs in secondary school face

the challenge of working to successfully navigate these changes in an unfamiliar language and context (Janzen, 2008; Lee & Buxton, 2008; Case, 2002).

In Indiana, the need to for teachers to address the complex needs of English language learners in their classrooms has increased dramatically in the last two decades. As of 2008, Indiana had the second fastest growing ELL enrollment in the United States; second only to South Carolina (Batalova & McHugh 2010). In fact, the ELL student enrollment in Indiana increased over 400% between 1998 and 2008 (Indiana Department of Education (IDOE), 2013). However, it is only recently that the topic has entered local media coverage (i.e. Elliot, 2015; Wang, 2015; Zubrzycki & Colombo, 2015). Much of this coverage has highlighted the impact of increased numbers of ELLs on state standardized test scores (Elliot, 2015) and the changes a few Indianapolis schools are implementing to address this impact (Zubrzycki & Colombo, 2015). Although some reports have shared stories of students and families who are negotiating school systems amidst teachers and students who do not understand the challenges they face to master academic content while learning English and adjusting to Indiana school and social cultures (Wang, 2015), most of the focus has been on accountability measures.

Regardless of the perspective of the individual stories, the overall message now reaching schools via newspaper and radio concerns the need to increase their attention to how they educate the growing number of students from diverse language and cultural backgrounds in order to raise test scores; and while scores on state science tests do not currently play a role in accountability measures (Indiana Register, 2015), graduation rates do (IDOE, 2015d). So, successful science teaching and learning for ELLs is crucial for students, teachers, schools, and districts. This is further emphasized by Indiana's adoption of new English language proficiency

(ELP) standards and the accompanying language proficiency exam that includes a focus on science language and content.

The newly adopted WIDA standards (IDOE, 2015b) increase Indiana's focus on academic language proficiency in science classrooms. Along with the standards, Indiana adopted the ACCESS® for ELLs (ACCESS) test as the state standardized measure of English language learning (IDOE, 2015b). This is the test that will now be used in the calculation of Annual Measurable Achieve Objectives (AMAOs) required by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, an accountability measure that impacts individual school and corporation funding as well as state determined letter grades (Indiana Register, 2015). Science teachers' work in the classroom will impact ELL performance on the ACCESS test because, unlike its predecessor, the LAS-Links test, the ACCESS test includes items specific to measuring the standard of academic science language proficiency (WIDA Consortium, 2008).

The WIDA science standard states, "English language learners communicate information, ideas and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of science" (WIDA, 2012). However, it does not provide individual indicators for science teachers to use in implementing this standard in their lesson planning and instruction. Instead, WIDA provide tools such as the Can Do statements, performance definitions, and Model Performance Indicators (WIDA, 2014) that teachers use to scaffold their own state content standards to meet the language needs of English language learners at all proficiency levels. This results in standard indicators that are compatible with Indiana state science standards and local curriculum, but that also assume the teachers using them have a basic level of understanding of how language is learned and how to teach literacy skills in science.

This assumption of basic knowledge on the part of most science teachers is not born out by research findings. In fact, various researchers have documented the lack of science teacher preparation to meet the content language learning needs of ELLs (e.g. Suriel & Atwater, 2012; Reeves, 2010) and that many secondary teachers continue to see language and content as two distinct subjects, taught in two distinct courses (Huang, 2004), instead of being the responsibility of all teachers in all classrooms. This latter viewpoint is the one taken by the IDOE in its statement concerning the adoption of the WIDA standards:

> All educators with English learners in their classroom are responsible for utilizing the WIDA standards and framework to ensure equitable access for all. We must ensure the ELD standards and Indiana Academic Standards are used collaboratively to create a continuous pathway to academic success for Indiana's English learners. (IDOE, 2015b)

Thus, given the lack of preparation of many secondary science teachers to teach ELLs and the increasing numbers of ELLs in Indiana schools, extensive professional development (PD) for science teachers will be required across the state in order to prepare them to provide "equitable access for all." In order for this professional development to address the complexity of teaching science to ELLs, it will need to address academic language learning *and* student context in science education. This paper will first summarize existing literature on both of these topics including how they intersect in the secondary science classroom. This will be followed by a discussion of how the implementation of WIDA standards in Indiana provides opportunities for research in coordination with professional development opportunities for teachers.

Academic Language Learning and Student Context in Science Education

Two previous reviews of the literature concerning English language learners (ELLs) in science classrooms were conducted by Lee (2005) and Janzen (2008) and focused on considerations of academic language learning and student context. Lee (2005) reports that within the topic of science learning there was mixed evidence on the importance of considering students' backgrounds when teaching science in the classroom; however it was generally evident that "when instruction is in English, ELLs' science learning is in direct relation to their level of English proficiency" (p. 500). This finding indicates that for ELLs, literacy instruction is of vital importance. This is reinforced by Janzen's (2008) pedagogical findings that identified specific successful literacy practices in working with ELLs in secondary science classrooms: practices that have been reinforced and built upon by recent research in language and multicultural education in secondary science classrooms. The importance of such practices in considering professional development for teachers preparing to implement WIDA standards is that teachers must move beyond simply implementing the practices to understanding *why* they work for ELLs, a point frequently left unsaid in the literature.

Inquiry is the Key to ELL Student Success

Inquiry in Indiana science classrooms is most clearly seen in the process standards used in conjunction with content knowledge standards (IDOE, 2015c) and is integral to science teaching in the state. Through inquiry students have the opportunity to develop academic literacy that addresses both language learning and student context by using academic language in classroom interaction (Johnson, 2011; Atwater, 1996; Atwater, 1994); connecting science with literacy, prior academic knowledge, and lived experiences (Janzen, 2008; Lee, 2005; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992); and questioning the status quo in science knowledge and practice (Suriel & Atwater, 2012). All of these are crucial for diverse students who are learning English.

Using academic language in classroom interaction. English language learners need to receive comprehensible input through meaningful interaction (Krashen, 1982). Recent research has demonstrated that this is essential in the secondary science classroom for increased ELL student learning. In activity design, collaborative small group and pairing strategies (Lara-Alecio, Tong, Irby, Guerrero, Huerta, & Fan, 2012; Matthews & Mellom 2012) with explicit attention to oral language development demonstrated a positive impact on student test scores on district benchmarks in science and reading. Because collaboration of this kind includes both teacher-student and student-student collaboration, the classroom structures and curriculum focused students on discussion of content using academic vocabulary and discourse (Johnson, 2011; Atwater, 1996; Atwater, 1994). For example, in her case study of two teachers working with Latino students, Johnson (2011) found that use of cooperative learning and small group work led to valuing different cultures and opinions, building a supportive classroom community, and increasing the motivation to learn science. Therefore, use of such collaboration not only addresses language development needs for ELLs, but also allows for student cultural influences on interaction patterns in the classroom (Gay, 2002, p. 111), partially due to the influence of "communal cultural systems of African, Asian, Native, and Latino American groups" (p. 112) represented in many ELL populations across Indiana. Yet, this cultural influence may contradict the school culture that typically enforces an active speaking role (teacher, usually, or student who has been "called on" by the teacher) and a passive listener role (everyone else). Such a school culture can be at odds with students whose cultures see the roles of people in communication as more fluid and verbally engaged. Therefore, inclusion of students' cultural communication patterns in the science classroom can prevent students being "intellectually silenced" and having "their thinking, intellectual engagement, and academic efforts . . . diminished as well" (Gay,

2002, p. 111). Thus, support is strong in both language and multicultural education research in science for collaborative learning in the classroom through inquiry activities.

Connecting science with literacy. Inquiry lessons designed with a focus on literacy assist students in connecting their developing language skills with science content (Lee, 2005; Amaral, 2002). The daily inquiry lessons Lara-Alecio, Tong, Irby, Guerrero, Huerta, and Fan, (2012) included in their study followed the 5-E instructional cycle (Engage, Explore, Explain, Evaluate, & Elaborate) to guide students through "lesson plans [that] were tightly aligned to state science standards, national science standards, and English language proficiency standards" (p. 995). Such inquiry activities provide students with the opportunities to use science language in a way that is contextualized within academic content (Lee & Buxton, 2013), leading to the use of language functions, such as describing, classifying, and interpreting that are integral to creating WIDA Model Performance Indicators. Use of the language functions in conjunction with science skills such as formulating hypotheses, collecting and interpreting data, and drawing conclusions (Lee & Buxton, 2013) ensure ELLs are meeting the same Indiana state science requirements as their native English speaking peers.

In contrast to the tightly designed and teacher-led lessons of Lara-Alecio, et al.'s (2012) study, Clark, Touchman, Martinez-Garza, Ramirez-Marin, and Drews (2012) used a student-directed inquiry project in an online environment that permitted students to navigate the online environment in their own way, with the students in the experimental group having access to native language supports not available to the control groups. Clark, et al. (2012) found that students who had access to native language supports in the online environment retained information better than their English-only counterparts, as demonstrated on a delayed post-test. Additionally, the students did equally well on a native language delayed post-test as compared to

the English one, so the native language supports did not hinder their English language production on the delayed-post test (p. 1219). This supports established research on the interactions of native and new languages (e.g., Cummins, 1979) and demonstrates the possibilities technology offers for teachers to provide native language support to students from many different linguistic backgrounds as are frequently found in Indiana schools.

The benefits of such native language supports were corroborated in studies by Matthews and Mellom (2012) and Gerena and Keiler (2012). These studies documented use of native language to assist students in understanding content area vocabulary. In the study by Gerena and Keiler (2012), native language use was enacted by untrained, bilingual Teaching Assistant Scholars (TAS) who had themselves been English language learners and reported using the strategy, among others described below, because they had remembered it being useful as they, themselves, learned academic English (p. 91). Utilization of native language in both studies was also helpful in connecting student understanding of science concepts in English to prior knowledge in their home languages.

Connecting science with prior academic knowledge and lived experiences. Intentional connections between concepts in secondary science and students' prior knowledge can be made through the use of graphic or advance organizers (Berg & Wehby, 2013; Lee & Buxton, 2013; Gerena & Keiler, 2012). These organizers connect content within the current unit of study and also help connect new content to prior academic knowledge, in any language, to enhance learning (Berg & Wehby, 2013; Gerena & Keiler, 2012). Decapua and Marshall (2010) specifically designed a model for addressing the learning needs of students with limited and interrupted formal schooling that relies heavily on such connections. This model includes "immediate relevance and interconnectedness," asking teachers to explicitly connect content to

student's lived experiences in their homes and communities (p. 54). Such connections assist teachers in understanding "the complex dynamics between scientific practices and students everyday knowledge" (Lee, 2005, p. 506) and in recognizing when student cultures can be resources for learning classroom science and when they may be in conflict with the school culture. (Janzen, 2008). Such recognition is paramount to pushing ELLs past textbook inquiry and into critical inquiry.

Questioning the status quo in science knowledge and practice. One way to begin such critical inquiry is through developing effective communication with the communities where students live through positive interactions with parents and families and participation in community action projects, as Johnson (2011) describes in her study. In this study communication with the community resulted in teachers' ability to connect science learning to students' contexts beyond the classroom and academics, shifting roles of student and teacher and giving students more voice in their learning.

Atwater (1996) declares the need for student voice in science education research and questions the role of science teacher as authority figure and decision-maker in both multicultural and monocultural classrooms. Bringing this voice to both research and practice involves a need to shift student and teacher roles to become more of a caring partnership (Valenzuela, 2013; Gay, 2002). Valenzuela describes the importance of such partnerships for Latino students as related to the idea of being *bien educado/a* (well-educated), meaning "to not only possess book knowledge but to also live responsibly in the world as a caring human being, respectful of the individuality and dignity of others" (p. 295). Such caring partnerships are described by Gay (2002) as "a moral imperative, a social responsibility, and a pedagogical necessity" in culturally responsive pedagogy (p, 109). From the teacher point of view, Johnson's (2011) study documented such a

change in teacher role when one of the teachers stated that "his shift to 'being a facilitator and not a dictator' was one of much pleasure" (p. 194), which then allows teachers to also shift their perspective to setting high expectations for every student in the room. Once the expectations are clear, teachers can then design instruction that scaffolds every student's attainment of those expectations, without exception (Gay, 2000, p. 109), because the teacher truly cares for each student.

Development of such caring partnerships between students and teachers expands science instruction to include "diverse perspectives on important social and cultural questions surrounding scientific concepts" (Suriel & Atwater, 2012, p. 1280). Such practice allows for discussion and investigation of "how marginalized people use their scientific knowledge and how they have contributed to the worldwide body of knowledge" in order to examine the social and political landscape and "become advocates for an equitable society" (Suriel and Atwater, 2012, p. 1280). This is particularly relevant for students whose home language, knowledge, and experiences may conflict with the science knowledge as presented in state standards (Janzen, 2008). Additionally, this moves science instruction away from being what Valenzuela (2013) describes as "subtractive schooling," (p. 292) that seems to ignore or even attempt to erase students' prior knowledge and experiences and moves it towards incorporating student context into secondary science classrooms. In this way students and teachers become partners in the creation of knowledge and recognize the importance of science understanding beyond the concepts found in the standards, while at the same time building "authentic caring" (Valenzuela, 2013, p. 296) relationships into the classroom community.

Implications for WIDA implementation and Professional Development in Indiana

Indiana's introduction of the WIDA standards brings with it the question of how best to engage secondary science teachers in the complex task of teaching science to ELLs. An examination of WIDA's various documents demonstrates that while the Can Do Philosophy acknowledges the important role of culture, experience, and social and emotional assets in student academic language development (WIDA, 2014), the tools provided for teachers to implement instruction with ELLs focus almost exclusively on students' linguistic needs, with little attention to these other aspects of science learning (Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, 2012, December; Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, 2012, May). This indicates a need for teachers, districts, and professional development providers to incorporate a variety of materials, resources, and research in conjunction with WIDA materials when preparing professional development opportunities for secondary science teachers in order to address both English language learning *and* student context in science classrooms.

To do this, the literature in both language and multicultural education in secondary science indicates that professional development can center its design on the use of inquiry in the classroom. Thus, inquiry becomes the framework to integrate the practices described here that are crucial for ELL student achievement, namely using academic language in classroom interaction; connecting science with literacy, prior knowledge, and lived experiences; and questioning the status quo in science knowledge and practice. The actual design of the professional development is a local undertaking, as each district and school has its own unique ELL population. The design of such local PD efforts offers opportunities for teacher-researcher and university-school partnerships to identify what teachers in a specific locale need to learn about their ELL populations; design ways to gather the information and build relationships with ELLs, their families, and their communities; and then provide on-going, in-classroom support to

develop curriculum and instruction that incorporates what teachers learn. This would create professional development with practicing science teachers that brings together language development and student context in order to ensure student learning and success in secondary science.

Additionally, such professional development would include opportunities for investigation into gaps in the current literature. Although there is a growing amount of research on multicultural education in secondary science, most of the research into such PD concerning the intersection of academic language instruction and student context has occurred in the elementary school context (e.g. Grimberg & Gummer, 2013; Stoddart, Bravo, Solis, Mosqueda, & Rodriguez, 2011; Lee & Luykx, 2005), with little having been conducted that is specific to English language learners in secondary science classrooms. Therefore, more research is needed concerning how to prepare secondary teachers to respect student linguistic and cultural knowledge and use it as a resource in the science classroom. In particular, considering the implementation of the WIDA science standard in Indiana secondary classrooms, some potential areas of study, drawn from Gay (2002), might include: determining cultural and linguistic strengths and weaknesses of curriculum and instructional materials; making changes to meet student needs; connecting to context (p. 108); avoiding simplification of topics via a facts-only approach by teaching the topics' complexity of content (p. 109); including many voices and perspectives beyond the commonly known "heroes" in science such as George Washington Carver or Ellen Ochoa; and finally identifying and addressing the stereotypes perpetuated by representations (or lack thereof) of cultural groups within the curriculum and mass media related to science (p. 109) as a means for questioning the status quo and connecting to students' lived experiences. While Gay (2002) emphasizes that all of these can be learned (p. 113), Suriel and

Atwater (2013) showed that intentional instruction in multicultural education strategies had an impact on teacher curriculum development practices. Therefore, as Indiana works to put the WIDA standards into practice in science classrooms, such approaches from multicultural education should be included in science teacher professional development.

Furthermore, with the adoption of the WIDA standards, Indiana is positioned to show nationwide leadership in their development of an equity-minded teaching force. If the state takes up the challenge in secondary science education, professional development could be designed and enacted that works deeply with teachers to change their practices with regard to educating English language learners. Changes in how science teachers address academic language development, contextualize content to students' prior knowledge, and, perhaps most importantly, design instruction that allows students to question the status quo in science knowledge and practice could lead to student science learning that exceeds the expectations outlined in both language development and science state standards documents.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Catherine (Cathy) D. Bhathena is Project Manager for IUPUI ESL Partnerships National Professional Development Grant and a doctoral student in the Urban Education Studies program at Indiana University School of Education at Indianapolis. Prior to working at IUPUI, Cathy was an environmental educator in the Peace Corps and at World Wildlife Fund, a middle school science teacher in New Rochelle, New York, and a secondary ENL teacher and coach in Indianapolis Public Schools. Her research interests include teaching English language learners in science classrooms, critical multicultural education, race, and curriculum theory.

Inquiries should be directed to cdfuller@iupui.edu

REFERENCES

Amaral, O. M., Garrison, L., & Klentschy, M. (2002). Helping English learners increase achievement through inquiry-based science instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal, 26*(2), 213-239.

Atkinson, D. (1999). TESOL and culture. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(4), 625-654.

Atwater, M. (1994). Research on cultural diversity in the classroom. In D. Gabel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Science Teaching and Learning* (pp. 558-576). New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Atwater, M. M. (1996). Social constructivism: Infusion into the multicultural science education research agenda. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 33*(8), 821-837.

Atwater, M. M., Lance, J., Woodard, U., & Johnson, N. H. (2013). Race and ethnicity: Powerful cultural forecasters of science learning and performance. *Theory Into Practice, 52*(1), 6-13. doi: 10.1080/07351690.2013.743757

Aud, S., Wilkenson-Flicker, S., Kristapovich, P., Rathbun, A., Wang, X., Zhang, J., Notter, L., Nachazel, T., & Dziuba, A. (2013). *The condition of education 2013*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Bashir-Ali, K. (2006). Language learning and the definition of one's social, cultural, and racial identity. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(3), 628-639.

Batalova, J. & McHugh, M. (2010). *Number and growth of students in U.S. schools in need of English instruction.* Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Buck, G., Mast, C., Ehlers, N., & Franklin, E. (2005). Preparing teachers to create a mainstream science classroom conducive to the needs of English-language learners: A feminist action research project. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *42*(9), 1013-1031.

Berg, J. L. & Wehby, J. (2013). Preteaching strategies to improve student learning in content area classes. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, *49*(1), 14-20.

Calabrese Barton, A. & Berchini, C. (2013). Becoming an insider: Teaching science in urban settings. *Theory into Practice*, 52(1), 21-27.

Calabrese Barton, A. & Lee, O. (2006). NARST equity and ethics committee: A call to action. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *43*(9), 875-878.

Case, R. E. (2002). The intersection of language, education, and content. *Clearing House*, *76*(2), 71.

Clark, D. B., Touchman, S., Martinez-Garza, M., Ramirez-Marin, F., & Skjerping Drews, T. (2012). Bilingual language supports in online science inquiry environments. *Computers & Education*, *58*(4), 1207-1224.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of educational research*, *49*(2), 222-251.

Decapua, A. & Marshal, H. W. (2010). Serving ELLs with interrupted or limited education: Interventions that work. *TESOL Journal*, *1*(1), pp. 49-70.

Elliot, S. (2015, April 19). Schools tested by rise in immigrants learning English. *Chalkbeat Indiana*. Retrieved from http://www.indystar.com/story/news/education/2015/04/19/schools-tested-rise-immigrants-learning-english/26041505/

Fang, Z. (2006). The language demands of science reading in middle school. *International Journal of Science Education*, *28*(5), 491-520.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(2), pp. 106-116.

Gerena, L. & Keiler, L. (2012). Effective intervention with urban secondary English language learners: How peer instructors support learning. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *35*(1), 76-97. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2012.667372

Grimberg, B. I. & Gummer, E. (2013). Teaching science from cultural points of intersection. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *50*(1), 12-32.

Huang, J. (2004). Socialising ESL students into the discourse of school science through academic writing. *Language & Education: An International Journal*, *18*(2), 97-123.

Indiana Department of Education. (2015a). *Indiana's Diploma Requirements*. Retrieved from http://www.doe.in.gov/ccr/indianas-diploma-requirements

Indiana Department of Education. (2015b). *Indiana English Language Development Standards: WIDA*. Retrieved from http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/elme/wida-one-pager.pdf

Indiana Department of Education. (2015c). *Science*. Retrieved from http://www.doe.in.gov/standards/science

Indiana Department of Education. (2015d). *A-F Accountability*. Retrieved from http://www.doe.in.gov/accountability/f-accountability

Indiana Department of Education. (2013). *Find school and corporation data reports*. Retrieved from http://www.doe.in.gov/accountability/find-school-and-corporation-data-reports

Indiana Register. (2015). TITLE 511 INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Proposed Rule LSA Document #14-447 DIN: 20150204-IR-511140447PRA Retrieved from

http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/accountability/20150204-ir-511140447pra.xml.pdf

Janzen, J. (2008). Teaching English language learners in the content areas. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(4), 1010-1038.

Johnson, C.C. (2011). The road to culturally relevant science: Exploring how teachers navigate change in pedagogy. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48*(2), 170-198.

Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford, England: Pergamon.

Kubota, R. & Lin, A. (2006). Race and TESOL: Introduction to concepts and theories. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(3), 471-493.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). Problematizing cultural stereotypes in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 709-719.

Lara-Alecio, R., Tong, F., Irby, B. J., Guerrero, C., Huerta, M., & Fan, Y. (2012). The effect of an instructional intervention on middle school English learners' science and English reading achievement. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49*(8), 987-1011.

Lee, O. (2005). Science education with English language learners: Synthesis and research agenda. *Review of Educational Research, 75*(4), 491-530.

Lee, O., & Buxton, C. A. (2013). Teacher Professional Development to Improve Science and Literacy Achievement of English Language Learners. *Theory Into Practice, 52*(2), 110-117.

Lee, O., & Buxton, C. (2008). Science curriculum and student diversity: A framework for equitable learning opportunities. *The Elementary School Journal, 109*(2), 123-137.

Lee, O., Lewis, S., Adamson, K., Maerten-Rivera, J., & Secada, W. G. (2008). Urban elementary school teachers' knowledge and practices in teaching science to English language learners. *Science Education, 92*(4), 733-758.

Lee, O. & Luykx, A. (2005). Dilemmas in scaling up innovations in elementary science instruction with nonmainstream students. *American Educational Research Journal, 42*(3), 411-438.

Matthews, P. H. & Mellom, P. J. (2012). Shaping aspirations, awareness, academics, and action: Outcomes of summer enrichment programs for English-learning secondary students. *Journal of Advanced Academics, 23*(2), 105-124. doi: 10.1177/1932202X12439197

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into practice, 31*(2), 132-141.

Reeves, J. R. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research, 99*(3), 131-143.

Spencer, M. L. & Lewis, P. G. (1986). Sex equity in bilingual education, English as a second language, and foreign language instruction. *Theory into Practice, 25*(4), 257-266.

Stoddart, T., Bravo, M., Solis, J., Mosqueda, E., & Rodriguez, A. (2011). *Effective Science Teaching for English Language Learners (ESTELL): Measuring Pre-service Teacher Practices.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. Retrieved from http://education. ucsc. edu/estell/Stoddart_et_al_2011_ AERA. pdf.

Suriel, R. L. & Atwater, M. M. (2012). From the contribution to the action approach: White teachers' experience influencing the development of multicultural science curricula. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *49*(10), pp. 1271-1295.

Taylor, L. (2006). Wrestling with race: The implications of integrative antiracism education for immigrant ESL youth. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(3), 519-544.

Valenzuela, A. (2013). Subtractive schooling, caring relations, and social capital in the schooling of U.S.-Mexican youth. In D. J. Flinders & S. J. Thornton (Eds.), *The Curriculum Studies Reader* (4th ed., pp. 289-300). New York, NY: Routledge.

Wang, S. (2015, April 20). One way street for immigrant integration in schools. *The Indianapolis Star*. Retrieved from http://www.wfyi.org/news/articles/one-way-street-for-immigrant-integration-in-schools.

WFYI. (2015). Lost in translation: Struggle and success as language barriers reshape Indianapolis schools. Retrieved from http://www.wfyi.org/news/articles/lost-in-translation

WIDA Consortium. (2014). *The WIDA Can Do Philosophy*. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System. Retrieved from www.wida.us

WIDA Consortium. (2012). 2012 *Amplification of the English Language Development Standards, Kindergarten–Grade 12*. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System. Retrieved from www.wida.us

WIDA Consortium. (2008). *WIDA® ACCESS for ELLs® Sample Items*. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System. Retrieved from www.wida.us

Wisconsin Center for Education Research. (2012, May). *Focus on Differentiation Part 1*. University of Wisconsin–Madison. Retrieved from www.wida.us

Wisconsin Center for Education Research. (2012, December). *Focus on Differentiation Part 2.* University of Wisconsin–Madison. Retrieved from www.wida.us

Zubrzycki, J. & Colombo, H. (2015, January 8). Feds: Schools must serve English language learners better: IPS, under improvement plan, seeks to change culture of serving non-native speakers. *Chalkbeat Indiana*. Retrieved from http://in.chalkbeat.org/2015/01/08/first-federal-guidance-on-english-learners-in-25-years-stresses-access-communications/#.VU-EWtpVikp

Getting with Program: An ACCESS Success Story

NICHOLAS FINE
The Lynhurst 7th and 8th Grade Center, MSD Wayne Township

An urban middle school with a large English language learner population (n=222) grapples with the complexity of the transition from the familiar LAS Links testing administration to the new WIDA ACCESS assessment for the first time in 2015. Here one of the lead ENL teachers outlines the organizational approaches developed to streamline the process and to minimize time out of mainstream classrooms for ELLs for ACCESS testing which is administered during a portion of the academic year already burdened by state-mandated ACUITY and ISTEP testing rounds.

Keywords: WIDA ACCESS, test administration, test organization, ELLs in Indiana

The transition from LAS Links to ACCESS might not have been a grand paradigm shift for most schools in Indiana. In fact in 2014, only 13 school districts statewide broke the 1,000 ELL student enrollment marker[1]. However, for a middle school with an ELL population of 222 (nearly 18% of the overall school population), the news of ACCESS came with a bit more anxiety. How could our department administer 222 tests, on three different levels, with 4 sections each? And, how could we accomplish this feat in a tight testing window without students losing significant class time, as we were also anticipating and preparing for the third round of ACUITY and the first round of ISTEP testing? The task seemed Herculean.

[1] "Find School and Corporation Data Reports | IDOE." 2013. 12 May. 2015 <http://www.doe.in.gov/accountability/find-school-and-corporation-data-reports>

Thankfully, our worries were somewhat eased by the Indiana Department of Education decision to exempt all who achieved level 5s[2] on the 2014 LAS Links and to immediately exit them from the program, rather than subjecting them to a completely different testing system. As a result, our 222 were filed down to 172. While 172 was a smaller number for our building to test, it still represented an ELL enrollment larger than the entire district enrollment of more than 80% of Indiana's corporations.

To test so many students quickly and efficiently, we needed to start from scratch and write off the old ways of doing things. Better to wipe the slate clean rather than shove a square peg into a round hole, as the clichés go. Simply put: new test, new approach.

Step One: Get Organized.

As anyone who has ever dealt with organizing a giant mess (say, sorting out recyclable materials) will tell you, start by separating everything into piles. So that is what we did; we "piled" our kids. With a high stakes test such as this, we wanted to keep the testing environments small and intimate, but we could not chop up the population too finely or testing would drag on forever. We also wanted to limit the amount of outside help (test administrators from outside our department) that we accepted. These were "our" kids; their scores would affect our evaluations. Therefore, it seemed best to keep them in a familiar environment with hands on the reins that we trusted, namely our own. In the end our department divided the 172 students into nine groups.

[2] "WIDA Assessment and Accountability Guidance - Indiana ..." 2014. 12 May. 2015 <http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/elme/wida-assessment-and-accountability-guidance.pdf>

Our level one students and our low ability level 2's were placed into a testing group together. These students would take ACCESS's Tier A (the lowest ability level test). Next, the rest of our level 2's and our low to mid-level 3's were assigned the Tier B (mid-level). We gathered and divided them into two different testing groups, as their numbers were nearly twice as great. The rest of the ELL population, high ability 3's and level 4's, were given the most difficult assessment, Tier C. This test is the only one that offers students the ability to test out of the LAP program, and we wanted to give as many students the opportunity to do that as we could. As a result, there were enough student taking Tier C to warrant six testing groups.

Once the students were chosen for each group, their materials were organized into boxes; each box contained testing booklets, answer sheets, CDs, scripts, pencils, etc. Boxes were labeled with the group names and a roster taped to the outside of the lid, so that absent students might be easily identified for make-up testing. We stored the boxes in a controlled area where they remained locked up, ready to distribute as needed before each testing session.

Step Two: Get with the Times.

Over the years, like many other districts, our school district has made a bigger a bigger push for technology in the classroom. One resource that has been highly utilized is Google Drive. We decided to make Google Sheets our platform for organizing our student groups, for storing information on individual students (class schedule, attendance, etc.), and for communicating with our teachers, administrators, and our districts education center. This was by far and away the best decision that our department made during this entire experience. It brought clarity to the whole process and allowed us to collaborate without necessarily having to be in the same room. One of our seasoned paraprofessionals took over this task as his full time responsibility leading up to and during the ACCESS testing window. Spreadsheets were constantly updated, absent

students were immediately identified and reassigned, and time lost to updating each other and our administrators was minimized.

Step Three: Get Students on Board.

In the weeks leading up ACCESS, we started prepping the students. We worked with those in our classes on ACCESS practice material, and we created similar exercises ourselves and shared them with students throughout the building with the help of My Big Campus and Google Drive. We tried to build excitement about the test itself; encouraging our lower level kids to prove to their peers, teachers, and parents how far they have come in a short time, and cheering on our higher level students to put the program behind them by scoring a 5 this year (an automatic exit for the 2015-2016 school year). By the time of the test, there was almost a competitive vibe in the classrooms and hallways as students bragged about how well they were going to do. In some cases, the discourse rose to the level of playful "trash talking" as students psyched up themselves and each other.

Step Four: Get a Plan.

The infrastructure was finally prepared upon which we could build our testing schedule. As ISTEP was fast approaching, we tried not to infringe on the language arts or math time of our students in their mainstream classes. The realities of testing such a large population of students, however, made that impossible, though we did make a conscious effort to create a schedule in which students would not miss any one class more than one period. We established a morning testing session and afternoon testing session. The shorter morning session was used to administer the portion of the test that could be given to the largest groups: writing. For the afternoon session, we paired the listening and reading portions of the ACCESS because it was

significantly longer. Dividing the day into two sessions and locking in what test would be administered in each session ensured that the students would not miss the same class twice.

The fourth test, speaking, had to be administered to the students individually. The test is designed to be completed quickly by lower level speakers; however, the more proficient a student is orally, the longer the test. Of the 172 students that we tested, 132 were level 4's; most of them were orally adept and required a longer testing time. So it was no surprise that though the speaking test was the shortest of the four portions, it took the longest amount of time to administer by far.

Between the morning and afternoon testing sessions, every free moment was dedicated to chipping away at this block of testing students one at a time on speaking. It was a long, slow process that often felt like trying to file down a boulder into sand. Had we been able to call down entire groups of students to a quiet room and then call them out one at a time in rapid sequence, the logistics would have been relatively simple. But with students needing every minute of class time leading up to ISTEP, having students out of class for long periods would have been counterproductive for our school. Instead, we developed a system that mirrored a baseball batting order: one at bat, one on deck, one in the hole. Using this strategy, we would always have one student taking the speaking test (the player at bat), another student in a nearby room waiting his/her turn (the player on deck), and a hall pass with the name and classroom number of a third student (the player in the hole). Once the student taking the test was finished, he/she was given the pass to retrieve the third student before heading back to his/her own class. A new pass was then written, and the student waiting outside was called in. Thus we moved "up the order" and rotation kept things fluid and constant. With the exception of a few minor

hiccups, this system worked smoothly and minimized time out of class and time spent locating students.

Step Five: Get a Move on.

We rolled out our plan to the students and staff well ahead of time, but in recognition that everyone had more on their plates than just ACCESS, we decided to be much more proactive at the start of each day. Using the group lists created on Google Sheets, we sent mass emails each morning to the entire staff letting them know which students would be testing in the morning and afternoon testing sessions. We then created notes to remind students of the testing schedule each day and delivered the reminders during homeroom.

It required getting to school extra early to write emails, staying late to write reminders, and a lot of leg work to deliver materials. In the end, the extra work paid off. Seldom did we have to put out APBs on missing students, teachers got back to us quickly with notice of missing students when they were unable to deliver the passes, and the added attention to detail inspired the students to take test more seriously.

Step Six: Get along.

This entire experience would have been much more difficult without the trust and easy going nature of The Lynhurst staff and administration. Everyone involved remained calm and flexible to accommodate the process. Administrators allowed us the freedom to design our own system without micro-management and lent a hand or guidance when needed. Teachers were understanding about students being out of their classrooms (sometimes large chunks of their classes) and brought students up to speed on what they had missed while they were testing. Teachers also were instrumental in communicating the schedule to those level 4 students not enrolled in an ELD (English language development) course. Paraprofessionals helped to create

spreadsheets, organize materials, seek out missing students and maintain running records. They also supported substitute teachers in for our own ELD classes on a consistent basis to ensure learning continued while we tested students.

My partner, Mrs. Marina Veprinski, worked in tandem with me to brainstorm aspects of the process, create materials, communicate with staff, run departmental meetings and administer the tests. We worked hard to make sure that we applied the same structure to our testing environments and to ensure adherence to the predetermined approach to add a sense of uniformity to the entire experience.

Step Seven: Get It Wrapped up.

Once we finished the last of the speaking tests and made up those students that missed sessions, it was time to dot i's and cross t's. We meticulously went through each box and flipped through each book to make sure that all portions of the test were completed. Books were divided, first by grade level, then again by tier. All spreadsheets were double checked and updated; all box top rosters were examined and then removed. The materials left the building for delivery nearly two days before the third round of ACUITY, our schools self-imposed deadline.

A transition that initially felt problematic and intimidating was accomplished rather seamlessly. We are aware, however, that the ultimate determiner as to whether or not our efforts were "successful" will be in the scores that return to the district and not the manner in which the tests were packaged and delivered. I hope that whatever equivalency committee (LAS Links to ACCESS) that the Indiana Department of Education puts together will take into account the painstaking effort that goes into making such a large transition, especially for schools like Lynhurst housing a large population of ELLs. In the end, we are all here for the same singular purpose: to help ELLs. I am of the opinion that no matter what the data points suggest or the

matrixes imply, we should sing of our victories when we get the chance. Thank you for allowing me to sing our song.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Nicholas Fine is a middle school ENL teacher at The Lynhurst 7th and 8th Grade Center, a Wayne Township school in Indianapolis, Indiana. He received his undergraduate in English education from Fort Lewis College in Durago, CO. He taught high school literature and composition for three years before moving to Spain. There, he operated a language laboratory at San Luis de Gonzaga, a private institution outside of Madrid (Majadahonda). While overseas, he received his master's degree in TEFL from UNED (Universidad Nacional de Educacion de Distancia). Since his return to Indiana, he has served on Wayne Township's Language Arts Taskforce and participated in developing the district's ENL/ELD curriculum.

Inquiries should be directed to Nicholas.Fine@wayne.k12.in.us

Indiana Department of Education Perspectives on the Transition: How We Got Here, What We Should Remember, and What We Hope for

CHARLIE GEIER, RACHEL DAVIDSON, AND NATHAN WILLIAMSON,
Indiana Department of Education

The article summarizes the process of Indiana's departure from the original English Language Proficiency Standards and the use of LAS Links as an annual assessment for Indiana's more than 60,000 English language learners (ELLs) to becoming a member of the WIDA Consortium of states. Historical perspectives and rationales for this transition, as well as an early indication of the benefits of this new association, provide an important documentation of the reasons for this significant decision and its anticipated positive impact on Indiana's ELLs.

Historical Account of Indiana's Membership in the WIDA Consortium

Indiana's transition to the WIDA English language development standards, W-APT placement test, and the ACCESS test is one of the most substantial reforms in the past decade in ensuring equity and high quality for Indiana's 60,000 English learners. By joining WIDA, Indiana is placing a particular emphasis on advancing the academic language development and academic achievement for linguistically diverse students through standards, assessments, research, and professional development for educators. This transition also changes the culture of language learning for English learners from the ESL teacher in an isolated setting to one where all teachers own the language acquisition and academic achievement of English learners.

The United States Department of Education's ESEA flexibility waiver requests require states to adopt college and career ready standards and assessments for all students. This requirement includes not only traditional academic subjects and assessments, but also the English language development standards and aligned assessments. Due to the fact that Indiana's previous standards were not categorized as college and career ready, the state had to make a change. The options included revising the current standards to be college and career ready or adopt a set of standards from either WIDA or ELPA21.

IDOE received a white paper in the Fall of 2012 from the Indiana Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (INTESOL) indicating that IDOE should join the WIDA consortium in order to use the WIDA English language development standards and the ACCESS assessment. IDOE leveraged the work of the Great Lakes Comprehensive Center, the WIDA consortium, INTESOL Leadership Group, an internal key stakeholder group, and external work groups to evaluate the 2003 Indiana English Language Proficiency standards in order to make a recommendation on college and career ready English language development standards. The consensus among all of the work groups was to adopt the WIDA English Language Development Standards.

After the recommendation was made, the standards were posted for public comment. Information was disseminated through the DOE Dialogue, INTESOL leadership listserv, and the Title III/NESP Learning Connection community. The comments spanned from all regions of the state and came from educators, administrators, parents, and community members. The overall approval score was 4.43 out of 5 possible points. The internal key stakeholder group then met to review and discuss the public comments. The group made an official unanimous recommendation for Indiana to adopt the WIDA English Language Development Standards. The

standards were officially launched in October 2013 for implementation in the 2014-2015 school year. Information was disseminated through formal announcements in the DOE Dialogue, Learning Connection listservs, IDOE website, newsletters, conference presentations, and leadership meetings.

After the adoption of the new standards, the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education began providing technical assistance and professional development to all educators and administrators on the transition to the new standards. Throughout the 2013-2014 school year, 25 professional learning events were held throughout the state focusing on new standards and specifically discussing the ESEA flexibility and how it impacts English learners.

Additional training was planned to be held throughout the summer of 2014. Feedback was solicited to offer input on the additional trainings. After considering the feedback, it was determined the summer training will would consist of 7 specific WIDA trainings and 19 Indiana Academic Standards trainings where the WIDA standards information will be embedded. Over the course of the summer, 1,500 educators attended the WIDA specific trainings. Video resources from the trainings were developed and posted to the www.doe.in.gov/elme website. Representation from the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education was also present and in leadership position throughout the development of the professional learning and also led the efforts for the scheduled events.

During the 2014-2015 school year, professional development for the implementation of the standards was focused on individual regional and district requests, a trainer of trainers model, and leadership. This approach provided a tailored method with an increase in intensity. Districts or regions requested standards training throughout the year. The requests were evaluated on the number of participants and resources available. In order to achieve a broader reach, districts are

encouraged to invite neighboring districts to the trainings. In addition, Indiana provided training for 90 individuals to become official trainer of trainers. During the summer of 2015, these trainers will be providing WIDA training at 18 events.

To continue the professional development for the WIDA standards implementation, IDOE developed a robust, nationally recognized WIDA standards and ACCESS assessment resources on the IDOE website and the WIDA website. The website includes resources such as the WIDA implementation guide, a series of on demand WIDA webinars on the overview of WIDA, the support materials and resources, transition expectations, and standards alignment. In addition, the summer training workshops will be were recorded and posted for viewing at any time.

IDOE has created a WIDA standards and assessment implementation guide. The implementation guide has been completed with input from the Office of Assessment and the INTESOL K-12 Leadership Group. The implementation guide includes an overview of the standards framework, specific Indiana and federal law and policies regarding the implementation, transition guidance, exemplary models, and tools for implementation and planning at the local level. This is a living document and is designed as a reference for LEA and school personnel working with English learners. During the next three years of the ESEA flexibility waiver, IDOE will continue to provide additional updates and resources on the WIDA standards and assessment website.

Train the Trainer professional development by WIDA began in the 2014-2015 school year for 90 individuals. This intentional approach will develop a cadre of regionally trained experts that can assist districts in the local training, professional development, and sustainability practices of the implementation. Particular consideration was placed on the Indiana Educational

Service Centers (ESCs), school corporations, universities, and internal IDOE staff including Outreach Division of School Improvement. English learner population, expertise, geographic location, and content areas were considered in the selection of invitees. The training is designed so that a number of individuals are trained to provide professional development to all types of stakeholders including pre-service teachers. This effort not only builds the capacity at the local LEAs, but also the capacity of the IDOE. The trainers are expected to assist the IDOE in leading upcoming professional development over the next three years.

Professional development by the official trainers and IDOE's Office of English Learning and Migrant Education staff will continue on an ongoing basis as needed and throughout the next three years of the ESEA Flexibility waiver. The training will take the form of individual trainings, summer workshops, and conference presentations. The next three years of trainings will not only include the basic WIDA standards information, but will put a keen focus on depth and breadth of implementation. The trainings will include topics such as WIDA standards for content teachers, lesson planning integration into all subjects, differentiation, collaboration, and leadership. To support these efforts, IDOE will also provide additional professional development each of the next three years for new trainers and will also continue to develop the current trainers in order to build capacity.

WIDA W-APT and ACCESS

Before Indiana could officially join the WIDA consortium, it had to receive an official Attorney General opinion that joining the consortium would not violate HEA 1427, which does not allow the state to join a consortium that requires Indiana to cede authority. This is particularly important because a state can always adopt the WIDA ELD standards, but a state cannot implement the aligned assessment without joining the consortium. IDOE received the

approval that joining the consortium would not violate HEA 1427 and was able to join and provide the W-APT and ACCESS assessments beginning in the 2014-2015 school year.

W-APT, ACCESS, and Alternate ACCESS were implemented in the 2014-2015 school year. The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education and the Office of Student Assessment designed and carried out a high quality plan for a smooth transition and implementation. IDOE reached out to various other states that have made the transition from LAS Links to ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS. This provided IDOE with particular insights and strategies for a smooth transition. The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education was also in close contact with the Title III federal program officer to ensure compliance throughout the transition. The transition plan included webinars, workshops, technical assistance, updates, and timelines to the field.

IDOE will transition to ACCESS 2.0, the new online version of ACCESS, in the 2015-2016 school year. IDOE will coordinate with the WIDA consortium to determine the implementation of the ACCESS 2.0 and the Alternate ACCESS, which will include training for administrators, technology needs for the online assessment, grade level specifications, and needed support. Technical assistance and professional learning for the transition to ACCESS 2.0 and Alternate ACCESS will be based upon stakeholder feedback and lessons learned from the transition to ACCESS and Alternate ACCESS.

Monitoring of the implementation of the assessments occurs through five methods. First, testing information is collected through the Language Minority (LM) data collection. This collection allows IDOE to analyze how many students have participated in the new W-APT placement test and previous English language proficiency annual assessments. This collection indicates how many students should be participating in the annual ACCESS and Alternate

ACCESS assessments. Second, IDOE monitors through the Corporation Test Coordinator's registration and assessment management via the WIDA access system. This allows IDOE to calculate who is and who is not accessing the system. Third, IDOE monitors through the Title consolidated monitoring visits, Title III monitoring visits, Title III desktop monitoring, and the state Non-English Speaking Program monitoring. Fourth, IDOE monitors through implementation surveys. The surveys provide data on implementation and additional support and technical assistance that may need to occur. Fifth, data will be analyzed after the completion of the 2015 ACCESS assessment, Alternate ACCESS, and the ACCESS 2.0 in subsequent years. The expected analysis of ACCESS will be conducted in a similar format so that conclusions can be drawn that informs practice, policy, and procedures.

The Office of Student Assessment and the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education conducted a linking study during the Fall semester of 2014 to analyze the WIDA standards in comparison to Indiana's new Academic Standards in E/LA, mathematics, and science. In addition, a bridge study will be conducted in the Spring 2015 through the fall of 2015 to compare LAS Links assessment expectations with those of the WIDA ACCESS assessment. The bridge study will provide information and guidance on transitioning to accountability measures using the ACCESS assessment.

The IDOE will continue the administration of ACCESS 2.0 and Alternate ACCESS in Spring 2016 and Spring 2017. The IDOE will coordinate with the WIDA consortium to determine the implementation of the ACCESS 2.0 and Alternate ACCESS assessment which will include training for administrators, technology needs for the online assessment, grade level specifications, and needed support. Technical assistance and professional learning for the continued implementation of ACCESS 2.0 and Alternate ACCESS will be based upon

stakeholder feedback and lessons learned from the transition to ACCESS 2.0 and the continued use of Alternate ACCESS.

Benefits of Membership

Indiana's membership in the WIDA consortium has been invaluable for the state. Indiana was the 36th state to join the WIDA consortium, which allows for powerful collaboration between educators all across the country who are working together to meet the needs of diverse students. Indiana not only shares students with other states but also challenges and successes. Additionally, the team at WIDA is well-respected in the field of English learners who support Indiana. Indiana is better suited to improve the academic performance of our English learners through WIDA's continuous improvement of their assessments, professional development offerings, and impact on policy at the federal level.

Early Outcomes

Indiana's educators are just beginning the process of analyzing ACCESS data. The informal feedback from teachers has indicated that ACCESS is better aligned to the current language expectations of the classroom and other state assessments. The implementation of the WIDA ELD standards put an intentional focus on meeting the needs of English learners in ALL classrooms. We are seeing improved collaboration between content area teachers and EL teachers. Educators are recognizing that the research behind the WIDA ELD standards framework can be applied throughout the curriculum and all classrooms. WIDA's emphasis on its can-do philosophy, academic language development, appropriate supports, and data-driven instructional approaches need to be tenets of every classroom with every student. However, this benefit is also a

challenge, as Indiana still has work to do to make sure all educators of English learners are well equipped to carry out this task. Indiana's teachers will need continuous and comprehensive training to ensure that English learners are provided with meaningful access to the core curriculum while developing their language skills.

Conclusion

The adoption of the WIDA was a big, first step in hopefully many more to come. The 2015 Indiana General Assembly approved a doubling in the state funded Non-English Speaking Program. Other efforts are being made at the local and state level to further improve educational outcomes for English learners. The adoption of a research-based framework that is used by all educators is a vital foundational piece that Indiana can continue to build upon. However, Indiana has to ensure that WIDA does not become just a compliance check but rather an embedded, living presence that makes a difference in the lives of children through the education they receive.

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS TO *INTESOL JOURNAL*

The *INTESOL Journal*, a professional, refereed journal, encourages submission of previously unpublished articles on topics of significance to individuals concerned with language teaching and learning. Although the *INTESOL Journal* was formerly published as a print journal, beginning in 2014, the *INTESOL Journal* will be an open-access journal published exclusively online. As a publication that represents a variety of cross-disciplinary interests, both theoretical and practical, the *INTESOL Journal* invites manuscripts on a wide range of topics, especially in the following areas:

- psychology and sociology of language learning and teaching
- issues in research and research methodology
- testing and evaluation
- professional participation
- curriculum design and development
- instructional methods, materials, and techniques
- language planning professional standards

Because the *INTESOL Journal* is committed to publishing manuscripts that contribute to bridging theory and practice in our profession, it particularly welcomes submissions that address the implications and applications of research in, for example,

- anthropology
- applied and theoretical linguistics
- communication
- education
- English education, including reading and writing theory
- psycholinguistics
- psychology
- first and second language acquisition
- sociolinguistics
- sociology

The *INTESOL Journal* prefers that all submissions be written in a style that is accessible to a broad readership, including those individuals who may not be familiar with the subject matter.

GENERAL SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Contributors are strongly encouraged to submit manuscripts of no more than 15-20 double-spaced pages or 7,000 words (including references, notes, and tables). Submit one copy plus an informative abstract of not more than 200 words. If possible, indicate the number of words at the

end of the article. To facilitate the blind review process, authors' names should appear only on a cover sheet, not on the title page; do not use running heads.

In every case, copyright of work appearing in INTESOL Journal is retained by the author. Individual articles may be reprinted for educational purposes, provided that no fees (other than copying costs) are charged. For information regarding more extensive copying or reproduction for other purposes, contact: Managing Editor, INTESOL Journal, managingintesoljournaleditor@intesol.org

INTESOL Journal prefers online submissions through the journal's online submission system. Please visit https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/intesol/user/register to create a user name and password prior to submitting a manuscript.

When evaluating a manuscript for publication in the *INTESOL Journal*, reviewers consider the following factors:

1. The manuscript appeals to the general interests of INTESOL's readership.
2. The manuscript strengthens the relationship between theory and practice: Practical articles must be anchored in theory, and theoretical articles and reports of research must contain a discussion of implications or applications for practice.
3. The content of the manuscript is accessible to the broad readership of the INTESOL membership.
4. The manuscript offers a new, original insight or interpretation and not just a restatement of others' ideas and views
5. The manuscript makes a significant practical, useful, plausible contribution to the field.
6. The manuscript is likely to arouse readers' interest.
7. The manuscript reflects sound scholarship and research design with appropriate, correctly interpreted references to other authors and works.
8. The manuscript is well written and organized and conforms to the specifications of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.).

All submissions to the *INTESOL Journal* should conform to the requirements of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.), which can be obtained from:

American Psychological Association
Book Order Department
P.O. Box 92984
Washington, DC 20090-2984 USA

- All submissions to *INTESOL Journal* should be accompanied by a cover letter that includes a full mailing address and both a daytime and an evening telephone number. Where available, authors should include an email address and fax number.
- Authors of articles should include a very brief biographical statement (in sentence form, maximum 50 words), plus any special notations or acknowledgments that they would like to have included.

Double spacing should be used throughout.

- Manuscripts submitted to *INTESOL Journal* cannot be returned to authors. Authors should be sure to keep a copy for themselves.
- It is understood that manuscripts submitted to *INTESOL Journal* have not been previously published and are not under consideration for publication elsewhere.
- It is the responsibility of the author(s) of a manuscript submitted to a *INTESOL Journal* to indicate to the Editor the existence of any work already published (or under consideration for publication elsewhere) by the author(s) that is similar in content to that of the manuscript.
- The Editor of *INTESOL Journal* reserves the right to make editorial changes in any manuscript accepted for publication to enhance clarity, concision, or style. The author will be consulted only if the editing has been substantial.
- The Editor's decisions are final.
- The views expressed by contributors to *INTESOL Journal* do not necessarily reflect those of the Editor, the Editorial Advisory Board, or INTESOL. Material published in the *INTESOL Journal* should not be construed to have the endorsement of INTESOL.

Special Topic Issues

The *INTESOL Journal* is an annual publication; however, one additional issue per volume may be devoted to a special topic. Topics are approved by the *INTESOL Journal's* Editorial Advisory Board. Those wishing to suggest topics or serve as guest editors should contact the editor. Issues will generally contain both invited articles designed to survey and illuminate central themes as well as articles solicited through a call for papers.

These guidelines are largely adopted from the *TESOL Quarterly* guidelines (09/2004).