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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The present study calls into question the impact of culturally and linguistically responsive practices on English learners’ academic English language development. It utilized a document review, administrator and teacher interviews, an artifact review, and classroom observations of a California district implementing the Sobrato Early Academic Language (SEAL) Model. The model utilizes culturally and linguistically responsive teaching practices with preschool through third-grade students to minimize the number of students with delayed reclassification rates. This study is of value since current practices with English learners have not addressed the reasons for the growth in the number of long-term English learners (Ascenzi-Moreno, Kleyn, & Menken, 2013; Gándara & Orfield, 2012; Olsen, 2010). Hence, the study of research-based contemporary models is critical (Howard & Terry, 2011).

Background of the Problem

In 2017, the California Department of Education (CDE, 2018) identified 183,272 students as reclassified, representing 13.3% of all English learners in California. Reclassification occurs when English learners meet a district’s criteria and are removed from the English learner program learn English, and 2) they must acquire age- and grade-level appropriate subject matter knowledge. If they are immigrants, they will most likely also need to adjust to an entirely new culture and learn the cultural and behavioral norms of a new society. However, schools have focused so extensively on the first task of learning English that academic preparation and the transition into a new culture often fall by the wayside. Bilingual education programs legislated both in California and the nation during the 1970s and 1980s attempted to take students’ academic preparation into account. Primary language instruction was held forth as a way to prevent students from falling
behind academically while learning English. But even bilingual programs used primary language to help students transition into English as quickly as possible (Gándara, 2002).

Currently Proposition 227, California’s English-Only initiative passed in 1998, calling for ELs to be placed in a year of English immersion upon entry to the school system, focusing again on English rather than content area academics (Callahan, 2007). Reclassified students no longer receive English language development (ELD) programs or services provided by the district, although federal law requires their academic proficiency be monitored for 2 years post-reclassification. The variation in reclassification criteria by district created implications for the time English learners remain in English language programs (Carroll & Bailey, 2016). Kim (2011) presented a study of three cohorts of students in public school systems that provides data indicating greater chances of dropping out of school the longer a student remains an English learner. A 10% longer English learner classification period increased their likelihood of dropping out 1.75 times, creating serious implications for long-term English learners.

Although not all states identify the length of time it takes for a student to become a long-term learner, several states have documented and laid plans to address the issue (Ascenzi-Moreno et al., 2013; Olsen, 2010). California defines a long-term English learner as (a) a student enrolled in sixth through 12th grade on census day (last Wednesday of October), (b) enrolled in a U.S. school for 6 or more years, and (c) remaining in the same English proficiency level for 2 or more consecutive years on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) or regressed to a lower English level on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) assessment (CDE, 2018).

Long-term English learners impact the school district, the state, and the nation (Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly, & Callahan, 2003; Olsen, 2010) through the state’s
productivity and economy (Gándara et al., 2003), including lower wages than high school graduates, less tax revenue due to lower wages, increased social services, and health coverage, and an increase in criminal behavior due to economic strain (Callahan, 2013). Additionally, these students face challenges beyond language proficiency: 38% of non-English learners receive free or reduced lunch, whereas 74% of English learners receive these resources; 25% of English learners drop out, whereas 15% of non-English learners drop out (Gándara et al., 2003).

Reclassification

Reclassification is a determinant for exiting ELD programming and ameliorating long-term English learner status. Multiple factors contribute to the lack of reclassification. Olsen’s (2010) report outlines why students remain English learners: (a) a lack of English language development; (b) elementary age materials and resources that are not designed with English learners in mind; (c) insufficient language development programming; (d) revolving programs; (e) a ping pong syndrome curriculum, where students move from one program to another; (e) segregation of linguistic communities; and (f) students’ international mobility.

Upon identification, English learners are placed in language programs, most of which contribute to their status as long-term unclassified. Recent programs focus on mainstream classes where students are assigned to structured immersion programs in English (Callahan, 2005a; Gándara et al., 2003). Mainstream English classrooms present all skills and content in English, excluding the primary language of the English learner (Ascenzi-Moreno et al., 2013; Olsen, 2010). English learners are placed into language programs with students who possess similar characteristics, creating communities of learners of linguistically isolated students (Callahan, 2005a; Olsen, 2010). These segregation practices group students who live in poverty, creating high-poverty mostly
Latin@ schools (Gándara & Orfield, 2010). Additionally, with the emphasis on the attainment of the English language, English learners face the increased possibility of *subtractive bilingualism*, where students lose their fluency in their native language for the sake of attaining English (Baker, 2011; Fillmore, 1991). Consequently, English learners fail to perform at grade level, creating a greater academic gap and therefore increasing the probability of students dropping out (Callahan, 2013; Coleman & Goldenberg, 2010; Kim, 2011).

**Statewide Reform**

SEAL negates a deficit approach that results in subtractive bilingualism. The model embraces students’ linguistic and cultural capital to enhance English learners’ academic language. English learners maneuver through academics, learning English while grappling with the content in the language they are learning (Bailey, 2007; Cummins, 2000; Olsen, 2010). Reclassification is delayed when students struggle to master the academic language of grade level content (Bailey, 2007). To address this problem, SEAL is based on English learning across the content areas, in addition to designated instruction in English language (Ascenzi-Moreno et al., 2013; Callahan, 2005a, 2006; Olsen, 2010).

**State expectations.** The California State Board of Education (SBE, 2017) adopted an English language arts/ELD framework that proposes specific skills necessary for all students to attain literacy proficiency. Within this framework, the state board called for districts to implement:

> Curriculum and instruction related to the CA CCSS for ELA/Literacy focus on five key themes of a robust and comprehensive instructional program in ELA literacy for all students: Meaning Making, Language Development, Effective Expression, Content Knowledge, and Foundational Skills. These key themes cut across the strands of Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening, and Language. (p. 69)

---

1 Latin@ is used in this dissertation to refer to Latina/o.
For English learners, the expectations set forth by the common core standards present a complex challenge (SBE, 2017). To meet the rigor demanded of the current expectations, students require optimal learning environments.

Optimal learning environments entail culturally and linguistically responsive environments for English learners (Espinosa, 2005; Giouroukakis & Honigsfeld, 2010; Heineke, Coleman, Ferrell, & Kersemeier, 2012; Lucas, 2010; Lucas & Villegas, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Gay (2010) discussed how the use of instruction that values students’ background experience and skills provides more access to the content being taught. She described culturally responsive teaching as containing the following critical components: establishing an understanding of the diversity of ethnicity and culture in the learning environments, creating a community of learners, establishing communication among diverse populations of students, and presenting instruction with ethnic and cultural diversity. I define culturally responsive practices as a pedagogical approach embracing students’ social and cultural contributions to assure academic success.

Culturally and linguistically responsive environments require that students see themselves in the curriculum. Although some research has indicated that there is no one teaching approach that engages all students, students can relate to the content if they can connect it to their own experiences (Banks et al., 2001; Bui & Fagan, 2013; Howard, 2003; Lucas & Villegas, 2013; Olsen, 2010). Therefore, valuing students’ linguistic and cultural capital, as seen with culturally responsive practices, can benefit student learning. Similar to my definition of culturally responsive practices, I define linguistically responsive practices as a pedagogical approach embracing students’ linguistic contributions to assure

---

2 The term “culturally responsive practices” is used interchangeably with various related terms. Among these, researchers use terms such as “culturally responsible, culturally appropriate, culturally congruent, culturally compatible, culturally relevant, and multicultural” (Irvine & Armento, 2001, p. 41).
academic success. I present how both culturally and linguistically responsive practices and identify perceptions of its effectiveness in accelerating reclassification. Based on these points, I designed the following research questions for this study.

**Research Questions**

This study investigated the following research questions:

1. What do teachers who are trained in the SEAL Model say are their culturally and linguistically responsive practices to address the development of academic English language of their English learners?

2. What are the impacts of culturally and linguistically responsive practices on student academic language (as self-reported by teachers and administrators, obtainable existing assessment measures, and in classroom observations)?

**Overview of Research Design**

This study used a qualitative multi-case logic model design to answer both research questions. The qualitative design allowed for an in-depth analysis of the SEAL model and its impact on English learners (Creswell, 2010). I documented two schools' experiences with SEAL Model implementation and gathered detailed information utilizing various data collection approaches. The case study design allowed me to focus on a contemporary phenomenon that does not have controlled variables, and allowed for triangulation of different data sources (Yin, 2013).

**Site and Population**

The Milagro Unified School District\(^3\) and the Vista School District were selected due to their use of SEAL, demographics, and high-density population of English learners. Milagro Unified School District is currently in the beginning stages of SEAL

---

\(^3\) All names mentioned in this study are pseudonyms to maintain anonymity of individuals and organizations.
implementation in preschool through third grade. The district is located in Southern California in a rural area with an English learner population of 30.1% in transitional kindergarten through 12th grade.

Reed Elementary is currently in full implementation of the SEAL Model, along with all of Milagro’s three additional elementary sites. The first cohort, teachers in transitional kindergarten through first grade, completed their second year using the SEAL model, and the second cohort, teachers in grades two and three, have completed their first year of staff development. The preschool began their first year during the middle of the school year. Reed Elementary School has approximately 273 students with a 53.1% English learner population and receives school-wide Title I funding. This site was chosen due to the high density of English learners as well as the implementation of SEAL at preschool through third grade. Additionally, Milagro is one of two districts piloting SEAL in the fourth and fifth grade.

Vista School District is also in the beginning stages of implementing the SEAL model in transitional kindergarten through third grade. The district is located in Southern California in an urban environment with an English learner population of 57.8% in transitional kindergarten through eighth grade.

Becerra Elementary is also in full implementation of the SEAL Model. The rollout of SEAL in the Vista School District varied by site and grade level. One teacher in this study received all of the module training, whereas the second missed the first set of modules but received all module training following modules one and two. Becerra elementary has 458 students with a 64.8% English learner population and is also a school-wide Title I school.

**Participants**

The participants in this study are from two school sites located in the Milagro Unified School District and the Vista School District. Participating teachers instruct in
preschool through third grade. The purpose of this grade level range is due to the grade levels serviced by SEAL. The SEAL Model is currently a primary model, providing resources for preschool through third grade. Although SEAL is currently implementing a fourth and fifth-grade pilot model (of which Milagro is one of two participating districts), for the purpose of this study, participants were within the range of preschool and third grade. The teachers at Becerra Elementary were chosen under the same criteria and were asked by the administrator to participate in the study, as I will elaborate upon in Chapter Three.

Data Collection Methods

Document Review

A document review of the Milagro Unified School District, the Vista School District, and the components of the SEAL Model revealed information to build context regarding the school and model being studied. I reviewed the district websites, along with the California Department of Education Dataquest database, State Dashboard results, English Language Arts CAASPP reports, and CELDT result database at the site level. My document review also consisted of an analysis of the professional development documentation provided to administrators and teachers during the SEAL training, including curriculum maps and lesson planning documents. These data helped answer the second research question: What are the impacts of culturally and linguistically responsive practices on student academic language (as self-reported by teachers and administrators, obtainable existing assessment measures, and in classroom observations)? The document review provided background knowledge of the strategies introduced to teachers during professional development and the curriculum plans established by the teachers.

Interventions and Observations

Teacher and administrator interviews were conducted to answer both research questions. Both research questions strove to acquire teacher and administrator perspectives
on the impact of culturally and linguistically responsive practices on their students’ academic language. Classroom observations of the teachers interviewed were performed to examine evidence of these culturally and linguistically responsive practices. The observations allowed me to triangulate data from the interviews and cross-check findings.

I interviewed a total of seven teachers from preschool through third grade. I also interviewed three administrators: the principal at Reed Elementary School, the principal at Becerra Elementary, and the Preschool Director overseeing the preschool teachers throughout Milagro Unified School District. Administrator interviews were used to answer both research questions, gathering administrator perspectives on the impact of instructional strategies, based on culturally and linguistically responsive practices. I conducted member checks throughout and following the interview process. As part of the teacher interview protocol, I included an artifact review. Finally, I conducted two observations in each of the classrooms of five teachers interviewed for a total of ten observations.

**Public Engagement**

Upon completion of the study, I informed the school district and educational entities of my findings and recommendations, with the hope of creating an impact within the context of English learners to reduce the numbers of long-term English learners. My dissertation will be a launching point to distribute my work in educational publication journals and presentations at educational conferences, as well as forums that specifically address the needs of English learners.
CHAPTER TWO

A Review of the Literature

Introduction

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2017), 4.8 million students in the United States in 2016 were identified as English learners, representing 9.5% of the total population. Data on English learners demonstrate a greater impact on specific states, including California. The CDE (2018) identifies 22.1% of the state’s students as English learners, representing 1.3 million students in California, with over 330,000 identified as long-term English learners. These statistics demonstrate California’s growing need to find a solution to the large and increasing number of long-term English learners in our state. These numbers represent students who are at risk of dropping out of school and present additional social ramifications, such as poverty, lower parent educational rates, and lack of access to resources (Callahan, 2013; Kim, 2011). These social issues are not universal to all students, since 13.3% of Californian English learner students in 2016 were reclassified under similar socio-demographic conditions. Hence, with effective instruction tailored to the needs of English learners, students can escape prolonged English learner classification along with the societal ramifications that follow. This study explored one model designed to address the increase in long-term English learners.

California’s high number of English learners and high percentage of long-term English learners demonstrate a growing need to find effective means to teach English as a second language. In this literature review, I begin with a discussion of legislation and policy, along with funding implications that shape the education of English learners. Next, I discuss historical and contemporary approaches to teaching English learners to depict what has and has not been effective in teaching these learners. I then turn to factors that affect English learners through the lens of Critical Race Theory (CRT), which underpinned
this study. Finally, I discuss how culturally and linguistically responsive practices, with its foundation in CRT, can reduce the growing number of long-term English language learners. The SEAL model appears a promising response to the problem of long-term English learners (Olsen, 2010) and incorporates instructional approaches based on linguistic and cultural responsiveness. I begin this literature review by exploring legislation and policies that affect the education of English learners.

The Law and English Learners

State and federal laws regarding the education of English learners have fluctuated in their support of native languages. As seen with race-related education legislation, such as Brown v. Board of Education (1954), students have a history of being deprived of access to equivalent educational experiences (Biegel, Kim, & Welner, 2012). Legal proceedings, such as Meyer v. Nebraska (1923), devalued the use of foreign languages in schools, therefore undercutting the value of English learners’ native language. However, the political landscape influenced legislation that created shifts regarding the right to access education. Figure 1 indicates the influential legislation affecting English learners as discussed in this section.

Figure 1. Timeline of laws and legislation affecting English learners.
**Right to Access Education**

The landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 required that schools and districts address the needs of all students regardless of race, color, or national origin. Specifically, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act banned discrimination based on race, color, and national origin specifically for organizations receiving federal funding. Although specific to employees, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act dictated that employers could not discriminate based on sex, race, color, national origin, or religion (Biegel et al., 2016). Additionally, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) served as an influential contributor to the war on poverty (Salomne, 2012). Title I of ESEA was intended to link federal funding for remediation of students with academic difficulties and low socio-economic status. To receive Title I funding, the institutions receiving funds must abide by the Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which was intended to prevent funding discrimination based on race, color or national origin.

The *Lau v. Nichols* Supreme Court ruling, also based on Title VI, sought to end discriminatory and exclusionary practices within the education of racial minority and language groups. In this case ruling, Chinese-speaking students sued the San Francisco Unified School District for failing to provide equal opportunity to students, violating the Fourteenth Amendment (Asturias, 2012; Biegel et al., 2012). The ruling also referenced the 1974 U.S. Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA), which passed in the weeks following *Lau v. Nichols*. The EEOA obligated school districts to provide *appropriate action* for students possessing language concerns who were participating in federally funded educational programs and activities. These legal decisions influenced bilingual education and the ways in which English learners’ needs could be met. However, the political ramifications of bilingual education continued.
**Bilingual Education Act**

During the late 1960s, educators and policymakers grew concerned about the academic and social challenges faced by Spanish-speaking children in the United States (Salomne, 2012). The effects were reflected in high school dropout rates, academic achievement results, and social self-perception of Latin@s, specifically Mexican-Americans. As a result, a highly influential initiative, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 (BEA), was put into place. The act was inspired by the highly successful bilingual education programs for Cuban immigrant students in Florida and French-English bilingual programs in Canada. Funds were allocated to approaches addressing the needs of English learners. No other government initiative equaled its impact. However, the act had political implications. Following its inception, the BEA was reauthorized several times, weakened by anti-bilingual education legislation, until it disappeared with the reauthorization of the ESEA. The Chacon-Mascone Bilingual-Bicultural Act of 1976 required bilingual education in public schools in California. This act grew from the BEA, named Title VII of the ESEA. The BEA sought to serve English learners with innovative programs. However, the original legislation did not set clear criteria and was minimally funded with the intent to make the legislation easier to pass and solidify bilingual programs throughout the nation (Biegel et al., 2012).

As the political environment changed, so did the nation’s stance on bilingual education. *Castañeda v. Pickard* (1981) highlighted segregation practices with English learners. Several Mexican-American families challenged a Texas school district for denying equal access to educational opportunities. The case was ultimately decided in favor of the plaintiffs creating a definition for appropriate action. *Castañeda* established a minimal three-part test: (a) if the program was based on theory with educational stability, (b) the school had to be able to take the theory and create action, and (c) the school had practices in
place to monitor the programs and adjust according to the results. The Castañeda test moved policy from equal access to minimal requirements, therefore minimizing the accountability of school districts (Biegel et al., 2012).

The issue of accountability continued to be a major theme in the proceedings of *Flores v. Arizona* (1992). The family of Miriam Flores, a fourth grader, brought a case against the Nogales School District and the state of Arizona, on the basis that she was not provided an educational opportunity under EEOA (Biegel et al., 2012). The case was prolonged after the district refused to fund an English learner program. However, the court began to fine the state $500,000 a day for their refusal. After receiving this order, Arizona took the case to the Supreme Court. Although the court decided 5 to 4 against Flores, the decision did authorize a requirement for districts to uphold the quality of education under EEOA (Salomne, 2012).

The case of *Flores v. Huppenthal* (2015) further challenged a 2010 court trial case, questioning the practices of the Arizona English Language Learner Task Force. Three issues were raised: (a) whether a 54-hour program determined by the district failed to address what students missed during instruction, (b) whether the use of grouping permitted segregation according to language proficiency, and (c) whether the Flores case brought relief throughout Arizona. The court ruled to uphold the district court decision, leaving much room for interpreting appropriate action and further legitimizing the standards for the teaching of English learners. These court rulings, related to the instruction of English learners, gave specific direction to education and impacted the policies enacted at the state and national level (Biegel et al., 2012).

**State Propositions and English Learner Instruction**

Immigration was one such area of policy that influenced English language instruction. In 1984, California voters passed Proposition 187, which could have denied
undocumented immigrant children basic benefits, such as the right to a public education. However, as ruled in *Plyer v. Doe* (1982), minors within the kindergarten through 12 system are entitled to a free education and cannot be penalized when it was not their decision to immigrate to the United States. Although undocumented students were spared the impact of Proposition 187, California saw a shift in the implementation of bilingual education (Biegel et al., 2012).

Proposition 227 had a significant impact on the decline of bilingual education. The proposition eliminated the option for bilingual instruction for students under the age of 10. Arizona launched a similar proposition through Proposition 203. These propositions gave rise to the increase of Structured English Immersion, which immersed students in English-only instruction (Biegel et al., 2012; Moran, 2010).

Thus far, the ban on bilingual education has not yielded improvement in language proficiency or even academic growth. However, there has been an increase in the number of English learners in special education (Biegel et al., 2012). Robert Lara wrote Senate Bill 1174, which later became Proposition 58, to reconsider the ban on bilingual education. Californians voted to pass Proposition 58 during the November 2016 ballot. This legislation supports viewing students' primary language as an advantage, rather than a hindrance, encouraging bilingualism for economic and social advantage (Gollnick, 1995).

Following the passage of Proposition 58, the California State Board of Education adopted the English Learner (EL) Roadmap, an educational policy for English learners, to replace the mandates imposed by Proposition 227. The EL Roadmap, as the name implies, serves as a roadmap for addressing the education of English learners. It holds four key principles: (a) assets-oriented and needs-responsive schools, (b) intellectual quality of instruction and meaningful access, (c) systems conditions that support effectiveness, and (d) alignment and articulation within and across systems. The new policy introduces
several shifts in educating English learners, including valuing multilingualism, recognizing early childhood education as critical to our educational systems, and a differentiated approach to respond to English learners’ needs. As with legal ramifications, policy plays a significant role in the education of English learners, as we see with the funding of schools (Olsen & Maxwell-Jolly, 2018).

Funding for English Learners

Funding for our nation’s schools has been a critical element within school reform movements. The issue of funding has a great impact on schools with large numbers of minority students, English learners, and students living in poverty. Funding, such as Title I federal funding and most recently the Local Control Federal Funding Formula (LCFF), directly links dollars to English learners and students of low socio-economic status. Policymakers have engaged in reform measures that redirected the funding of schools to address the achievement of students in certain subgroups, addressing race and economic status (Darling-Hammond & Plank, 2015; Putnam, 2015).

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was a political reform for English learners and students of low socio-economic status. NCLB aspired to bring at-risk students to academic proficiency in language arts and mathematics. Emphasis was placed on the assessment and accountability measures to address the performance of students from targeted subgroups (i.e., English learners, students with disabilities, etc.) and identify schools that were failing this population of students (Logan, Minca, & Adar, 2012). Historically, funding for K-12 schools was locally controlled. Up to the 1980s, local property taxes were a major funding source for schools (Kirst, 2010). However, NCLB shifted local control to federal oversight, translating to a greater role of funding at the federal level. This was significant depending on school populations, since federal funding, such as Title I funding, provided a significant
increase of funds in comparison to local funding distributions. However, in order to receive Title I funding, schools had to meet requirements and respond to accountability measures.

NCLB possessed various accountability requirements that sought to address the achievement gap, one being the annual measurable objectives. Schools were obligated to assure that all students were being taught by *highly qualified* teachers (Kirst, 2010). The shift in focus also impacted funding, limiting expenditures based on local property taxes and changed school funding to enhance an equitable resource allocation among schools.

Sociologists argue that the impact of the type of reform laid out by NCLB does not address the social issues that significantly influence the achievement of minority and poverty students (Condron, 2009). Promises of increasing the number of proficient students were not enough. Sanctions were placed on schools failing to meet the intended goals. NCLB assumed that students would succeed if they attended schools that were successful. Thus, legislation was put in place to identify *failing schools* and close these schools following a series of sanctions (Logan et al., 2012). Yet, closing schools had only a marginal impact and new approaches became necessary.

Darling-Hammond and Plank (2015) described the response to NCLB; it took the form of the LCFF, which sought to link resources for funding schools to the performance of Local Education Agencies (LEAs). LEAs are required to use a funding formula that specifically addresses students’ needs, with greater allocation of funding for students impacted negatively by the achievement gap. Schools receive supplemental funding for *unduplicated students*. This would include an unduplicated count of students that are (a) of low-socioeconomic status, (b) English language learners, or (c) foster students. Consequently, to receive these funds, LEAs are accountable for measuring their performance based on eight state priorities (CDE, 2018), which indicate the school’s
performance as well as overarching themes that point to the quality of education. The goals and outcomes are written into a Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP).

In December 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was authorized to replace NCLB and called for states to design accountability systems in schools (Darling-Hammond & Plank, 2015). ESSA takes multiple measures into account, with English learners identified as a significant subgroup being monitored. The accountability measures target services and funding for English learners, monitoring English language progress and reclassification rates. In California, the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) was developed to replace the CELDT and assess the newly adopted ELD standards (CDE, 2018).

The LCAP intended to assure that funding is specifically allocated to the unduplicated populations. As discussed in the *Flores v. Arizona* case, the Supreme Court could not utilize the EEOA to require the LCAP funding to address the needs of English learners. This new funding formula would require LEAs to structure programs to specifically address the needs of English language learners. Court decisions and policies have historically served as catalysts for political movements and theory (Kubota & Lin, 2009). Civil rights legislation and policy drove theories that impact the field of education. From the early ethnic studies movement arose multicultural education and eventually culturally responsive practices (Banks, 1995).

**Theoretical Framework**

Culturally responsive practices in education have a foundation in CRT and Multicultural Education. CRT takes a socio-cultural perspective that acknowledges the counter stories of those that have been historically oppressed (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Yosso, 2005). CRT provides a lens that allows researchers, educational leaders, and educators to see the implications of race, language, gender, and social status and apply this perspective
to educational contexts (Bernal, 2002; Garcia Martinez, 2016). Multicultural Education, an offshoot of CRT, directly serves to create curriculum based on these theoretical frameworks (Banks, 2004; Banks et al., 2001; Nieto, 1992). CRT addresses political and race issues that can be applied to the topic of long-term language learners. The lack of reclassification of English learners can be studied through CRT, looking at racial and social implications that contribute to the increase of long-term English learners. Hence, it is essential to understand the history and critical elements of CRT and to understand the impact on English learners.

**Critical Race Theory**

CRT originated from the work of Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman, who expressed concern regarding the slow reform in addressing race in the United States (Ladson-Billings, 1998). Originally, CRT derived from critical legal studies: a leftist movement within the field of law that articulated the reality of an oppressive establishment in the United States. However, CRT provided a forum to allow for an alternative voice: storytelling to give narratives of untold realities for people of color. Although CRT originated in the legal sphere, it spread quickly into the social science arena and found a place in educational leadership (Lopez, 2003). CRT frames students’ educational experiences and how they are impacted by historical and current contexts (Chapman, 2013) that contribute to the discriminatory practices present in education culturally (Solorzano & Ornelas, 2004).

To address the discriminatory approaches embedded in education, Ladson-Billings (1998) discussed the use of CRT, synthesizing curriculum, instruction, assessment, school funding, and desegregation to demonstrate areas in which CRT and education intersect. Ladson-Billings’ analysis of curriculum and instruction presents relevant perspectives on the educational challenges linked with long-term English learners. In the context of curriculum, a politically muted perspective presents an image of the universal immigrant,
leaving room for African American, Indigenous peoples, and Latin@s to feel a sense of failure for not rising to the level that other immigrant groups have been able to achieve. CRT also argues that existing instructional strategies take a deficit perspective with African Americans in that these students lack a culture and come from a place of poverty, and are therefore predisposed to failure in academics (Howard & Terry, 2011). This perspective correlates with teaching English learners, where instructional strategies are proposed to compensate for the deficiency of language proficiency.

**Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching**

Culturally responsive teaching is an approach that brings awareness to racially, culturally, ethnically, and linguistically diverse students (Villegas & Lucas, 2007). Many terms used interchangeably to describe the concept of culturally responsive teaching, including *culturally compatible, culturally congruent, and culturally relevant* (Beyond Brown: Pursuing the Promise, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 1992). In addition to the multitude of terms, there is a variety of definitions for culturally responsive practices, as was discussed briefly in Chapter One.

**Roots of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Practices**

Although there is no one teaching approach that engages all students, students can relate to the content if they can connect it to their own experiences (Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 1995). Wlodkowski and Ginsberg (1995) established a motivational framework for culturally responsive teaching with four conditions: (a) establishing inclusion, (b) developing attitude, (c) enhancing meaning, and (d) engendering competence.

**Multicultural Education**

Banks (2004) presented a an alternative to perspective to Wlodkowski and Ginsberg (1995), articulating four levels to Multicultural Curriculum Reform:
Level 1: The Contributions Approach—isolated cultural components are discussed (i.e., heroes, traditions, foods, etc.);

Level 2: The Additive Approach—curricular structures have cultural content, lessons, or units injected;

Level 3—The Transformative Approach—the curricular structure is changed to see the issues presented through the lens of different cultural groups;

Level 4: The Action Approach—students have presented choices in which they must act on important individual, societal, and political issues.

Although Banks described Multicultural Education, he articulated the gradient for multicultural approaches in education, whereas Wlodkowski and Ginsberg (1995) set specific criteria for culturally responsive teaching. However, both emphasize the importance of integrating culture into education for deeper understanding.

Multicultural Education grew from the Ethnic Studies movement, which began in the 1960s and 1970s based on the work of G. W. Williams, Wesley, Woodson, and DuBois (Banks, 1995). This movement called for desegregation in schools. Although not linked with the Ethnic Studies movement, the Intergroup Education movement emerged as the educational approach to the racial and cultural tension of the time. The Intergroup Education movement also possessed many of the goals seen in contemporary Multicultural Education approaches. From Multicultural Education also emerged scholars representing specific ethnic groups: Carlos Cortes (Mexican American), Jack Forbes (American Indian), Sonia Nieto (Puerto Rican), and Derald Sue (Asian American).

**Implications of Multicultural Education**

Although Multicultural Education sought to incorporate theoretical practices from emerging ethnic scholars, the practice did not go without criticism. Multicultural Education
sought to incorporate cultural adjustments to curriculum, teaching materials, and learning styles that took students’ culture into consideration. However, implementing Multicultural Education meant recasting the traditional curriculum (Wilhelm, 1998). The question became whether the goal of Multicultural Education was to create an acceptance of our society or to face the unfair treatment of minority groups and accept the portrayal of our society as racist and unequal.

A second criticism associated with Multicultural Education is the negative portrayals (as seen with slavery and poverty) that perpetuate the acceptance of stereotypes. Avoidance of stereotypes proves to be a challenge. It is easier to generalize, rather than study a group with these general perceptions. Nieto (1992) made use of case studies to address the issue of generalizations and stereotypes. She described the use of typical and atypical case studies of a ethnic, racial, or linguistic group in order to challenge or even shatter stereotypes.

Gloria Ladson-Billings, a contributing author on CRT, presented an additional criticism of standard approaches to curriculum. During a personal conversation following an Administrative Leadership Symposium at the California Association of Bilingual Educators Conference, I asked Dr. Ladson-Billings to explain why her research stems from culturally relevant teaching (the term she uses) and not Multicultural Education (G. Ladson-Billings, personal communication, March 31, 2017). She cautioned that Multicultural Education must move beyond altering the curriculum and additionally incorporate the what, how, and why of the instruction. Namely, culturally relevant teaching must meet students’ academic needs, drawing students towards academic excellence (Ladson-Billings, 1995). She stressed that teachers need to affirm the students’ cultural contributions while utilizing effective educational pedagogy. These apprehensions served as a catalyst to conceptualize culturally responsive teaching.
Culturally Responsive Practices: A Response

Cultural responsive pedagogy is identified as an ideology that incorporates politics, culture, and ethics. It revolves around students, their families, their communities, and the ways in which they are taught, with a fierce commitment to assuring that they are successful academically (Howard & Terry, 2011). It incorporates a framework that considers the qualities that students bring to schools, impacting their socio-emotional, cultural, and physiological wellbeing.

For the purposes of this study, I adopted the final definition, describing culturally responsive practices as a pedagogical approach embracing students’ social and cultural contributions to assure academic success. I chose this definition because it embraces the cultural capital that students bring to their educational setting but also focuses on the goal of academic achievement.

The Development of Culturally Responsive Practices: A Historical Perspective

An important concept of culturally responsive teaching is no longer seeing students of color in a deficit thinking model (Howard, 2003; Villegas & Lucas, 2007); rather, educators are called to look at underrepresented students in a more positive perspective (Gay, 2013). Dunn (as cited in Ladson-Billings, 1989) sought to study students of color and their varying learning styles due to their cultural differences. This perspective could be linked to the conclusion that students of color experienced academic failures due to cultural reasons. Culturally responsive practices aim to eliminate deficit-model approaches and reduce the achievement gap (Howard & Terry, 2011), encouraging students to become agents of change (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

It is important to note that research indicates considerable opposition to culturally responsive practices (Gay, 2013). Culturally responsive practices call for highlighting the differences in cultures and utilizing them in curriculum and instruction. One criticism is
that highlighting different cultures may be a form of racism (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Additionally, teachers may feel they are not competent to address cultural discussions in their classrooms and therefore may only address issues they feel are safe. The lack of culturally responsive materials may also be a hindrance to incorporating culturally responsive practices; textbooks often present an uneven distribution of ethnic groups. In addition to culturally responsive approaches, teachers must also encourage academic rigor and excellence (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Despite these concerns, culturally responsive practices have a place in education. Educating students with culturally and linguistically responsive practices gives teachers a curricular approach that keeps the students’ culture in mind, making content accessible and of personal interest to students (Lucas, 2010: Lucas et al., 2008).

**Linguistically Responsive Practices**

As with culturally responsive practices, linguistically responsive pedagogy also focuses on academic achievement with a focus on the needs of English learners (Giouroukakis & Honigsfeld, 2010; Lucas & Villegas, 2013). Lucas, Villegas, and Freedson-Gonzalez (2008) identified three critical types of pedagogical expertise that serve as defining features for linguistically responsive teaching: (a) gathering the language and academic background of English learners, (b) understanding the language tasks expected of students, and (c) providing scaffolds4 for English learners. I define linguistically responsive teaching as a foundational understanding of the linguistic needs of students and adapting practices to see that students achieve academic success. Lucas and Villegas (2011) highlighted the term *sociolinguistic consciousness*, which they define as conceptualizing the

---

4 Lucas et al. (2008) defined scaffolds as, “the instructional adaptations used to make academic content understandable to ELLs” (p.366).
connectedness of language, culture, and identity, as well as understanding that language use and language education have sociopolitical dimensions.

**The Relationship between Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Practices**

Linguistically responsive practices mirror culturally responsive practices to a certain degree, as seen in the sociopolitical themes and in the goal to achieve academic success with underrepresented student populations. Nonetheless, there are distinct variances among such practices (Lucas, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). To illustrate this point, I present Figure 2, a continuum describing the relationship between culturally and linguistically responsive practices.

*Figure 2. Continuum of culturally and linguistically responsive practices.*

In the figure, the relationship between cultural responsiveness and linguistic responsiveness is portrayed on a spectrum. At their core, culturally responsive practices value culture; they also incorporate a value of language. At the point of valuing language, linguistically responsive practices intersect and continue with a precise focus on language learning. Scaffolding and linguistically responsive strategies are introduced to impact academic English language, which will be elaborated upon further in this chapter. To actualize theories of cultural and linguistic responsiveness, teachers must receive adequate
training and support to implement culturally and linguistically responsive strategies effectively.

**Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teacher Preparation and Professional Development**

Teacher training is critical in the implementation academically rigorous instruction, which entails preparing teachers to think critically about the content they provide for their students (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2007). Teachers need training on how to understand their students’ cultural contributions and ways in which they can engage in conversations about diversity (Gay, 2002; Howard & del Rosario, 2000). Creating teacher preparation programs that encourage culturally responsive teaching is a critical component of ensuring that educators will incorporate a culturally competent approach; this means helping students come to the realization that content is influenced by factors such as race/ethnicity, social class, and language (Banks et al., 2001; Beyond Brown: Pursuing the Promise, 2004; Howard, 2003, Lucas & Villegas, 2013; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). An important element of building teacher capacity is the implementation of professional development at multiple layers. It is essential that school leaders invest in professional development that focuses on culturally and linguistically responsive practices to assure that they are implemented correctly (Banks et al., 2001; Lucas & Villegas, 2013).

Lucas and Villegas (2010) proposed professional development for pre-service teachers based on the Feiman-Nemser (2001) framework highlighting language-related issues in culturally responsive teacher preparation. The framework proposes three orientations of linguistically responsive teachers: (a) sociolinguistic consciousness, (b) valuing linguistic diversity and (c) the inclination to advocate for English language learners. Additionally, the Feiman-Nemser model outlines four pieces of foundational
pedagogical knowledge and skills: (a) possessing strategies to learn about linguistic and academic backgrounds of English learners and their native language, (b) knowledge and execution of key principles in second language learning, (c) identification of the language required for the classroom, and (d) strategies to scaffold English learner instruction. With this process, teachers in training gain sociolinguistic consciousness and can impart this knowledge in their professional practice as linguistically responsive educators. Another important element in this process is reflection built into teachers’ learning processes.

Howard (2003) discussed the importance of teacher reflection in teacher preparation programs to build pedagogical practices with social and cultural considerations. As an educator in teacher education programs, Howard identified reflective practices he and his colleagues utilize to reflect on their own identities and the relevance to their teaching of diverse student populations. Amongst these practices, pre-service teachers attend a course titled *Identity and Teaching*, where they reflect on critical conversations that question their own identity. Teachers participate in activities and read texts based on race, ethnic, class, and gender issues. Instructors of the course attend a 3-day workshop where they engage in the same conversations in which they will ask their students to engage. These critical reflective practices are key to the understanding of culturally relevant pedagogy, helping educators comprehend the importance of asking critical questions and understanding their students’ perspectives. From this programming, Howard surmised that preservice teachers struggle when grappling with the content, articulating their discomfort talking about race, which is traditionally seen as taboo. Therefore, teachers must process their personal beliefs and ideologies about race identity in preparation for their practices with their students. Culturally responsive practices with teachers have a direct impact on the practices that occur with students. Next, I present seminal research that demonstrates how culturally responsive practices can affect students’ academic achievement.
Research on Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Practices

Ladson-Billings (2009) studied teachers implementing culturally responsive practices with a high capacity in classroom behavior management. These teachers had an increase in student attendance and a track record of having students with strong academic performance in standardized assessments. Her book, *the Dreamkeepers*, provided research on the impact of what she referred to as *culturally relevant teaching*. In her research, Ladson Billings conducted an ethnographic study consisting of interviews and classroom observations to observe culturally relevant practices with African American students. Eight teachers were identified by administrators and parents. This study took place over a 2-year period, with classroom visits at least once a week, along with interviews. From this research, Ladson-Billings observed that culturally relevant teachers: (a) perceive knowledge with a critical lens, (b) hold passion with new knowledge, (c) assist students with essential skills, and (d) perceive student excellence as a balance of valuing the students’ diversity and their individual needs, not settling for mediocrity.

Howard and Terry (2011) researched the impact of culturally responsive practices to increase academic rigor in a Southern California High School. The study was a partnership between the UCLA Sunnyside GEAR UP (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs) and the UCLA Graduate School of Education and Informational Studies department. During the last year of the study, in 2006-2007, the high school served about 2,100 students with a demographic makeup of 48% Latin@, 50% African American, and 2% White, Pacific Islander, Filipino and/or Asian. In this Title I school, 24.6% of the population were English language learners, and the program served 450 students. The program provided high school students with afterschool services, college readiness supports, and test preparation. The tutors were selected from working-class backgrounds, many having experienced trials in their own lives that gave insight into the challenges the
high school students encountered. Tutors worked in the students’ classrooms, assisting with instruction and learning the content so they could help the students while making the material relevant to their lives. University faculty also provided professional development opportunities surrounding socio-emotional elements in human development and culturally responsive teaching.

As a result, the high school experienced growth in various academic areas: an 85% passing rate on the California High School Exit Exam, the largest graduating class with a 25% increase from the previous year, and a doubling of the number of African American students accepted to 4-year colleges (Howard & Terry, 2011). This research emphasized three areas that need to be considered in future efforts within culturally responsive practices: (a) rigor, (b) the importance of relevance, and (c) drawing from effective models. These effective models inform how culturally responsive practices can be implemented in classrooms to improve the academic achievement of all students.

Giouroukakis and Honigsfeld (2010) also studied culturally responsive practices at the high school level. The study explored the culturally and linguistically responsive practices used with English learners to prepare them for high-stakes testing. The research design was qualitative, consisting of observations, interviews, an open-ended online survey, and a document analysis. The study researched various practices that could be used with English learners to teach to the test. Findings indicated ways in which teachers can teach English learners to prepare for testing yet still manage to integrate culturally and linguistically responsive practices. In this study, I explored ways in which SEAL incorporates culturally and linguistically responsive practices to address academic English language.
**Academic English Language**

Academic English is defined by the forms and functions of English in educational settings (Bailey, 2012). Academic English consists of formal language that even English proficient students may not yet know. The origins of academic English take root in Cummins’s (2008) distinction of Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). BICS are identified as context-embedded language that utilizes the context to acquire meaning, whereas CALP is decontextualized language, which relies on the understanding of language to gain meaning.

**Discussion on the Debate of Academic English Language**

The definition and conceptualization of academic English language are contested in the educational field. Contemporary research on academic English questions Cummins’s (2008) theories in terms of cognitive demands, yet advocates for the importance of oral language and differentiates between formal and informal language (Bunch, 2006). In addition, Cummins’s theories are criticized for ignoring sociopolitical context. English learners need to have social, cultural, and identity considerations to access the academic language being taught (Bunch et al., 2014; Turkan & Celik, 2007). Valdés (2001) argued that the lack of a universal definition of academic language within academia proves problematic and could devalue the language that English learners bring. Rather, language must be taught in context, engaging theory and practice (Bunch, Walqui, & Pearson, 2014; Valdés, 2001; Van Lier, 2010). Additionally, conversational language can be engaged to facilitate the acquisition of academic English language.

**Defining Academic English Language**

For the purposes of this study, I defined academic English language and assigned descriptors to answer my research questions. The three descriptors are (a) use of precise language and elaborate vocabulary at a word level, sentence level, and discourse level
(Bailey, 2012); (b) proper grammatical forms are used, with the ability to identify linguistic features (Bailey, 2012; Turkan, Oliveira, Lee, & Phelps, 2014); and (c) the ability to fully provide an explanatory nature of discourse such as a sequencing of a story or explaining of a scientific process. My overall definition of academic English language is defined as the forms and functions of English in educational settings (Bailey, 2012).

Proficient speakers of academic English language use precise language and elaborate vocabulary at a word level, sentence level, and discourse level (Bailey, 2012). Michaels et al. (2008) discussed the use of Accountable Talk to draw precise language through deliberate questioning and an emphasis on the forms and norms of oral discourse. Students are held accountable to the standards of reasoning, to the learning community, and to knowledge. Content-based language is important to express academic processes (Schleppegrell, Achugar, & Oteíza, 2004; Zwiers, 2007). In addition to content vocabulary, English learners need to acquire academic words to express themselves within discourse on given content and across content areas (Bailey, 2004).

Grammatical forms make use of different registers, where various lexical and grammatical options are utilized for language tasks in educational settings (Schleppegrell, 2001; Turkan et al., 2014). Zwiers (2006) emphasized the importance of scaffolding as English learners acquire the content language, thus providing teacher modeling and structures to support language acquisition. Nonetheless, grammatical forms cannot be taught in isolation (Schleppegrell et al., 2004). A focus on language itself is critical to allow for the ability to use grammatical forms for language functions.

The third descriptor for academic English language is the ability to provide a full explanatory nature of discourse of language (Bailey, 2012). Academic English requires that the speaker engages in communicative acts, with explanations in academic contexts (i.e., cause/effect, contrast, counterfactuals, and hypotheticals: Bailey, 2017; Turkan et al., 2014).
Academic language may be critical to communicating in school settings, however, there is an even more important connection with using the language to communicate complex and abstract concepts (Zwiers, 2007). English learners require instruction on language functions and opportunities to use the academic language deriving from this teaching (Bailey, 2004). Schleppegrell (2013) discussed the role of metalanguage, “the language of language” (p. 156), in which students become conscious of language and begin to see patterns, using context to build their knowledge of language systems.

Research on academic English language illuminates the importance of understanding the complexities of language learning. Teachers require a solid knowledge base in both language and content. Conversely, teacher training falls short (Bailey, 2017; Bunch, 2006; Turkan et al., 2014). Teachers require strategies to assure that pedagogical language is taught. Academic language cannot be taught in separate classes; rather, language must be taught in context (Bunch, 2013).

In addition to teacher development, assessment is a key component of understanding what students need to learn to acquire academic English language. Assessments serve as a tool to measure language development (Bailey, 2017; Bailey & Butler, 2004; Bailey & Heritage, 2008, 2014). Progressions are another valuable tool that can provide information to teachers on next steps for language learning (Bailey, 2017; Bailey & Heritage, 2014).

Academic English language delves into the complexities of language learning; however, this study explored cultural implications involved in learning multiple languages. Cook (1992) coined the term multicompetence, signifying the knowledge of more than one language inhabited in one mind or in one community or the whole mind, lending to the concept that multilingualism is more than knowing more than one language; rather, it establishes an understanding that there are cultural implications associated with knowing
more than one language. Cook’s concept demonstrates foundational theories for linguistically responsive practices, a major framework for this study.

This study explored the impact of both linguistically and culturally responsive practices. To best understand the definition of culturally and linguistically responsive practices, it is critical to understand the relationship between these practices and academic English language. In Figure 2, I present a visual representation of the spectrum between culturally and linguistically responsive practices. With the initial explanation of Figure 2, I explain that culturally responsive practices serve as a bridge to linguistically responsive practices, activated with the value of language. I provide descriptors for linguistically responsive practices: (a) sociolinguistic consciousness (Lucas et al., 2008), (b) valuing linguistic diversity, (c) the inclination to advocate for English language learners, (d) acquiring the language and academic background of English learners, (e) understanding the language tasks expected of students, and (f) providing scaffolds for English learners. Through linguistically responsive practices, students can incorporate linguistic and cultural assets to learn academic English language.

**Sobrato Early Academic Language PreK-3 Model**

As suggested by Howard and Terry (2011), a critical future practice for culturally responsive pedagogy and curriculum is the study of models, determining their effectiveness in serving as successful prototypes. The SEAL approach is a recent model stemming from research analyzing the societal impact of long-term English learners (Olsen, 2010). The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2017) presented a section on the SEAL Model that discusses their incorporation of science in language learning. My own experience with SEAL at the school site motivated this study to review SEAL.

SEAL teacher preparation documentation indicates that the model is based on three foundations: (a) the prevention of the growth of long-term English learners, (b) enacting the
research on effective English learner practices, and (c) seizing the opportunity and addressing the demands of the Common Core Standards. The model was conceptualized because of the growing number of long-term English learners and the social ramifications of the rise (The Sobrato Family Foundation, n.d.). As the Sobrato Family Foundation (n.d.) writes:

The vast majority of English learners (four out of five) who enter U.S. Schools are Spanish speakers. These children are eight times more likely to drop out of school than their non-Hispanic, Native English speaking peers. In California, close to half of the English learners who enroll in kindergarten are likely to become “Long-term English Learners” who accrue irreparable academic gaps as they move school, and never to develop the levels of English proficiency necessary for academic success. (p. 2)

The model began with three elementary schools and 13 preschools in Redwood City School District and the San Jose Unified School District in 2008. Students in these classrooms either received English instruction or participated in a dual language immersion program in English and Spanish. The students enrolled in these schools were 95% minority students, 90% Latin@, and 70% English learners. The initial program served as a pilot that has expanded to 6 school districts throughout California. The program underwent a longitudinal evaluation by a national expert in dual-language education, Dr. Kathryn Lindholm-Leary. The data were based on 422 students who have received all their instruction in SEAL classrooms and 309 students who received part of their schooling in these settings.

The SEAL Model is an approach rooted in culturally and linguistically responsive practices. Its methodological approach values students’ cultural capital, home language, and parent involvement, as seen through parent SEAL training and the end-of-unit celebrations and display of content referred to as Gallery Walks. The teacher trainings are broken up into modules (see Appendix C for a description of Modules). Although each module places an emphasis on valuing student culture and diversity, the fourth module
includes the *World in the Classroom*. In this module, teachers receive training on how to make use of a variety of strategies meant to encourage students to talk about their lives and bring their experiences into classroom interactions. Teachers build units to help students find the relevance of their learning with the world, emphasizing diversity. Additionally, the model utilizes knowledge of English learners and uses strategies and scaffolds, in addition to valuing the students’ primary knowledge.

Although SEAL does not directly label these practices as culturally responsive teaching, they do provide literature to the teachers on Anti-Bias Education during the World in the Classroom Module. The following are the four goals of Anti-Bias Education as identified by SEAL:

1. Each child will demonstrate self-awareness, confidence, family pride, and positive social identities.
2. Each child will express comfort and joy with human diversity, accurate language for human differences; and deep, caring human connections.
3. Each child will increasingly recognize unfairness, have language to describe unfairness, and understand that fairness hurts.
4. Each child will demonstrate empowerment and the skills to act, with others or alone, against prejudice and/or discriminatory actions. (The Sobrato Family Foundation, n.d., p. 5)

Culturally responsive practices are most helpfully defined as a pedagogical approach embracing students’ social, linguistic, and cultural contributions to assure academic success. The goals of Anti-Bias Education value students’ social status, language, and culture.

---

5 See Appendix D for graphic describing foundational elements of the World in the Classroom Module.
In addition to the research presented on Anti-Bias Education, the SEAL model embeds culturally relevant research within its theoretical framework (Valdés, 1996). SEAL administrators and facilitators intentionally avoid labels and strategically place the World in the Classroom Module during the second year of implementation (A. Horowitz, personal communication, August 4, 2017). This choice allows teachers to focus on academic language and experience student progress prior to being exposed to the cultural implications presented in the module. A. Horowitz (personal communication, August 4, 2017) explained that this protocol allowed teachers to see the impact of linguistically responsive practices prior to addressing cultural issues. SEAL also emphasizes the implementation of dual immersion programs to help English learners attain English utilizing primary support. According to a SEAL document review, the implementation of a dual immersion model is a requirement for instituting SEAL preschools. Several SEAL districts also use SEAL in bilingual classrooms, although this model was not a focus of the current study.

**SEAL Instructional Model**

The SEAL Instructional Model has foundations in linguistic and brain research, as well as a combination of effective practices designed for English learners (see Figure 3). Figure 3 describes the SEAL strategies incorporated in the SEAL Instructional Model, with visuals indicating the level of influence of each strategy base. The SEAL Instructional Model borrows from these strategies to create a hybrid approach to teaching English learners,

---

6 Research list acquired from an email correspondence with SEAL Executive Director, Anya Horowitz on July 19, 2017.
Guided Language Acquisition Design (Project GLAD®). Project GLAD® is a predominant, award-winning model intended to focus on English language learning (Be GLAD LLC, 2018). It was developed by Marcia Brechtel and Linnea Haley and field-tested by the United States Department of Education for 9 years. As indicated in the SEAL Instructional Model (see Figure 3), Project GLAD® is the model of greatest influence on SEAL. The SEAL Model adopted and modified various Project GLAD® strategies including the Draw and Label (Pictorial Input Chart), the Categorical Matrix (Process Grid), Cooperative Strip Paragraph, Vocabulary in Context Chart (Cognitive Content Dictionary), Narrative Input Chart, Sentence Patterning Chart, and Inquiry Chart. Many of these strategies further discussed in Chapter Four, presenting a close relevance to the acquisition of academic English language.

Kagan Strategies. Kagan Strategies are not as catered to English learning although these strategies assist in practicing English discourse and claim that their strategies are effective with language acquisition. The goal of Kagan strategies is to make learning more engaging for students (Kagan, 2018). Kagan focuses on collaborative learning and student-to-student discourse. Time-Pair-Share is among the primary Kagan Strategies, which could
be compared to Think-Pair-Share in the SEAL Model, a strategy observed in nine of 10 observations in this study. As I will discuss in Chapter Four, Think-Pair-Share is a strategy that allows students to practice oral academic English language, if done with intentional questioning techniques. Kagan strategies also promote collaborative opportunities to activate student learning, also present in SEAL.

**Anti-Bias Curriculum.** Based upon Anti-Bias Curriculum informational materials and a document review of SEAL materials, the World in the Classroom Module has many foundational elements in Anti-Bias Curriculum. SEAL documents describe the World in the Classroom with the concept of mirrors and windows. Mirrors symbolize how students see themselves and windows are a view of the outside world. The concept of mirrors is present in Anti-Bias Curriculum (Teaching for Change, 2018).

**Thinking Maps.** Thinking Maps were designed to create visual teaching tools correlated with eight foundational thinking processes (Thinking Maps, 2015). Eight thinking maps are used to display each thought process. The intent of Thinking Maps is to create visuals to promote critical thinking and creative approaches to learning. The maps are designed for all grade levels to be used across content areas, creating a common language across grade levels (Designs for Thinking, 2012). The SEAL Model incorporates graphic organizers used to organize information, as well as teach academic contexts, such as compare and contrast and sequencing.

**Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP).** The SIOP model was sponsored by the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2018; Short & Echevarria, 1999). The goal of the model was to address the needs of diverse students to succeed academically. SIOP was designed to create a model for sheltered instruction. SEAL adopts elements of SIOP, including the foundations for a strategy SEAL has identified as the Dialogic Read-aloud. SIOP encompasses a wide range
of strategies and practices, providing a framework that SEAL incorporates into its Instructional Model.

**Systematic English Language Development (SELD)**. Systematic ELD was designed to improve the English proficiency of English learners so as to impact their academic progress (E.L. Achieve, 2016). The model was designed to provide language development on a daily basis to scaffold grade-level academics. The goal of SELD is to move students up English proficiency levels. The SELD model provides strategies and structures for the designated ELD design promoted by SEAL. SEAL has designed an ELD planning tool that incorporates SELD strategies, including the use of oral and written sentence frames to scaffold student language.

**Summary**

Culturally and linguistically responsive practices provide a construct for teachers to blend their students’ social, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds into their pedagogy and curriculum. Teachers address the specific needs of English learners by valuing their linguistic and academic contributions so that they shape instruction that makes use of their strengths. Culturally and linguistically responsive practices must also utilize academic rigor, where teachers guide students to engage in critical discussions and collaborative processes. English learners require rigorous language and academic instruction to avoid the societal consequences linked to the fate of long-term English learners. Through an analysis of the SEAL model, I measure the effectiveness of their basic tenets and practices with a culturally and linguistically responsive lens. Additionally, I explore the academic impact that the model has on academic English language.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Introduction

According to the CDE (2018), over 218,000 students have been English learners for over 6 years in grades 6 through 12 in 2017. California specifically defines long-term English learners as students that have scored at the same proficiency level or lower on the CELDT and have scored Standard Not Met on the CAASPP. Essentially, long-term English learners have demonstrated a lack of progress in ELD and a failure to meet the state standards according to state assessments. Figure 4 illustrates the population of English learners in California and the number of years they have been classified as English learners.

![Figure 4. English learner comparisons 2015-2018. Adapted from “Data Quest,” by the California Department of Education, 2018 (http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/). Copyright 2018 by the author.](image)

Figure 4 indicates a slight, steady decrease in English learner populations; however, the numbers remain concerning. A statewide advocacy coalition, Californians Together, has sponsored research publications outlining the current educational impact of long-term
English learners (Olsen, 2010). From this research, we can glean that the designation of long-term English learners is a growing concern in need of reparation.

The SEAL Model’s primary goal is to build strong academic language in elementary school students to reduce the number of long-term English learners. This study investigated the SEAL model to determine how culturally and linguistically responsive practices are used to build academic English language and in turn construct language proficiency, resulting in the reclassification of English learners. Although the SEAL model has been a topic of prior research (see Lindholm-Leary, 2014), studies have not been conducted on the SEAL Model as it relates to culturally and linguistically responsive practices. Therefore, I investigated the following research questions to explore the culturally and linguistically responsive practices presented in the SEAL Model.

**Research Questions**

To guide my research, I focused on the following research questions:

1. What do teachers say are their culturally and linguistically responsive practices to address the development of academic English language of English learners?

2. What are the impacts of culturally and linguistically responsive practices on academic language (as self-reported by teachers and administrators, obtainable assessment measures, and in classroom observations)?

**Research Design and Rationale**

For my research, I conducted a qualitative study to allow for a deeper understanding of the culturally and linguistically responsive practices and strategies used within the SEAL Model. Specifically, I used a dual case study design. I was exposed to this model following my initial research and as an administrator for 12 years, I saw that many fifth and sixth grade students with behavioral or socio-emotional concerns possessed
characteristics that qualified them as long-term English learners. These students who were
not able to reclassify were destined to continue into middle school as English learners.

I began with a document analysis to gather information about the school and the
implementation of the SEAL Model. This was followed by interviews and observations.
Although my intent was to follow this set sequence during my methodological
implementation, I kept in mind the importance of flexibility throughout my research
process (Maxwell, 2014).

**Strategies of Inquiry**

**Site and Population**

Since the goals of the study were to explore culturally and linguistically responsive
practices associated with the use of the SEAL model, I chose two schools, one in the Milagro
School District and the Vista School District that is undergoing SEAL training. A second
criterion was the identification of a population of students with a high percentage of
English Learners. I chose two school districts in Ventura and Los Angeles Counties
reflecting the state average of English learners (see Table 1). I chose these schools because
their number of English learners are substantially higher than the rate of the state of
California and of the county in which the district is located, therefore possessing a high
density of English learners. In addition to English learner demographics, I provide student
demographics and assessment data for both Reed Elementary and Becerra Elementary (see
Tables 2 through 5).

Tables 2 through 5 outline general student demographic information at Reed
Elementary situated in the Milagro School District. CAASPP results for students in third
through fifth grade and CELDT results for all English learners are also included from 2015
through 2017. These data serve to introduce the context in which Reed Elementary
educates its preschool through fifth graders.
Table 1

*Study English Learner Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage of English learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milagro School District</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Elementary</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista School District</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becerra Elementary</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

*Reed Elementary Student Enrollment by Subgroup*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latin@</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or American Native</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Not Hispanic)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically Disadvantage</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Youth</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Reed Elementary Student Enrollment by Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Reed Elementary California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade(s)/Subject</th>
<th>Reed Elementary 15-16</th>
<th>Milagro USD 15-16</th>
<th>California 15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd-5th grade CAASPP Test Results (Percent Proficient or Above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Language Arts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd-5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th-5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mathematics</strong></th>
<th>Reed Elementary</th>
<th>Milagro USD</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd-5th</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th-5th</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

*Reed Elementary California English Language Development Test (CELDT) Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Reed Elementary 15-16</th>
<th>Milagro USD 15-16</th>
<th>California 15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Advanced</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intermediate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 6 through 9 provide demographic data for Becerra Elementary. CAASPP results for students in third through fifth and CELDT results for all English learners are also included from 2015-2017. It is important to note that the CELDT results will be the final scores available due to the recent implementation of the ELPAC, California’s newly adopted English language assessment aligned to the recently implemented ELD standards.

Table 6

*Becerra Elementary Student Enrollment by Subgroup*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latin@</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or American Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Not Hispanic)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically Disadvantage</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Youth</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

*Becerra Elementary Student Enrollment by Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

*Becerra Elementary CAASPP Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade(s)/Subject</th>
<th>Becerra Elementary 15-16</th>
<th>Becerra Elementary 16-17</th>
<th>Vista SD 15-16</th>
<th>Vista SD 16-17</th>
<th>California 15-16</th>
<th>California 16-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*3rd - 5th grade CAASPP Test Results (Percent Proficient or Above)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Becerra Elementary</th>
<th>Vista SD</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

*Becerra Elementary CELDT Results by Proficiency Level (Percentage)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Becerra Elementary 15-16</th>
<th>Becerra Elementary 16-17</th>
<th>Vista USD 15-16</th>
<th>Vista USD 16-17</th>
<th>California 15-16</th>
<th>California 16-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Advanced</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intermediate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants from Reed Elementary included the school principal, the Preschool Director, and five teachers from Reed Elementary (see Appendix B for a description of participants). The teachers instruct preschool through third grade. All teachers must have received SEAL training and must have participated in the program’s entire staff development. The teachers at Reed Elementary all received a presentation regarding the research and were allowed to volunteer for the study (see Tables 10 through 12 for teacher demographics).

Table 10

Reed Elementary Teacher Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15-16</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Teachers with Full Credential</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

Reed Elementary Teachers by Ethnic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latin@</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or American Native</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Not Hispanic)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

Reed Elementary Teachers by Languages Spoken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages Spoken</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Spanish</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and other language</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more languages spoken</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The demographics presented in Tables 10 through 12 reflect the entire teacher population. The data outline the number of teachers, the breakdown of teachers by ethnic group, and the languages that teachers speak at Reed Elementary. Tables 13 through 15 provide teacher information for Becerra Elementary. Data indicate that 15 teachers at Becerra Elementary are Latin@ and 16 teachers speak both English and Spanish, reflective of the student population.

Table 13

*Becerra Elementary Teacher Assignments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15-16</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Teachers with Full Credential</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

*Becerra Elementary Teachers by Ethnic Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latin@</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or American Native</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Not Hispanic)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

*Becerra Elementary Teachers by Languages Spoken*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages Spoken</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Spanish</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and other language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more languages spoken</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access

Milagro School District is working through the final SEAL modules in grades kindergarten through first grade, and the second and third-grade teachers are receiving training in the third module (see Appendix C for a description of SEAL professional development modules). The program’s director is phasing out after our final module, therefore giving me access to the SEAL Model program leaders.

I met with the former executive director and the current executive director during the beginning of my dissertation process to discuss ideas that would be beneficial work with English language learners. I reached out to the former executive director, Laurie Olsen, due to her extensive research on long-term English learners. At this point, they assisted with my research as it relates to the SEAL Model.

I initiated my research at Reed Elementary with the Milagro Unified School District’s Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services. After speaking to the superintendent, I was given permission to speak directly with the Reed Elementary principal and head of the migrant program for the district. After receiving all Institutional Review Board (IRB) and district approvals, I met with the entire Reed Elementary staff to discuss my research. As a principal with 25 teachers, I was surprised to see such a small staff as I entered their staff meeting, held in a conference room, where the entire teaching staff was seated at a table intended to hold no more than 15 people. I presented a prepared PowerPoint to the group and followed up with individual emails to teachers in grades preschool through third grade. Of the 10 teachers within this grade span, five participated in my study.

Three teachers volunteered to be interviewed and were observed twice; these teachers were Sophia, who taught preschool; Sasha, a transitional kindergarten/kindergarten combination teacher; and Marina, a second-grade teacher. Two
teachers were only interviewed: a second-grade teacher, Joshua, preferred not to have observations made; and a third-grade teacher, Inés, had a student teacher that was doing her 3-week take-over during the time of the study. The principal, Ana, and the Preschool Director for the district, Catherine, participated in an interview. My study was interrupted by local fires that caused the district to close for over a month, including the winter break. Prior to the fires, I conducted one round of observations over a 3-week period. Upon return from the break and school closures, I conducted the remaining three observations and five interviews over a 2.5-month period.

Becerra Elementary, in the Vista School District, was not originally included in my research proposal. Well into my research data collection stage, I knew I needed to explore if my findings were adequate to articulate that the culturally and linguistically responsive practices and strategies were influenced by the SEAL Model or if they were a characteristic of Reed Elementary. Consequently, I reached out once again to SEAL administrators to search for a second school site. I was connected with the Director of English Language Learners and the Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services. The Director knew my limited timeline and quickly connected me with the principal of Xavier Becerra Elementary, Rubina. She also gave me the contact information for one of the district Teachers on Special Assignment, Teresa, a SEAL coach for teachers throughout the district. I asked the principal to identify two to three teachers who would be willing to be observed and interviewed. The principal contacted two second grade teachers, Marcia and Nicola, and I met with all the participants during a 1-day visit, scheduling all the interviews and observations in person during my visit. I completed four interviews and four observations in a span of 4 days.
Data Collection methods

My case study involved a collection of several types of data to allow for triangulation (Maxwell, 2013). In this way, I provided different data sources to substantiate my findings. The methods consisted of a documentation review, then interviews (containing an artifact review), followed by audio recorded classroom observations.

Documents

I collected documents to reveal information regarding the sites and districts being researched as well as the SEAL Model components. Document analysis was performed in two stages. I conducted a document review of the SEAL professional development documentation to gain insight into the program and how it is implemented in a school district. The SEAL document review consisted of curriculum maps and lesson plans to help answer my second research question, What are the impacts of culturally and linguistically responsive practices on academic language (as self-reported by teachers and administrators, obtainable assessment measures, and in classroom observations)?

In the second stage, I collected documents and data about the site researched. This consisted of a review of the site's website, the district website, and school accountability report cards. I made use of state databases to explore information regarding the progress of English learners at both sites. This included the CDE Dataquest database, State Dashboard results, and CELDT result database. These documents helped me articulate the context of both the school and district.

Initially, I also asked teacher participants to bring an artifact that related to SEAL that they felt addressed the culture and/or language of their students. During the interview, I asked them to explain why they brought that item. In my first interview, Marina, a second-grade teacher from Reed Elementary, brought an iPad and had pictures of several artifacts. Following the interview, she emailed me additional artifacts, providing
rich evidence of how culturally and linguistically responsive practices impact academic English. Consequently, I adjusted my artifact collection during the end of data collection at Reed Elementary. I also encouraged teachers to send me pictures of items that they felt represented the ways in which SEAL addressed culture and language to enhance academic English language.

**Interviews**

The next data collection method used in the study was interviews of seven teachers, one teacher on special assignment, and three administrators in the district (as elaborated upon in the Site and Population section).

The interview protocol was developed by the researcher and can be found in Appendices E and F. The questions were designed to gain insight into the teachers and administrators’ perceptions of culturally and linguistically responsive practices existent in the SEAL model. Interview questions explored how the instructional strategies and culturally and linguistically responsive practices affect the academic English language of their English learners, answering both research questions. These questions were tested at another site for effectiveness and reliability; two interviews were conducted with SEAL teachers at another site in the Milagro Unified School District prior to formal interviews for this study. The questions in the interview reflected upon ways in which teachers and administrators feel that they have been able to increase academic English language use.

The interviews were between 45 minutes and 1 hour long and were conducted at each school site. They were recorded with the use of two devices: a voice recorder and a cell phone. As indicated in the participant section, the teachers selected currently teach using the SEAL model and have undergone SEAL professional development. The administrators selected were (a) the administrator for the identified sites and (b) the Preschool Director that oversees the preschool teachers throughout the district.
In my original protocol, I posed the following question to ascertain how teachers saw the SEAL strategies impact academic English: *How does the _____ strategy (go through each strategy discussed) assist students in learning academic English?* During the actual interviews, I generalized the question to: *Of the linguistically/culturally responsive strategies you mentioned, how do they assist students in learning academic English?* Appendix K provides a chart encompassing all of the participants’ answers to these questions. After the conclusion of the interviews, classroom observations were conducted.

**Audio Recordings of Classroom Lessons**

The third data collection strategy was audio recordings of lessons in the classes of the teachers interviewed. The recordings were conducted during the implementation of SEAL. Additionally, these observations provided data on the students’ academic English knowledge. I conducted two observations in each classroom. During observations, I created observation logs, which were used during data analysis. The classroom observations addressed the second research question. This provided evidence for the administrators’ and teachers’ responses during the interviews (see Figure 5).

![Figure 5. Data collection sequencing.](image)

**Data Analysis Methods**

The case study analysis utilized a logic model analytic technique (Yin, 2013). This analytic approach studied an intervention (i.e., the SEAL Model) and analyzed the cause and effect patterns resulting from the intervention. The data from the three methods—documents, interviews, and observations—were triangulated to confirm the findings and
patterns found in the study. The data were organized in a case study database, which included documents, document notes and analysis, interview logs and transcriptions, and field notes (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The document analysis consisted of a continuous reading of data in search of reoccurring themes (Maxwell, 2013; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Interviews were transcribed through an online transcription service (Rev.com) but were reviewed and analyzed to assure accuracy. I utilized open coding to identify coding categories that were organized in a series of MS Excel spreadsheets based on the research questions (Maxwell, 2013) and research from my literature review. The thematic analysis emerging from open coding was color-coded in the spreadsheet to record patterns and trends that were utilized as I conducted the classroom observations. Teacher observations came in the form of audio recordings. These recordings were coded to identify culturally and linguistically responsive practices and identify trends in the teacher’s practices in order to confirm or negate the statements coded from interviews. The classroom observations were recorded and transcribed for analysis. I created a codebook to monitor culturally and linguistically responsive approaches that were coded in my analysis.

**Ethical Issues**

Although I did not foresee ethical questions based on what I was studying, I needed to maintain confidentiality with the interviewees and those captured in classroom recordings. This practice provided respondents with a sense of privacy, allowing them to feel more at liberty to answer questions freely (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). I did not conduct interviews with teachers at my own school site and did not include my own opinions about interviewees or in observations. Teachers received a letter outlining my study and the intent of gathering the data prior to agreeing to their participation and were asked to complete a consent form in order to take part in the study.
All the participants were given pseudonyms and files were safely stored in password-protected devices. Students were not identified. Data identifying the identities of the participants will be destroyed upon completion of the study.

**Credibility and Trustworthiness**

Through personal regulation of this study, I securely assured that ethical issues were addressed. However, the validity of my study required strategic thought into the steps and procedures that deemed my study trustworthy. To build trustworthiness I triangulated data (documents, interviews, observations, and artifact reviews) identifying patterns as they related to culturally and linguistically responsive practices with the use of the SEAL model. The greatest challenge related to credibility was to provide sufficient evidence indicating that the culturally and linguistically responsive practices affect the academic English language of the English learners in my study. To address this challenge I implemented the following validity strategies: triangulation of data, member checking among those studied, provided a rich description of the setting and observed phenomenon, a clarification of biases, and transparency of negating or inconsistent information (Creswell, 2010).

To do so, I addressed researcher bias by explicitly identifying myself as a Latina English learner with the intent to uncover strategies and practices that assist English learners. I revealed my bias in favor of CRT, along with culturally and linguistically responsive practices. I developed an interview protocol extracting detailed responses. I provided in-depth, sequenced information on the teachers’ practices and identified interview dialogue, along with student dialogue in class, that confirmed my assumptions. I crosschecked these findings with administrator interviews. Following the interviews, I made a list of instructional approaches that administrators and teachers identified as culturally and linguistically responsive practices and used these descriptions on my
observation form to monitor the approaches utilized. I also discussed the conflicting arguments and provided data to that contradicted statements from interviews. I made several observations in classrooms to determine if there was data that backed up the teachers or administrators’ statements. This process provided a respondent validation necessary to assure that what was said during interviews was observed during instruction (Maxwell, 2013). Therefore, I used the documents, interviews, and observations to triangulate the data and confirm validity (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Finally, I made adequate engagement in data collection using observations.

**Summary**

The SEAL Model serves as an approach that implements culturally and linguistically responsive practices to build academic language in English learners, particularly at an early age. This study took an in-depth look at the culturally and linguistically responsive practices incorporated into the SEAL Model and consists of a dual-case study research utilizing a logic model analytic technique, in order to observe culturally and linguistically responsive practices and the impact administrators and teachers see on the academic language of English learners.
CHAPTER FOUR

Summary of Case Study Findings

Introduction

Five key findings emerged from this study of whether or not SEAL: (a) uses culturally responsive practices and strategies to create a cultural context to serve as a bridge to learning academic English language, (b) integrates research-based strategies to teach English learners academic English language, (c) incorporates student-to-student discourse to promote oral production of academic English language and student engagement, (d) utilizes a unit design involving thematic planning to expand precise language, teach grammatical forms, and explanations in academic contexts, and (e) makes use of a variety of strategies allowing for the reprocessing of academic English language. To explain these findings, I first describe my process of analysis, then move to the key themes that surfaced, and then describe and detail the two case studies, highlighting culturally and linguistically responsive practices that help English learners acquire academic English language. I end with a cross-case analysis revealing three key differences at the sites in (a) the use of reprocessing and (b) the perception of parents’ value of language.

I sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What do teachers who are trained in the SEAL Model say are their culturally and linguistically responsive practices to address the development of academic English language of their English learners?

2. What are the impacts of culturally and linguistically responsive practices on student academic language (as self-reported by teachers and administrators, obtainable existing assessment measures, and in classroom observations)?
Culturally Responsive Practices: The Process of Analysis

It is important to determine the components of the terms culturally responsive practices and linguistically responsive practices. I begin with a definition of culturally responsive practices as established in this study’s theoretical framework. Culturally responsive practices refer to a pedagogical approach embracing students’ social and cultural contributions to assure academic success. Based upon the research outlined along with this definition, I prescribe five components of culturally responsive practices: (a) awareness of race, culture, and ethnicity (Villegas & Lucas, 2007); (b) incorporates culture, politics, and ethics (Howard & Terry, 2011); (c) revolves around students, parents, and communities, (d) considers the qualities that students bring; and (e) impacts socio-emotional, cultural, and physical being. These components were used for coding culturally responsive practices and determining how the participants approached instruction with a culturally responsive perspective. Table 16 provides observations and quotes serving as evidence for ways in which teachers utilize culturally responsive practices in SEAL classrooms.

In Table 16, I summarize the five components of culturally responsive practices and provide examples of how teacher interview responses and classroom observations provide evidence for culturally responsive practices in SEAL classrooms. The second column provides a description of the evidence and the page in which the interview or observation is discussed in this study. The third column elaborates on the analysis of how the evidence addresses the components of culturally responsive practices.
Table 16

*Evidence of Culturally Responsive Practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Observations/Evidence</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of race, culture, and ethnicity</td>
<td>Draw and Label: Economy Unit incorporating a follow-up of Cesar Chavez Unit discussion (p. 72)</td>
<td>During the discussion on Cesar Chavez, students interpreted that all students that speak Spanish with Latin@ surnames are Mexican. The teacher had a class discussion revealing that one of their classmates spoke Spanish and was from El Salvador, thus providing evidence that the teacher has an awareness of cultural misinterpretations. Identifying a variety of Latin@ identities and bringing awareness through open dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sasha describes a student that “came in the middle of the school year. Everything was new to him, the culture, everything here was new for him.” - Sasha (TK/K Teacher; Appendix H: p. 127)</td>
<td>Sasha, Ana, and Joshua each discussed, during interviews, challenges newcomers face upon arriving to American schools from other countries. Sasha recounts her first year teaching, when she had a student from Mexico. Sasha demonstrates an awareness of cultural implications for recent student immigrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporates culture, politics, and ethics</td>
<td>Cesar Chavez Unit (pp. 72-73)</td>
<td>Second grade teachers at Becerra Elementary teach a unit on heroes emphasizing Cesar Chavez and his work promoting justice for farmworkers. Thus, incorporating a Latin@ historical figure and the political challenges that the United Farmworkers faced to fight for the human rights of farmworkers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draw and Label: Discussion on Types of Government (Appendix H: pp.128-129)</td>
<td>Second grade class was engaged in a discussion on different types of governments. While discussing a monarchy, a student asked what would happen if the monarch didn’t have a child. The teacher responded stating that was a great question and said that perhaps her “Tia” would be the next in line. The teacher presents a political structure and makes a cultural reference to help students understand the concept of a monarchy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 *Tia* is the Spanish word for aunt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Observations/Evidence</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revolves</td>
<td>The parents came to the classroom and the students took them on a tour to see the different strategies that we’ve been working on and share the content with them. So the students went to say the Narrative Input and told them about the story and used the language that was there and I also showed them the videos that we had made, or they went to the vocabulary in context chart we did... (Appendix H: p.130)</td>
<td>Along with the awareness of community culture, all participants expressed the importance of revolving their practices around their students and families in mind. Reed Elementary’s administrator described family projects that are incorporated in each unit, creating a bridge of communication, as well as an integration of academic practices and home discussions. An additional bridging activity is integrated into each SEAL Unit. Parents are invited to “gallery walks.” The gallery walks serve as a culminating activity where students become the docents for the learning having taken place. Hence, the work that is done concludes with an integration of school and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teresa articulates the importance of creating a familiar context to guide and assist students’ cognitive learning. Cultural context acknowledges students’ cultural knowledge, allowing for teachers to make content accessible and personally interesting to students. For example, when teachers use the SEAL strategy of self-portraits, students are encouraged to explore colors to identify their skin color and write a description using the sentence frame, “I am <strong><strong><strong>.My skin is as _____ as</strong></strong></strong>_. My eyes as _____ as <strong><strong><strong>, and my hair is like</strong></strong></strong>.” Students are introduced to descriptive writing using their traits as the topic. Culturally, students explore their skin color and compare it to something they can relate to in a positive manner, celebrating themselves and the differences they possess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persona dolls are an instructional strategy unique to preschool SEAL model used to address socio-emotional and cultural issues. At Reed Elementary, the preschool teacher used a persona doll during an observation named Alejandro, a near life-size doll. As articulated during an interview with Sophia, a preschool teacher, Alejandro is utilized to introduce concepts and to discuss socio-emotional issues that the students experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers</td>
<td>I think that the strategies are all a wonderful place to begin our learning, because we know that, when we are teaching cognitive skills and the language of those cognitive skills, the best place to start is with the familiar. - Teresa (Teacher on Special Assignment; pp. 76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the qualities that students bring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td>Persona Doll: Preschool Classroom, Community Unit (pp. 79-80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socio-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although data provided indicators of culturally responsive practices in SEAL classrooms, the practices are not all explicitly identified as SEAL strategies. Therefore, the question remains as to whether the practices are derivative of SEAL practices or teacher-led practices. This implication must be considered throughout the analysis of this study’s findings.

**Linguistically Responsive Practices: The Process of Analysis**

In my theoretical framework, I defined linguistically responsive practices as a foundational understanding of the linguistic needs of students and adapting practices to see that students achieve academic success. I further defined the components of linguistically responsive practice as: (a) sociolinguistic consciousness (Lucas & Villegas, 2010), (b) valuing linguistic diversity, (c) understanding language tasks, (d) advocating for English learners, and (e) providing scaffolds. These descriptors were used to code linguistically responsive practices and determine how the participants approached instruction with a linguistically responsive perspective. Table 17 provides evidence of the linguistically responsive practices in SEAL classrooms. I include an elaboration of sociolinguistic consciousness, since the term was coined in the literature by Lucas and Villegas (2010).

Table 17 summarizes the components of linguistically responsive practices and provide examples of how teacher interview responses and classroom observations offer evidence for linguistically responsive practices in SEAL classrooms. As in Table 16, the second column provides a description of the evidence and the page on which the interview or observation is discussed in this study. The third column elaborates on the analysis of how the evidence addresses the components of culturally responsive practices.
### Table 17

**Evidence of Linguistically Responsive Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Observations/Evidence</th>
<th>Page found</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistic consciousness</td>
<td>Persona Doll: SEAL Conference Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>As described in the prior section on culturally responsive practices, the persona doll is used as a tool to discuss socio-political topics with young children. In some cases, persona dolls can be used to raise socio-emotional issues, arising from contemporary issues. Ana describes a presentation at a local conference that highlighted the use of a persona doll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Understanding that language and identity are strongly interconnected</td>
<td>One of the presentations that we saw at C Abe (California Association of Bilingual Educators) with Laurie Olsen where the doll was saying how she wanted her friend to come over, and they do these, like a role play kind of thing. The doll is sad, because she wanted her friend to come over to her house, but the mommy of the friend didn’t allow her to come over, because the doll has two mommies. They’re tackling these social phenomena in a way that the doll is giving her perspective of how she feels. That’s really empowering for a child to be able to say what they feel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ana (Reed Elementary Principal) (Appendix H: p. 127)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing linguistic diversity</td>
<td>Pre-School “All About Me” Book (Appendix: p. 128)</td>
<td></td>
<td>During interviews, four of five teachers mentioned that the linguistic culture at Reed elementary was primarily Spanish speaking. Indicating there wasn’t a significant linguistic diversity. Nevertheless, all participants articulated valuing linguistic diversity. Sophia described a preschool SEAL unit titled “All About Me” encouraging students and families to introduce their traditions, cultures, and languages. Hence, valuing the linguistic diversity of all the students in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Categorical Matrix: Second grade Names (Appendix: p.128)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Second graders in Marina’s class were read books discussing the names of immigrant children entering American schools, discussing themes of respect and pride of diverse cultures and languages. Marina created a categorical matrix chart to outline these major themes and book details (see Figure 12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Observations/Evidence</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding language tasks</td>
<td>TK/K Academic Process Journal (p. 62)</td>
<td>Sasha, a TK/K combination teacher creates an assessment tool and independent practice for students to articulate the vocabulary taught during unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well, there’s resources that have defined some of these pieces when we’re looking at standards. The English Language Development Standards are a resource that kind of outline some of the skills the students need to be successful. Experience is part of it, knowing our curriculum and knowing what I’m going to be asking them to do and seeing sometimes where the struggles have been, helping to scaffold and know what they will need in order to reach the level you’re asking them to reach.</td>
<td>Five of seven Reed Elementary teachers and administration related the language tasks to current English language development standards, along with other resources to ascertain students’ linguistic abilities. Inés represents this understanding in her response. Inés discussed the response of language tasks that included scaffolding for English learners, coming in various forms and strategies, as seen throughout SEAL culturally and linguistically responsive strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates for English learners</td>
<td>Use of Spanish in Structured English Immersion Classrooms (pp. 72-73)</td>
<td>Of the teachers interviewed, six of the seven teacher participants were bilingual in English and Spanish. Regardless of language diversity, all teachers expressed an advocacy for English learners and the importance of addressing language needs. As such, 4 of 5 teachers used Spanish during observations while teaching in Structured English Immersion classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Observations/Evidence</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing scaffolds</td>
<td>Draw and Label: Third grade Condor Unit (pp. 62-63)</td>
<td>Provide vocabulary, reprocess opportunities, and allows processing of academic content and language task (i.e., retell academic and scientific processes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graphic Organizers: Cesar Chavez Unit Flow Map and Bubble Map (pp. 67-68)</td>
<td>Organizes information related to the content matter, provides a vehicle to build descriptive words leading to independent writing exercises, as well as teaches language functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative Input: Gruffalo Narrative Input (p. 69)</td>
<td>Facilitates sequencing with use of visuals and vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-Based Chants: Economy Unit (pp. 69-70)</td>
<td>In isolation, the content-based chant does not explicitly teach content, nor does it directly address culturally responsive practices, rather it scaffolds and provides opportunity for reprocessing of key information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language Function Chart: Economy Unit (p. 76)</td>
<td>Use of sentence frames to scaffold the learning of English learners. Nicola made use of several sentence frames visually and orally during observations. The Language Function Chart (see Figure 13), posted in her classroom included sentence frames to provide scaffolds for students when they discussed the processing of cocoa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic English Language: The Process of Analysis**

Academic English language, as used in this study, has three components: (a) use of precise and elaborate vocabulary (Bailey, 2012); (b) use of proper grammatical forms, with the ability to identify linguistic features (Bailey, 2012; Turkan et al., 2014); and (c) use of discourse to explain an event or process, such as sequencing a story or a scientific process (see Appendix J for examples). Overall, academic English language consists of forms and functions of English in educational settings (Bailey, 2012). I use these components to
determine if SEAL teachers utilize linguistically responsive practices to determine ways in which teachers instruct English learners’ academic English language.

During the first round of open coding, I identified observations and interview responses demonstrating culturally and linguistically responsive practices and strategies (see Appendices H and I for full analysis). Next, I isolated the practices and strategies to determine if they addressed any of the components of academic English language. Tables 16 and 17 provide the frequency of linguistically responsive strategies used during observations. This data will be elaborated upon in the case study analysis.

Two Case Studies

Reed Elementary

I chose Reed Elementary in Milagro Unified School District in Southern California due to its unique environment and historical background. Reed is situated in a rural area, 45 minutes in each direction to suburban and urban locations. The two primary roads to Reed are either a four-lane highway or a winding two-lane road. Driving down the highway (my favored route), there are pockets of green fields. At given times of the day, you can see lines of farm workers picking the crops yielded by these fields. Many of these farmworkers are the parents of the students at Reed Elementary, although not limited to the farmworker population.

Entering the town, there are what appear to be recently built apartments to the left, and to the right there are murals on cracked white walls, separating the town from train tracks. The town itself looks like a picture from a western movie, decorated with a pizza store sign bringing the town closer to this century. An elderly Latino in a cowboy hat walks his Chihuahua while roosters crow in the distance.

The school of 273 students is nestled at the end of a primary road, attached to the town library. Walking into the school, an old bell hangs above, leading into the school office,
only steps away from a large grassy field area lined with trees, reminiscent of the parks where my parents would take me in Griffith Park to barbecue and where my father would play soccer.

Of the entire school population, Reed Elementary students are 97% Latin@ and 53% English learners. This high-density population called for the implementation of a model that would address the academic English language of students, hence the adoption of the SEAL Model. Ana, Reed Elementary’s principal, expressed that she was an advocate for the model since it was presented to administration. She reminisced:

When SEAL came onboard, it was all about academic language. I thought, this is going to be awesome because it’s going to take the work that we’ve done, and further it, so that our kids are really working on developing their language skills, and they’re able to be confident in their communication.

As she explained further in her interview, Reed Elementary had begun using the SELD Model, a component of the SEAL Instructional Model (discussed in Chapter Two). At the time, Ana was hopeful the SEAL Model would build upon the work implemented at Reed Elementary to enhance academic English language in her classrooms.

**Essential practices impacting academic English language at Reed Elementary.** I conducted a total of six observations at Reed Elementary in a preschool class, transitional kindergarten/kindergarten combination class, and second grade classroom. Of the total 33 linguistically responsive strategies, 10 were used and 23 were not observed. Four strategies were used in multiple classrooms: Think-Pair-Share, Choral Response, Content-Based Chant, and Narrative Input. Think-Pair-Share was observed in all classrooms and during five of six observations. All classrooms and three of five observations included the Content-Based Chant. Choral Response was observed in Sophia’s preschool class and in Sasha’s transitional kindergarten/kindergarten combination class. Three strategies were observed in two classrooms. Narrative Input and Choral Response were observed in Sophia
and Sasha’s classrooms and the Sentence Patterning Chart was observed in Sasha and Marina’s second grade classroom. Table H3 in Appendix H provides a visual representation of this data.

Although multiple strategies were observed, the data reflect that there is a lack of diversification of strategy use. Teachers tended to use certain strategies more consistently (Think-Pair-Share, Choral Response, and Content-Based Chants for example) and many strategies were not observed at all. Perhaps more extensive observations would reveal different findings, or it may be that the strategies observed are key strategies or simply the ones that are most easily implemented. However, a document review did not provide justification for either hypothesis. One Reed Elementary teacher revealed that the implementation of SEAL and its strategies were a challenge. The teacher stated, “It’s very challenging…It’s hard to blend it together. It’s hard to find.” Five of the 11 participants indicated that a challenge with SEAL was the amount of strategies that were available and the difficulty with implementation. Further development in the use and integration of strategies is integral, as will be discussed in the recommendation section.

All three teachers taught strategies that developed students’ use of precise language and expanded content vocabulary. Accountable Talk serves as a model intended to acquire precise language (Michaels, O’Connor, & Resnick, 2008). Deliberate questioning and accountability draw precise knowledge (see Chapter Two for further discussion). Although SEAL does not adhere to this frame, SEAL administrators state that SEAL is used in districts implementing Accountable Talk and is integrated through their second high-leverage pedagogical practice: structured interaction and academic discourse (A. Horowitz, personal communication, May 26, 2018).

Two of three teachers addressed the completeness of grammatical forms and the full explanatory nature of discourse during the use of SEAL strategies. During interviews,
teachers and administrators were asked if SEAL addressed each of the components and were asked to provide evidence for their responses. All seven participants articulated during interviews that SEAL addresses the key components of academic English language.

Although all teachers reported that SEAL addresses each component of academic English language, the only consistent component I observed was the development of vocabulary. Therefore, I saw some inconsistencies deriving from triangulation of data.

One way was through the use of an Academic Process Journal. Figure 6 is an Academic Process Journal entry of a transitional kindergarten student outlining the process of a volcano eruption. The student was not yet writing words; therefore, she was doing a Draw and Tell.

![Figure 6. TK academic process journal entry.](image)

Sasha presented this drawing as an artifact, indicating what she remembered the student said during her description of her drawing: “Well, this is my volcano, and there’s lava. This was a river running through the mountains,’ I think right here, I want to say that she was trying to draw a person, which would be a geologist.” The words that the student used—*volcano, lava, river, mountains*—were all content vocabulary from their unit on earth science. Although the student could not yet write the words, the Academic Process Journal and the Draw and Tell strategy exemplified the student using content-specific vocabulary in discourse with the teacher, hence extracting precise terminology for conversations regarding the earth science-related concepts.
Teachers revealed that Draw and Label, another SEAL strategy that I observed, promotes the use of precise language. It is a linguistically responsive strategy displaying images and key vocabulary for the content discussed in the unit. Inés reported the chart begins with a pencil drawing that the teacher goes over in marker in front of the class. Sections are reviewed one at a time and themes are separated by color (i.e., habitat, food, interesting facts, etc.). In Figure 7, according to her interview, Inés used a Draw and Label to teach students information about the condor, a native bird in the local area.

In the Draw and Label on condors, pictures are taped to the display to give additional visuals, and the yellow squares contain content vocabulary words such as environment and endangered species. The teacher reviews the chart in stages, and students put up the pictures and vocabulary as the teacher reviews, or reprocesses, the content (see Finding 5 for a discussion on reprocessing). In her interview, Inés discussed the purpose of the chart:

Draw and Labels are a really great [strategy] to do retelling of the academic processes and looking at [academic processes] or scientific processes. So, for example, like we have a little life cycle one on this one, so it’s really explaining the life cycle of the condor raptor.
Inés described how the Draw and Label is used to retell academic and scientific processes. In this example, the students use the chart to explain the life cycle of an animal, including such words as *incubation, hatching,* and *plumage,* which explain the scientific processes a condor undergoes.

Another SEAL strategy that Inés told me she used in the condor unit was a language function chart. She presented me with the following artifact (see Figure 8).

![Figure 8. Third grade language function chart on cause and effect.](image)

According to Inés, teachers identify a language function for each unit (i.e., cause and effect, sequencing, compare and contrast). The language function is introduced on the chart and graphic organizers related to the function are also placed on the chart. As in this chart, additional features such as vocabulary and definitions are added throughout the unit. Sentence frames providing models for language were also added. As described by Inés, the chart was referenced throughout the unit.

The Language Function Wall addresses a specific language function, in this case, cause and effect, and serves as a strategy for students to explain the nature of discourse. In the chart, students are provided with graphic organizers and sentence frames such as, *As a result of* ____, and *Since _____, ______* to scaffold the use of the language function. This provides students opportunities to articulate academic language based on the language function being presented. It should be noted that the Language Function Wall was not
observed; therefore, this study cannot confirm the effectiveness of academic language with the use of this strategy.

**Vista School District**

Becerra Elementary is a pleasant contrast to Reed Elementary. The travel to Becerra Elementary involves a series of highway connectors in a large metropolitan city. Exiting the freeway, there are rows of power lines overhead, with a slight scent of oil or gas. A large sign announces the name of the city and a banner recruiting kindergarteners for Vista School District. Faintly, in the distance, the sound of Spanish music blares from a moving vehicle.

Pulling up to the school site, you see a long bright blue gate surrounding Becerra Elementary. Through the bars, a brightly-colored play structure peeps through, with backpacks on hooks lined up in front of every classroom. After being buzzed in, you face rows of outdoor hallways with more backpacks. Walking down one of the hallways, an entire wall is adorned with the faces of Cesar Chavez, Martin Luther King Jr., the Statue of Liberty, and George Washington. During each of the observations, at least half of the students wore a blue shirt with the acronym PRIDE on the back standing for Productive, Responsible, Independent, Determined, Every day!

Of the 458 students, 94% of the students are identified as Latin@, and 65% are English learners, similar to the demographics in Reed Elementary. Rubina, Becerra Elementary’s principal, also articulated the positive impact that SEAL strategies have had on students’ language development, “You could really see when they do the assessments how their vocabulary has really, really improved... Look how wonderful these kids tested in vocabulary, in everything that has to do with just enriching their language.” Rubina explained that Becerra employs an ELD assessment used throughout the district and has seen marked improvement since the implementation of SEAL. The following are key
practices at Becerra Elementary observed and/or reported to impact academic English language.

**Key practices impacting academic English language at Becerra Elementary.** At Becerra Elementary I made a total of four observations in two second grade classrooms. Of the 33 linguistically responsive strategies, seven were used and 26 were not observed. Two strategies were used in both classrooms in all observations: Content-Based Chant and Think-Pair-Share. Three additional strategies were observed in multiple observations, but not in both classrooms. The Sentence Patterning chart was seen in both of Marcia’s observations and Draw and Label was seen in both observations in Nicola’s classroom. Table 23 in Appendix H provides a visual representation of this data. As seen with Reed Elementary, limited number of strategies were observed, although the timeline of the observations at Becerra Elementary gave better insight into the unit structure and strategy use.

The SEAL strategies observed at Becerra Elementary touched upon all four components of academic English language, with the exception of the explanatory nature of discourse in Marcia’s classroom. Although Marcia’s lessons did not touch upon the language function, the Draw and Label Chart observed in Nicola’s classroom indicating she had intended to process the chart seen in Marcia’s classroom. As reflected in the Reed Elementary data, all four participants from Becerra Elementary articulated that SEAL addresses every component of academic English language. This finding triangulates with the observation data from Becerra Elementary teachers.

Teresa, an instructional coach, mentioned in her interview that their district had previously adopted Thinking Maps, which is part of the SEAL Instructional Model. Consequently, Becerra Elementary teachers were already familiar with the graphic organizers presented in SEAL Module training. Figure 9 displays an artifact from second-
grade classrooms at Becerra Elementary. During an interview, Nicola described a class discussion on Cesar Chavez that was a part of a SEAL unit on Heroes and introduced the civil rights movement, integrating culturally responsive practices with linguistically responsive strategies. Cesar Chavez SEAL unit charts, provided as artifacts, illustrate teachers’ use of linguistically responsive SEAL strategies, scaffolding students’ learning. The linguistically responsive strategies identified—the Multi-Flow Map and a Bubble Map—are used to present culturally relevant information regarding Cesar Chavez, a Latino hero who worked to promote justice for farmworkers.

![Figure 9. Cesar Chavez SEAL unit charts.](image)

The top thinking map, provided by Marcia, is a Multi-Flow Map, displaying the language function of cause and effect, fully explaining the nature of discourse. In this graphic organizer, the teacher presents the cause for Cesar Chavez’ activism and the effects of founding the United Farm Workers of America. In the bottom thinking map, a Bubble Map, the teacher uses the Thinking Map to identify descriptive words for Cesar Chavez.
This graphic organizer serves to record identifiers, building precise language at the word level and providing background knowledge of a critical part of speech: the adjective. It thus teaches grammatical forms of English. Although not labeled explicitly in this map, the adjectives are intended to be used with the unit’s Sentence Patterning Chart. Additionally, the discussion regarding Cesar Chavez brings awareness of Latin@ culture, incorporating a political movement impacting the Latin@ community and therefore utilizing culturally responsive practices.

Another strategy that explains academic contexts is Narrative Input, a strategy used at Becerra to sequence the events in a story (see Figure 10).

Figure 10. Narrative input on the story *The Gruffalo* by Julia Donaldson

In the Narrative Input, the pictures of the stories are placed on cards and the teacher reads the story on the back of the card as the teacher or the students place the cards in sequential order. In this artifact, submitted by Teresa, each picture has a quote bubble, which has identified dialogue spoken by the Gruffalo in the story. Each pictures has a section of the story in the quote bubbles, along with descriptive words from the text such
as amazing, poisonous, and frightfully. In addition to teaching the sequencing of the story, the Narrative Input Chart also integrates vocabulary and the use of adjectives and adverbs.

A highly-utilized strategy for vocabulary development seen in every classroom observation at Becerra was the Content-Based Chant. As seen in Figure 11, chants are created by teachers to review the precise language from the social studies or science content identified within a unit. Words in the chant include such words as consumer, manufactured, and services.

![Figure 11. Content-based chant on economy.](image)

Students recited this chant in a second-grade observation at Becerra Elementary. It was part of the Economy Unit, which emphasized consumers and producers (a unit highlighted in Findings 4 and 5). The Content-Based Chant identified the following key terms: goods, services, consumer, and producer. Each term was described with a familiar tune and practiced multiple times to increase understanding of content language regarding economy.
Cross-Analysis

**SEAL culturally responsive practices and strategies use cultural context to serve as a bridge to learning academic English language (finding 1).** Data from interviews, artifacts, and classroom observations at both sites show that SEAL culturally responsive practices and strategies value students’ cultural contributions, thereby, weaving a familiar cultural context into the identified content. English learners require expanded linguistic repertoires. However, it is critical that they are provided social, cultural, and identity considerations (Bunch, 2013). As outlined in my theoretical framework (see Figure 2), culturally responsive practices do not affect academic English directly. Instead, culturally responsive practices set a cultural context necessary for English learners to create a bridge to academic English language.

Culturally responsive practices are designed to address the academic failures that students of color experience due to the deficit approach that education has historically taken with underrepresented students (Gay, 2013; Howard & Terry, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Rather, the foundational theory for this study, CRT, calls for the acknowledgement of counter stories, in this case the Latin@ experience of English learners. Hence, culturally responsive practices embrace the language and cultural knowledge that students bring to school to create an environment where students see themselves as active agents in learning (Villegas & Lucas, 2001).

One such example was observed in Nicola’s second-grade classroom at Becerra Elementary. Nicola was creating a Draw and Label on the processing of cocoa to chocolate (a strategy elaborated upon in Findings 4 and 5). During the observation, Nicola described locations where cocoa is grown: Mexico, Central America, and Africa. While showing the picture of Central America, she named the countries that were part of the isthmus. As she said *El Salvador*, several students looked around and smiled. Nicola then stated that she
knew why they were so excited, “because some of you have parents from El Salvador.” During Nicola’s interview, she explained that weeks before, her class discussed Cesar Chavez and the students assumed he was Mexican because he spoke Spanish. Nicola revealed to the class that one of their classmates spoke Spanish but she wasn’t Mexican, her parents were from El Salvador. Through cultural conversations, Nicola gave her students a cultural relevance for their learning. Students could better understand geographical concepts due to cultural conversations revolving around a classmate’s ethnicity bringing forth a connection with the content.

Teresa captured the concept of creating a familiar context in an interview response after identifying the SEAL culturally responsive strategies in Vista School District classrooms. She discussed how the strategies helped English learners develop academic English language. She responded,

I think that the strategies are all a wonderful place to begin our learning, because we know that, when we are teaching cognitive skills and the language of those cognitive skills, the best place to start is with the familiar.

Here, Teresa articulates the importance of creating a familiar context to guide and facilitate students’ cognitive learning. Cultural context is significant because by keeping the students’ cultural knowledge in mind, teachers make content accessible and personally interesting to students (Howard, 2003; Lucas et al., 2008).

Another way in which four out of five SEAL teachers honored their students’ culture was through their use of Spanish in a Structured English Immersion environment. All five of the teachers observed were bilingual. Four of the five were observed speaking Spanish during lessons. Marina, a second grade teacher at Reed Elementary, made use of Spanish while discussing a monarchy when a student asked what would happen if a monarch didn’t have a child. The teacher responded stating that it was a great question and that perhaps
her tía would be the next in line. Marina used her students’ primary language and cultural knowledge to explain the lineage of a monarchy. Although the use of the term tía did not directly teach academic English language, it gave students a reference point to draw from.

Marcia, a second grade teacher at Becerra Elementary, also used Spanish, with a cultural reference, during an observation regarding consumers. She was discussing the role of consumers and said that when students went outside to buy ice cream or an *elote*, they too were consumers. Elotes are frequently found in Latin@ communities. Vendors put an ear of corn on a stick and cover it with mayonnaise, parmesan cheese, and hot sauce. Marcia’s cultural knowledge, familiar to students, gave her an anchor to describe how students can relate to being consumers, thus creating a context for learning about the theme, economy.

As illustrated by Marcia and by Marina’s observations, Cook (1992) spoke to the theory of multicompetence, arguing that teachers who are English learners can serve as models for their students because they can code switch and also learned to speak English in the same way that their students are learning. A significant consideration of this study is that all teachers observed were Spanish speaking and of the same culture of the students in the class. Hence, neglecting the possibility of how English speaking teachers can create the same cultural context without knowing the primary language of a significant population of their students.

Universal use of culturally responsive practices is another implication that comes with the implementation of curriculum. Although SEAL training includes the World in the Classroom module training, it does not assure implementation of the practices. With a teacher-driven curriculum, teachers are able to overlook SEAL practices that promote

---

8 *Tía* is the Spanish word for aunt.
9 *Elote* is the Spanish word for corn.
culturally responsive practices. Therefore, adequate accountability measures and assessment devices are critical in assuring that culturally responsive strategies remain intact.

**SEAL integrates research-based strategies to teach English learners academic English language (finding 2).** The SEAL Model incorporates instructional strategies with foundations in research-based models targeting learning for English learners (see Figure 3). The integration of these strategies gives teachers various tools to present and review academic English language. As mentioned in my theoretical framework, the SEAL Instructional model includes Project GLAD®, Kagan Structures, Anti-Bias Curriculum, Thinking Maps, SIOP, and SELD. Each of these models is described in more detail in chapter two, however, in this section, I indicate how these strategies are combined to create a hybrid model adopted by SEAL, with the purpose to help English learners acquire academic English language.

As visualized in Figure 3, Project GLAD® is the most substantial influence of all the research-based models in the SEAL Instructional Model. The SEAL Model adopted and reworked several Project GLAD® strategies (see Chapter Two for a list of specific strategies and descriptions). Among the strategies, is the use of the Categorical Matrix (see Figure 12).
Second graders in Marina’s class were read books discussing the names of immigrant children entering American schools, discussing themes of respect and pride of diverse cultures and languages. Marina created a categorical matrix chart to outline these significant themes and book details. This culturally and linguistically responsive practice was used to organize inferential conclusions and determine the author’s message for the book. In doing so, Marina was able to model to English learners how to pull text to communicate meaning in reading and writing (Turkan et al., 2014). This strategy, like several Project GLAD® strategies, provided a visual to explain a nature of discourse.

Anti-Bias Curriculum is a second model adopted as part of the SEAL Instructional Model (Teaching for Change, 2018). One cross-over strategy seen in SEAL preschools is the use of a Persona Doll. Anti-Bias Curriculum uses multi-racial dolls with distinct characteristics meant to reflect the students in classrooms. In SEAL, the dolls are meant to reflect student experiences. Sophia brought out Alejandro, her preschool classroom’s Persona Doll, to talk to the students about his trip to the panaderia\textsuperscript{10} with his
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\caption{Second grade categorical matrix chart.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{10} Panaderia is the Spanish word for bakery.
grandmother. Sophia asked students to engage in a Think-Pair-Share regarding a time when they went to the bakery. Sophia stated that Alejandro was going to the panadería with his grandmother again and would bring back some pig-shaped cookies. The cookies are mentioned in the story reflecting the theme unit, communities, being read by the teacher and processed by the Project GLAD® strategy, Narrative Input. The Persona Doll is a culturally responsive practice that is used to create a cultural context for the learning of academic English language (see Finding 1 for a further discussion).

A third model adopted by SEAL is SIOP. As elaborated upon in my theoretical framework, the SIOP model was developed to define a structure for sheltered immersion, an instructional model designed for language minority students. SIOP encompasses a robust strategy base and lesson design (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2018). The Dialogic Read-Aloud is one of the SIOP approaches adopted by SEAL. At Reed Elementary, Sasha was observed on day three of a Dialogic Read-Aloud. In the strategy, teachers post notes on their books with prompting questions and highlight essential vocabulary. In this lesson, Sasha preselected and presented vocabulary words and in some cases provided hand motions (i.e., hoisted).

Sasha described during her interview how she taught the word hoisted with the Dialogic Read-Aloud, stating,

Well, the Dialogic Read Aloud, we have to do it three times. Say the first time I read it: I remember using the word hoisted, like to hoist up, and I had to show them to pull something. The second time around, I actually drew it.

The lesson was a part of a unit on community workers. The book was about a mouse that had to go to the dentist. Students were presented words not typically used by native speakers in transitional kindergarten or kindergarten (i.e., hoisted, dainty, have mercy, suffering, risk, gauze, lugging, unique, stunned, and engage). This process built word level knowledge that provided content language to further engage in academic language.
conversations. Through the Dialogic Read-Aloud, the teacher identified key vocabulary, highlighted this vocabulary during multiple reads, and presented the vocabulary in its narrative context.

SELD is another model incorporated into the SEAL Instructional Model that was designed to address the needs of English learners (E.L. Achieve, 2016). The goal of SELD was to move language learners up in English proficiency levels. SELD advocated for a dedicated block of time to give explicit language instruction to English learners every day. The model was based on supporting content as seen in SEAL. One critical component is the use of sentence frames to scaffold the learning of English learners. Nicola made use of several sentence frames visually and orally during observations. The Language Function Chart (see Figure 13) posted in her classroom included sentence frames to provide scaffolds for students when they discussed the processing of cocoa.

Figure 13. Sentence frames.
The sentence frames on the chart went along with a Draw and Label (further discussed in Findings 4 and 5) and were color-coded according to the section being discussed. During the lesson, Nicola asked her students a question, read the frame, and asked her students to speak to their partners or in triads, then repeating the frame. Students used sentence frames as models of correct usage of academic English vocabulary. Sentence frames provided samples of grammatically correct forms to discuss the academic content.

As discussed in the Becerra Elementary case study, Thinking Maps are utilized throughout SEAL units to help students organize communicative forms (see Figure 14). In this Thinking Map, the cause and effect of littering were captured in a flow map. Like the Cesar Chavez Multi-Flow Map highlighted in the key strategies section in the Becerra Elementary case study discussion, this flow map provides a framework for students to have a modeled explanation of the nature of discourse of cause and effect.

![Figure 14. Flow map on the cause and effect of littering.](image)

SEAL’s integration of a wide base of instructional strategies provides teachers with a multitude of resources to teach English learners. However, this integration does come
with some challenges. During interviews, five of 11 participants identified the variety of strategies as overwhelming and difficult to refine. Ana, Reed Elementary’s principal, saw this challenge at a school-wide level stating, “Right now, the teachers are so into SEAL, that they’re focusing on the strategies, and they’re kind of forgetting what they were good at, so that they can really hone into what the strategies are like.” During her interview, Ana expressed that teachers felt overwhelmed with the strategies and the details required to understand effective ways to implement each element. In this statement, Ana was referring to her teachers’ prior training on SELD, although her staff had previously demonstrated a strong understanding of teaching SELD, the mechanical focus on implementing strategies has prevented teachers from translating that expertise.

Moreover, this study was not focused on identifying empirical data relating to the foundational models of SEAL. Instead, this research gathered qualitative data regarding the SEAL Model. Further research would be necessary to confirm the effectiveness of the identified models and strategies within the SEAL Instructional Model. An alternative would be to utilize local and SEAL assessments to measure the effectiveness of the SEAL Model, confirming that the combined strategies create the right combination to address academic English language development of English learners. Such assessments would need to be created since current measures do not target the development of academic English language.

**SEAL incorporates student-to-student discourse to promote the oral production of academic English language and student engagement (finding 3).** Kagan Structures are the final model utilized, and the second-most emphasized, as seen in the SEAL Instructional model (see Figure 3). I include Kagan Structures in my third finding because SEAL incorporates student-to-student discourse to promote the oral production of academic English language, since it consists of instructional strategies that promote cooperation and
communication among students (Kagan, 2018). Although Kagan Strategies are not
designed for English learners like prior discussed models, the creators of Kagan Structures
claim their strategies are used for language acquisition. Kagan offers a variety of
strategies; Time-Pair-Share is among the primary Kagan strategies to promote student-to-
student discourse. English learners require disciplinary linguistic knowledge that is
modeled and spoken orally (Turkan et al., 2014). SEAL lessons incorporate intentional
student-to-student discourse opportunities. As seen in observations, Think-Pair-Share, a
variation of a Kagan strategy, was integrated into every lesson observed. A document
review of unit plans indicates that lesson templates require prompts to initiate discussion.

Student-to-student discourse also provides engagement opportunities for students to
process the content with peers prior to guided and independent practice. Rather than a
traditional model where students receive direct instruction and a few students answer
relevant questions, the incorporation of language-oriented oral student discourse could
create opportunities for incorporation of academic English language (Bailey, 2004). An
example is seen in Marina’s second-grade classroom, where students brainstorm together in
pairs prior to completing the Sentence Patterning Chart. Students are told to get into pairs
throughout the lesson, defining the parts of speech and identifying examples for each part
of speech. Students practiced grammatical language, followed by a teacher-led discussion
affirming or redirecting their responses.

Before activating the Think-Pair-Share strategy, SEAL incorporates T-Charts for
Social Skills, which explicitly teach students how to collaborate. Figure 15 was reviewed
multiple times in Marcia’s classroom before collaborative conversations and small group
work.
In this T-Graph, students have reviewed and recorded what cooperation looks like and sounds like (significant features of a T-Graph for Social Skills). Marcia has also included the classroom rules and a Think-Pair-Share rhyme that the students recited, before collaborative discussions. T-Charts provide guidelines for expectations for students as they engage in oral communication, modeling to students how to communicate and engage with the content at a discourse level. During an observation in Marcia’s class, students worked in table groups and asked to work together to build sentences based upon the Sentence Patterning Chart; within those conversations students were observed explicitly agreeing and disagreeing with one another to create their sentences as illustrated in the “Sounds like” section of the T-Chart.

**Thematic planning to expand precise language, teach grammatical forms, and explanations in academic contexts (finding 4).** SEAL Units are created thematically with teacher-identified overarching enduring understandings and essential questions (see Figure
A document review of SEAL unit plans indicates that teachers collaborate to identify critical academic vocabulary, choose strategies to review the precise language, teach grammatical forms, and identify the nature of discourse for the unit surrounding a science or social studies theme.

Figure 16. Classroom posting of unit enduring understandings and essential questions.

I observed two second-grade classrooms at Becerra Elementary teaching a unit based on the enduring understanding and essential questions in Figure 16. These observations confirmed my finding that SEAL teachers use thematic planning to teach academic English language.

Marcia and Nicola collaborated with their grade level colleagues and teachers on special assignment (TOSAs) during a unit design day. As revealed during the administrator interview, transitional kindergarten through third-grade teachers throughout Vista School District are released for unit development days to build units, reflecting the elements revealed during the document review. Both teachers intended to complete all the strategies
presented, as was evident with the blank SEAL charts posted on their walls. Hence, the observations reflected elements of an entire unit.

Two observations in Marcia’s classroom utilized the Sentence Patterning Chart (see Figure 16), which directly taught grammatical forms of English, a descriptor of academic English language (Bailey, 2012). Marcia guided students to brainstorm adjectives, verbs, and prepositional phrases, discussing how to describe a consumer, what a consumer does, and where the consumer does the acts identified. In addition to the whole group discussion, Marcia used Think-Pair-Share for students to brainstorm together. Upon completing the chart, Marcia chose a few students, one-by-one, to go up to the chart to create a “super sentence.” The creation of super sentences gave students a frame to understand the grammatical elements of a sentence and practice using parts of speech. Figure 16 shows the completed Sentence Patterning Chart.

Figure 16. Sentence Patterning Chart.

Students are given a definition of each part of speech with a word, phrase, and/or small visual. The chart organizes a variety of words that fit the descriptions. The small paper tags indicate the words chosen by a student. This chart serves as a frame to build precise language surrounding the theme and gives students a scaffold to produce
grammatical forms orally and in written form, therefore modeling to English learners how to communicate meaning through reading and writing (Turkan et al., 2014).

Further direct grammar instruction was seen during the second observation. Marcia reviewed the words on the chart and added a few more words to each section. The class also reviewed the purpose of an adverb and brainstormed appropriate adverbs. Marcia had a few students go up and choose their words to create their super sentences once again. For instance, the sentence created from the chart in Figure 16 was, “Rich, excited consumers shop happily at Gamestop.”

The lessons utilizing the Sentence Patterning Chart taught precise language at a word level, sentence level, and discourse level, another descriptor for academic English language identified in this study. At the word level, students used vital academic words (in this case, consumer) and built sentences (sentence level) using the vocabulary with descriptive words related to the academic word. A key example is “Patient, strategic consumers browse wisely down the aisles.” The teacher pulled the word *strategic* from the Content-Based Chant “Producers Here, Producers There.” Marcia explained to her students, “Strategic. That means they’re a good buyer, right? Maybe, you have to be strategic ’cause you have to go to three stores this afternoon. Where are you going to go first?” The Sentence Patterning Chart promotes a conversation on how words relate to one another to form grammatically correct sentences. During the lesson, one student demonstrated her understanding of how words relate when she said, “It won’t make sense if you put poor and rich.” This student understood that in choosing two adjectives, they must match grammatically in meaning to describe the consumer. The Think-Pair-Share opportunities provided students guided practice with discourse, orally using precise language with peers and the teacher.
Academic vocabulary and the use of precise content language is a critical element of the development of academic English language (Bailey, 2012). Additionally, content and academic language should be presented in context to make the language accessible (Bunch, 2013). Nicola’s lessons applied the Draw and Label chart along with related texts and strategies to teach students the processing of cacao to produce chocolate (see Figure 18), which provided practice with content language within context.

Figure 18. Draw and Label on the processing of cocoa.

The Draw and Label chart highlights essential vocabulary while teaching the language function for the unit, in this case, sequencing. Marcia described how SEAL strategies within a unit teach the fully explanatory nature of discourse:

Definitely, in our Draw and Label, a lot of it ... like this unit, we’re doing one on chocolate, and we’re doing a flow map, so they need to know the sequence, the order, same thing when we’re doing a Narrative Input. A Narrative Input provides us an opportunity to do that.

Although I did not observe the Narrative Input strategy, Marcia’s statement was confirmed via observations in Nicola’s classroom.

Nicola used content-based texts and the Draw and Label to present the language function of sequencing, followed by student practice through their Draw and Label. Thus,
Nicola exhibited another critical descriptor of academic English language, providing an explanatory nature of discourse. During the first observation, Nicola briefly discussed a book they had read the day before called *No Monkeys, No Chocolate*, wherein she discussed with the students the importance of the monkey in the production of cocoa. Nicola then read an informational text with pictures and descriptions of how cocoa is processed to make chocolate. Nicola began a Draw and Label to discuss the production and processing of cocoa.

After completing both sections of the Draw and Label, Nicola’s students produced their Draw and Label in their Academic Process Journal. Students shared their writing in small groups, and three students described their writing to the class. The independent practice in the students’ Academic Process Journal allowed students to take the modeled demonstration of the discourse of sequencing events and apply it in their written and oral practice. Students practice sequencing through writing and oral presentations while using academic vocabulary presented in the Draw and Label, as well as the related text.

Marina, from Reed Elementary in the Milagro School District, confirmed the impact of SEAL strategies on academic English language within a given unit. In her interview response to the question asking if SEAL strategies help English learners acquire academic English language, she articulated how a SEAL unit on the government contained strategies to teach precise language and the language function of sequencing:

> We’re doing government right now, and they’re talking about the legislature and Congress and the executive branch and they don’t call it the president they call it the executive branch and we’re talking about the supreme court, these are words that they’re using in conversation now, and they don’t even really know that they’ve learned the vocabulary, it wasn’t they’ll write the word supreme court and draw a picture, it is part of the conversation. Just today they’re sitting there, and kids are like, “Well what happens when the Supreme Court doesn’t like a law? What happens if the president vetoes a law?”

Marina’s response articulates the impact of how the SEAL Unit builds a precise language on a given topic, in this case, the three branches of government. She outlined critical
vocabulary: *legislature, congress, executive branch, supreme court, law,* and *veto.* Marina expressed that her students learn the vocabulary without realizing they’ve learned it. This assertion implies that the strategies teach vocabulary engagingly and are used as a part of conversation. She also discussed her students’ understanding after a lesson on how a bill becomes a law, reflecting the language function of sequencing as demonstrated in the observation of the Draw and Label in Nicola’s classroom. She described the student-driven questions that result from the instruction, showing a solid understanding of the processing of a law. Through this unit on government, Marina taught precise content language and taught students to explain the nature of discourse, two essential components of academic English language.

The thematic unit design provides teachers resources to combine content in social studies and science with the teaching of English language arts and ELD. Unit planning becomes an art of weaving each component to create a carefully orchestrated unit. However, in order to do so, teachers must have a solid grasp on the strategies and how to most effectively address the given content. Additionally, teachers require adequate time to plan the unit and create the materials for each strategy. Participant interviews revealed that the lack of time to prepare is a challenge of the SEAL Model. Four of 11 participants expressed that SEAL was time extensive and required district support to provide time to appropriately build units. Teresa, a TOSA and instructional coach for Vista School District, voiced this concern and explained that the district had to work closely with the teachers’ union to create a plan to address preparation time. Two out of five teachers at Reed elementary concurred with these sentiments.

*The variety of SEAL strategies allows for the reprocessing of academic English language (finding 5).* The second grade observations outlined in the fourth finding also confirm my finding that SEAL teachers use a variety of SEAL strategies to allow for the
reprocessing of academic English language. Both second grade teachers at Becerra Elementary were observed engaging in reprocessing, whereas three of five teacher participants at Reed Elementary made reference to the concept of reprocessing during interviews. Academic English language was incorporated within each strategy, and critical academic vocabulary was repeated, and therefore reprocessed during instruction.

In an initial observation, in the context of social studies, Marcia referred to the Vocabulary in Context chart (see Figure 19) to review grammar vocabulary and sentence completion.

![Figure 19. Vocabulary in context chart.](image)

The Vocabulary in Context chart takes critical vocabulary from the unit and creates a context for the words. Teachers start with a word, like consumer, and ask the students if they have heard the word before. The teacher notes how many students have heard (H) or not heard (NH) the word and annotates the number of students on the chart. The teacher presents a sentence with the word and shows students how to use context clues to
determine the meaning. After a partner discussion, the class creates a final meaning and the teacher records language extensions.

In this lesson, Marcia directed students to the chart displaying the term consumers; she explained they were going to complete a Sentence Patterning Chart using this noun. She asked for the final definition of consumer and told her class that consumer was going to be their signal word. She told them to repeat after her, “Consumer, a person who buys and uses goods or services.” The students repeated after her. Marcia had the students sing the “Consumers Here, Consumers There” chant and completed the Sentence Patterning Chart with her students (see Figure 17). During this observation, Marcia used the following SEAL strategies to reprocess the key concept consumer: (a) Vocabulary in Context Chart, (b) Signal Word, (c) Content-Based Chant, and (d) Sentence Patterning Chart.

Nicola also utilized multiple SEAL strategies during her observation. As described in the fourth finding, Nicola used the following strategies that were also part of the unit on producers and consumers: (a) Draw and Label, (b) Academic Process Journal, and (c) Think-Pair-Share. Within the unit design, a variety of strategies were employed to teach students and practice precise language necessary to gain disciplinary linguistic knowledge (Turkan et al., 2014).

Teresa, a district TOSA and SEAL coach, discussed the practice of reprocessing during her interview:

So, we’re continually utilizing multiple modalities through the use of all of these strategies. Yeah, they’re immersed in the language, and they’re continually practicing it, here, there, and everywhere so that there are echoes throughout their day. They’re seeing it on the walls, they’re seeing it in actual authentic text, they’re writing about it, the teacher is intentionally modeling the use.

Teresa described a fundamental concept in SEAL: the reprocessing of academic English language. Through reprocessing, students practice building precise knowledge with a variety of SEAL strategies at the word level, sentence level, and discourse level.
The term reprocessing was also mentioned in interviews with five of the seven participants from Reed Elementary. As Sasha explained:

Helping to reprocess that information and then they go, “Oh yeah, that’s what it’s called.” So helping them develop and remember that language, and I also use the vocabulary words that we use for the unit... I say, “Community” and they say, “Community, a place where people work and live together.” So, every time I stop, I say that [and] they know exactly what to say. They know what the meaning is.

In this example, Sasha referred to the use of a signal word to repeat the key term. Students learn the signal word and it is used as a transitional tool. When the teacher wants her students’ attention, she says the signal word and the students repeat the word with the definition, giving students multiple opportunities to repeat essential vocabulary, therefore, developing precise language.

Due to the timing of observations at Reed Elementary, I did not have the opportunity to hold multiple observations of one teacher within the same unit. Hence, I was not able to capture the thematic reprocessing of academic English language outside of one observation. During my observations, however, I observed teachers using a variety of SEAL strategies within a single lesson. An example was a preschool observation, where Sophia used (a) Narrative Input, (b) Think-Pair-Share, (c) Content-Based Chants, and (d) a Persona Doll to discuss the social studies theme of communities. For example, Sophia used the strategy of a Narrative Input to retell a story of a boy that went to the bakery, students performed a Think-Pair-Share of an experience that they may have had going to a bakery or panaderia, and sang a Content-Based Chant on communities. Reprocessing with a variety of SEAL strategies was a recurring theme at Reed Elementary; however, no observations indicated that teachers reprocessed strategies used during previous lessons, as observed in Marcia’s use of the Vocabulary in Context chart. The only exception was the use of Content-Based Chants to review vocabulary in context side-by-side with other SEAL strategies, as seen in Sophia’s lesson.
Although this key finding provides evidence that students receive multiple exposures to the relevant content, the strategies outlined have limitations worthy of discussion. Education Northwest received a multi-million dollar grant to study the effectiveness of Project GLAD®, conducting a randomized trial in 30 schools in Idaho. The primary goal of the study was to explore Project GLAD®’s influence on the academic gap between English learners and non-English learners (Deussen, Autio, Roccograndi, & Hanita, 2014). With the increased population of English Learners (ELs), educators need programs that help students access academic content while learning to understand, speak, read, and write English (Tharp, Estrada, Dalteen & Yamagushi, 2000; Echevarria, Short & Powers, 2006). ELs come into U.S. schools needing to learn the same grade-level content as their non-EL peers, but with the additional challenge of learning English—usually the language of instruction—as well. Although some approaches separate the two tasks, many researchers and practitioners call for integrating the, so that students do not miss content area instruction while they are learning English. One way to combine the two is sheltered instruction, which provides intentional linguistic and other supports to ELs to facilitate their learning of grade-level content (Echevarria, Short & Powers, 2008). As a recent review of the research makes clear, however, there is limited evidence to show the effectiveness of sheltered instruction (Goldenberg, 2013).

Since the early 1990s, Project GLAD has made the claim to be a program that helps teachers meet diverse language and content needs within the mainstream classroom (Brechtel, 2001). Project GLAD is a multi-component K-12 instructional model designed to build academic English and grade-level content knowledge for students at varying levels of English language proficiency. The study discussed herein was a two-year cluster randomized trial in fifth-grade classrooms from 30 Idaho schools across 21 different districts. It focused on two research questions: (1) What is the impact of Project GLAD
teacher training on fifth-grade students’ reading comprehension, vocabulary, writing and science achievement in the treatment classrooms during the first year of implementation, compared to a “business as usual” control group? And (2) Is the program impact different for ELs? (Deussen, Autio, Roccograndi, & Hanita, 2014). Although initial results did indicate an impact on the performance of English learners at the Intermediate level on the CELDT, longitudinal results indicated that the use of Project GLAD® and SIOP did not demonstrate a significant decrease in the academic gap between English learners and non-English learners (Education Northwest, 2018). This is an important consideration in a study of the SEAL Instructional Model. Qualitative and quantitative assessments are necessary to measure the effectiveness of the model, particularly regarding to the attainment of academic English language.

**Key Differences in the Case Studies**

The key differences observed between Reed Elementary and Becerra Elementary were the use of reprocessing and the perception of parents’ value of language. I analyzed the critical differences between the two case studies based on my theoretical framework regarding themes of culturally and linguistically responsive practices, as well as academic English knowledge.

**Reprocessing**

As discussed earlier, the concept of reprocessing is a SEAL technique meant to give students multiple exposures to precise language, grammatical forms, and explanations in academic contexts. A variety of SEAL strategies are incorporated into a unit lesson in order for students to witness key academic vocabulary in a variety of contexts. According to teacher and instructional coach interviews, teachers are trained to keep unit artifacts posted so they can refer to the various strategies, even if the particular strategy is not utilized for explicit instruction during the lesson.
In both case studies, SEAL teachers created units using multiple SEAL strategies to help students access the academic English language of the unit's social studies or science topic. A fundamental difference was the frequency with which the strategies were mentioned when not being explicitly taught during the lesson. Becerra Elementary teachers were observed referring to other charts, for example, Marcia referred to the word consumer in the Vocabulary in Context Chart on multiple occasions when she was teaching from the Sentence Patterning Chart. This was followed with a chant on consumers and the use of consumers as a signal word.

One hypothesis for the variance was revealed through an interview with Teresa, Vista School District’s TOSA. She explained that Vista School District was a “GLAD District” and had previously received training on Thinking Maps. One can surmise that just as we see with students, teachers’ background knowledge serves as a solid foundation for new knowledge. As discussed in the second finding, SEAL’s Instructional Model has roots in Project GLAD® and Thinking Maps. Thus, Becerra Elementary teachers were familiar with many SEAL strategies from their prior training, giving them the capacity to reprocess with higher frequency.

Very much like English learners themselves, Reed Elementary had to engage in two learning tasks at the same time. First, they had to learn the intricacies of the strategies, and second, they had to manipulate the strategies to provide multiple reprocessing opportunities for their students. This is significant because limited background knowledge on such an extensive strategy base can compromise the quality of instruction. As I discuss in my recommendations, it is critical that Milagro Unified School District provide teachers with the support and opportunities to refine their understanding of SEAL strategies. The remaining two key differences I identify related to cultural and linguistic responsiveness, the identified framework for this study.
Parent Value of Language

The second fundamental difference seen was related to the participants’ perspectives of parental value of their children’s primary language. Three of four participants in the Vista School district articulated a trend among the parents of young children in the district. As expressed by Rubina:

Unfortunately, many of our families stress the English language to our students. I find that very disappointing here at the school because everything is like, “No, no, no, no. They have to speak English.” I hear some of my parents speaking their broken English to their little ones because the child is not speaking Spanish. It breaks my heart to see that.

Rubina’s statement resonated with most participants from Becerra Elementary. As Rubina explained further, the school is finding that some parents do not want their children to remain English learners for a prolonged period; therefore, they only speak English in the home and deprive their children of their primary language. Thompson (2015) debated the negative connotation related to the long-term English learner label. Frequently, parents also see this label as limiting access in the higher grades. An extensive research base stresses the importance of building a robust linguistic foundation for language learning (Baker, 1993; Cummins, 2000; Fillmore, 1991; Olsen, 2010). Cook (1992) proposed that language learners never replace or lose their primary language. Learning a second language entails utilizing the language like a native speaker, not converting the second language into the new primary language. Language deprivation, as seen at Becerrra Elementary, produces the opposite intended effect, depriving children of a strong language base from which they can make connections as they learn English.

The trend in parents’ devaluing of primary language was not present at Reed Elementary. Sophia contradicted this sentiment during her interview. She stated that at the beginning of the year, preschools were abiding to a 50/50 Dual Immersion Model, where instruction was held in Spanish on certain days and English on others. During this time,
she said that parents would speak to the teachers in Spanish on the Spanish-designated
days, reminding the teachers that they should not be speaking English on that day. One
can surmise that the geographical location and immigrant status of parents allowed for a
variance in perspectives on the value of primary language. Although this difference does
not relate directly to academic English language, language acquisition research indicates
that young students with a robust primary language background can gain language skills
more readily than those that do not (Baker, 2011; Bull, 1992; Cummins, 2000; Schinke-
CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore a contemporary model serving to address the growing population of long-term English learners in California. Five significant findings emerged: SEAL (a) incorporates culturally responsive practices and strategies in its model design to give teachers tools to create a cultural context to serve as a bridge to learning academic English language, (b) integrates research-based strategies to teach English learners academic English language, (c) utilizes student-to-student discourse to promote oral production of academic English language and student engagement, (d) utilizes a unit design involving thematic planning to expand precise language, teach grammatical forms, and explanations in academic contexts, and (e) makes use of a variety of strategies allowing for the reprocessing of academic English language. Four challenges also surfaced: (a) the need to address culturally and linguistically responsive practices with parents (i.e., parents devaluing of primary language at Becerra Elementary), (b) the balancing and refinement of strategies presented in the SEAL model, (c) the need for structured support for preparation to design units, and (d) the need for district and SEAL assessments to measure students’ academic English language development.

Considering these findings, the SEAL Model makes three significant contributions to the field of education in academic English language learning: (a) SEAL incorporates a professional development structure, providing a variety of resources shaping the perception that students’ culture, language, and identity are assets rather than deficiencies; (b) SEAL teachers design units based on science and social studies content to frame the context of language learning, and students engage in collaborative opportunities to learn academic English language within the content while practicing language tasks; and (c) SEAL has
explicitly identified foundational research and strategies as best practices, providing professional development on these strategies with all levels within school districts.

**Summary of Findings**

The first finding reveals SEAL culturally responsive practices and strategies use cultural context to serve as a bridge to learning academic English language. Figure 2 creates a visual of my perspective demonstrating culturally responsive practices do not directly influence the acquisition of academic English language; however, their use creates a context for learning, as well adopting an asset approach to encourage English learners’ attainment of academic English language.

The second finding shows that SEAL integrates research-based strategies to teach English learners academic English language. As presented in Figure 3, the SEAL Model incorporates various instructional strategies including Project GLAD®, Kagan Structures, Anti-Bias Curriculum, Thinking Maps, SIOP, and SELD. These strategies are combined to create a hybrid model adopted by SEAL, with the purpose of helping English learners acquire academic English language.

In the third finding, SEAL utilizes student-to-student discourse to promote the oral production of academic English language and student engagement. Observations showed that Think-Pair-Share is integrated intentionally into every lesson taught, providing student-to-student discourse opportunities. Students also engage in the creation and review of T-Charts for social skills, which explicitly teach collaborative and communicative skills, outlining what specified social skills should look and sound like.

The next finding shows SEAL Units involve thematic planning to expand precise language, teach grammatical forms, and explanations in academic contexts. Observed units made use of a Sentence Patterning Chart to present and practice precise language while teaching grammatical structures, a Draw and Label to build upon the precise language and
teach sequencing (the unit’s language function), the Vocabulary in Context Chart to define the critical vocabulary in grammatical context, and Think-Pair-Share to use precise language in discourse.

The final finding reveals that the variety of SEAL strategies allows for the reprocessing of academic English language. Units are designed for strategies to be revisited throughout the unit and students are taught to use the language from a variety of sources for oral and written language production.

**Significance of Findings**

**English Learners’ Culture, Language, and Identity as an Asset**

Key findings revolving around culturally and linguistically responsive practices reveal that SEAL implementation consists of a professional development structure which includes a variety of resources to value English learners. The World in the Classroom module and foundations in Anti-Bias Curriculum shape teachers’ perception that students’ culture, language, and identity are assets rather than a deficiency.

Research on culturally and linguistically responsive practices point to the importance of eliminating deficit-model approaches, instead seeing culture, language, and identity as assets (Howard, 2003; Villegas & Lucas, 2007). One example is the presentation of Cesar Chavez during a unit on heroes at Becerra. In the unit, students were introduced to a Latino hero, highlighting the contributions he made with the United Farmworkers. Additionally, the EL Roadmap presents new policy replacing Proposition 227, introducing a new framework for English learners (Olsen & Maxwell-Jolly, 2018). The roadmap’s first principle calls for an asset-oriented approach and needs-responsive schools. The SEAL Model incorporates into its module training a module dedicated to recognizing the qualities that students bring. In the World in a Classroom training, teachers are introduced to the concept of mirrors and windows, based on Anti-Bias Curriculum. This approach ensures
that teachers engage in conversations regarding culture, language, and other critical sociopolitical themes (i.e., gender identification, disabilities).

Such training also addresses a universal concern of researchers of academic English language. As indicated in my theoretical framework, researchers differ in approaches to academic English language. However, many agree that teachers require adequate training and support to be able to teach content and language (Bailey, 2017; Bunch, 2013; Turkan et al., 2014). SEAL training on culture and language provides the training necessary to all teachers during the World in the Classroom Module to understand the impact of social, cultural, and identity considerations necessary to help English learners acquire academic English language.

The World in the Classroom Module training does not guarantee transformation of teacher beliefs and approaches. Although this study finds evidence of culturally responsive practices, it cannot affirm a direct link of practices with SEAL. As discussed further in the limitations and recommendations for future study, extensive research and analysis would be necessary to determine if the SEAL model is directly linked to the implementation of culturally responsive practices in SEAL classrooms.

**Learning Language in Context**

The second vital construct revealed from this study’s findings involves SEAL’s unit design to position learning language in context. SEAL teachers design units based on science and social studies content, with consideration of ELD standards to frame the context of language learning. SEAL planning devices build in collaborative student opportunities to learn academic English language within the content while practicing an identified language task for each unit. Inés’s interview highlighted the language function chart displaying cause and effect during a unit on condors. Inés incorporated a language function with grade level content, giving her students a context for learning language.
The second fundamental principle in the EL Roadmap calls for an intellectual quality of instruction and meaningful access to the curriculum (Olsen & Maxwell-Jolly, 2018). Language acquisition research indicates language must be taught in context, engaging theory and practice (Bunch et al., 2014; Valdés, 2001; Van Lier, 2010). Bunch (2013) finds it essential for English learners to learn language by engaging in the content through action, allowing for a variety of opportunities for students to be active participants using the language and literacy tasks. Moreover, English learners must manipulate language to practice language tasks (Schleppegrell et al., 2004). SEAL units are designed with Next Generation Science Standards and social studies standards at the core. An ELD planning tool is used to incorporate ELD standards. Students engage in collaborative practices to use academic English language with peers and in oral presentations. A variety of strategies are used to teach the vocabulary, provide structures for language use, and frame the identified language task.

As discussed previously, the debate surrounding academic English language involves a spectrum of researchers placing value on either the fundamental teaching of academic English language or the emphasis on the sociopolitical context necessary to help make academic English language accessible to English learners. SEAL unit design activates the art of teaching, where teachers present content and language standards using clear culturally and linguistically responsive strategies. SEAL adopts academic English language theory while incorporating the importance of social, cultural, and identity considerations, as seen with the unit on economy taught by the Becerra teachers, utilizing Spanish in an Structured English setting, cultural references (i.e. use of elote described on page 81), use of cognates (i.e., mold/molde), and discussions about Central America.
Organizing Curriculum Utilizing Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Strategies

Within the SEAL Unit framework, SEAL has explicitly identified foundational research and strategies for best practices. SEAL overtly describes the research-based strategies for their Instructional Model and makes use of specific strategies adopted from these models. SEAL training involves several layers of training for teachers, instructional coaches, administrators, and district-level personnel, however, further analysis is necessary to measure the effectiveness of this training.

*Castañeda v. Pickard* (1981) utilized a three-part test to determine appropriate action to address the needs of English learners. The legislation prioritized the following three program qualifications: (a) the program was to be based on theory with educational stability, (b) the school had to be able to take the theory and create action, and (c) the school had practices in place to monitor the programs and adjust according to the results. Although the test created various complications, this ruling prioritized English learner programming based on substantiated theories and practices (Biegel et al., 2012). Prior legislation such as *Castañeda v. Pickard* created a policy requiring districts to vet their instructional practices. SEAL’s Instructional Model takes culturally and linguistically responsive strategies from previous research-based models to create a hybrid approach, teaching all of the identified components of academic English language.

Furthermore, as articulated previously, research discussing teacher preparation for educators of English learners indicates that teacher training falls short and lacks the necessary support to teach content and language (Bailey, 2017; Bunch, 2006; Turkan et al., 2014). Teachers require strategies to assure that pedagogical language is taught. However, the responsibility does not lie solely with teachers of English learners. Language must be taught by all, in all content areas (Bunch, 2013). Educators and politicians have a shared responsibility with the rigorous requirements of common core to teach English learners.
The last two principles of the EL Roadmap also outline the importance of systems that support effective teaching and are aligned and articulated across systems (Olsen & Maxwell-Jolly, 2018).

SEAL has developed an extensive professional development model outlined throughout this study for teachers, principals, and district personnel. All levels of the system are exposed to the model’s key components and foundations. Additional supports are also put in place for teachers to receive ongoing support through their unit design work with SEAL coaches. Based upon participant interviews, there was a variation of supports in each district. Becerra Elementary’s principal expressed the use of additional hourly pay for extending preparation for SEAL, as requested by the teachers’ union. Four of five teacher participants in Reed Elementary expressed the need for additional preparation time to better understand the strategies and prepare materials for implementation.

**Revisiting Research Questions**

An asset-based approach relates directly to culturally and linguistically responsive practices, which place value on culture and language. In this study, teachers were observed using Spanish during instruction and creating units utilizing culturally-related themes. Teachers also displayed a variety of strategies that scaffolded student learning by placing the language in context. Observations showed that teachers used SEAL strategies to create units.

Participants also articulated a sociolinguistic awareness, placing value on race, culture, and language. Teachers reported taking part in collaborative practices to utilize linguistically responsive strategies, build units, and introduce identified language tasks in context, thus, framing the answer to research question 1: *What do teachers who are trained in the SEAL Model say are their culturally and linguistically responsive practices to address the development of academic English language of their English learners?*
Although teachers expressed culturally and linguistically responsive practices and related strategies were observed, this study fell short of providing empirical evidence of SEAL’s direct impact on academic English language, therefore not fully answering research question 2: *What are the impacts of culturally and linguistically responsive practices on student academic language (as self-reported by teachers and administrators, obtainable existing assessment measures, and in classroom observations)?* Although this study provides evidence of the culturally and linguistically responsive practices and strategies SEAL utilizes to address academic English language, further research is necessary to adequately measure how the SEAL Model directly impacts academic English language.

**Recommendations for School Personnel and SEAL Model Administrators**

Based on key findings and an analysis of their significance, I propose four recommendations associated to the significance of findings that are intended for the personnel of both case studies and SEAL Model administrators with the intent to improve the acquisition of academic English language of English learners in both school districts.

- Culturally and linguistically responsive awareness for parents
- Models for extending learning of strategies
- Opportunities for processing and preparation
- Local and SEAL universal assessments

**Recommendation 1: Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Awareness for Parents**

Observations, interviews, a document review, and an artifact review revealed that SEAL participants demonstrated culturally and linguistically responsive approaches in teaching academic English language. Nonetheless, interviews exposed Reed Elementary participants’ apprehension at integrating politics into teaching; interviews also exposed Becerra Elementary participants’ concern with parents’ value of primary language.
Findings suggest that parents require further training on these topics. Parent training and informational material are necessary to bring awareness to SEAL’s culturally and linguistically responsive practices.

A component of SEAL’s professional development model is the principal convening with district and site administrators. Administrator participants explained that the convening provides administrator training and information necessary to support SEAL implementation, while also providing instructional rounds to inform principals of critical elements to observe as they walkthrough their SEAL classrooms. The principal’s convenings could provide a forum to disseminate how districts have addressed disconnects with parent populations thus far using culturally and linguistically responsive practices. Moreover, SEAL administrators can provide opportunities for district and site administrators to create a plan addressing specific culturally and linguistically responsive concerns.

**Recommendation 2: Models for Extending Learning on Strategies**

A second recommendation is based on an interview question that queried participants on the challenges found in SEAL. As discussed in the findings, participants indicated that there are too many strategies or that refining SEAL strategies was overwhelming. Observations showed that participants at Reed Elementary required a higher frequency of reprocessing as compared to Becerra Elementary. One such example was Marcia’s use of the Vocabulary in Context Chart; although she was not teaching the chart, she referred to it while teaching the term consumer. Such a level of reprocessing with students is not observed universally. These indications suggest the need for a structure for teachers to refine SEAL strategy implementation with a focus on reprocessing. Such a structure would require assistance from SEAL coaches.
Additionally, since teachers are directly responsible for building curriculum, this may create implications for accountability and policy implementation. A lack of consistent curriculum may allow teachers to interpret the content or plan curriculum that does not adequately utilize SEAL strategies and practices. Consequently, SEAL administration can utilize the convening of SEAL district instructional coaches (a current SEAL practice) to facilitate the creation of a district-wide plan to support teachers in the refinement of SEAL instructional strategies. An additional suggestion on the matter stems from the magnitude of resources provided by SEAL. Currently, SEAL has produced an ELD Planning Tool packet for teachers as they plan for systematic ELD. I suggest creating a similar tool with planning resources for the creation of thematic units.

**Recommendation 3: Opportunities for Processing and Preparation**

The second commonly occurring theme in interviews regarding challenges was the amount of preparation and time needed to develop SEAL Units. SEAL unit development activates the art of teaching, calling teacher grade level groups to collaborate to create uniquely designed units based on student needs. Additionally, teachers require time to process the plans and produce the materials necessary for each instructional strategy. Therefore, districts require extensive opportunities to provide teachers the time to design units and prepare for instruction. Teachers also require content knowledge and an understanding of cultural implications. Therefore, training is necessary with extensive follow-up.

As articulated in the first recommendation, the principal’s convening can also provide a venue to work with district and site administration to review effective ways to offer teachers extensive planning opportunities. The forum can create critical time for the administration to identify a plan that would address district-wide opportunities to process unit elements and prepare for instruction.
**Recommendation 4: Local and SEAL Universal Assessments**

This study’s third research question asked: *What are the impacts of culturally and linguistically responsive practices on student academic language (as self-reported by teachers and administrators, obtainable assessment measures, and in classroom observations)?* Participant interviews and classroom observations provided substantial findings indicating that SEAL’s culturally and linguistically responsive practices address the components of academic English language; however, this study failed to provide definitive assessment measures to substantiate these claims.

Consequently, my final recommendation for participating districts and SEAL administrators is to create local and SEAL universal assessments to measure the effectiveness of the program on the attainment of academic English language. Currently, SEAL has acquired a substantial grant to work with Loyola Marymount University, developing a Depth of Implementation Tool to monitor SEAL Model progress. The tool outlines critical components necessary to measure program effectiveness and provides a continuum for implementation. Nonetheless, student assessment measures are necessary to monitor student growth in the area of academic English language.

**Study Limitations**

Although Reed Elementary provided a unique and historical context for this study, the school’s small size created complications for recruiting adequate participants. In the end, recruiting Reed Elementary participants depended upon those who wanted to volunteer and did not provide adequate participation for a single case study. This process created time limitations for the study at Becerra Elementary. Consequently, the data collection for both sites had variances. Data collection at Reed Elementary was additionally extended due to a natural disaster that caused school closures for an extended period in the middle of data collection. Reed Elementary participants were observed over a 2.5-month
period, not allowing observations within the same unit or following a sequence of lessons. In contrast, data collection at Becerra Elementary was conducted over a 4-day period. Observations were made at the same grade level and within the same unit. Observations at Becerra Elementary gave greater insight into the unit design.

The make-up of teacher participants also created an additional limitation. All five of the teachers observed were bilingual in Spanish and English, identifying themselves as English learners. Although their ability to communicate and relate to their students was advantageous, a lack of English-only speaking teachers limited data on whether the SEAL model promoted culturally and linguistically responsive practices or if the cultural relatedness of teachers created a unique context of cultural relevance.

The reinforcement of primary language support, as seen in the implementation of dual language immersion programs, is an explicit SEAL tenet. This is a significant linguistically responsive approach that was not explored in this study. Neither site possessed a dual language immersion program, which did not allow for observations in SEAL bilingual education classrooms. Nonetheless, the void provides opportunities for future research.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study takes a qualitative approach investigating the culturally and linguistically responsive practices in the SEAL Model questioning the impact on academic English language. To do so, this study utilized a multi-variable qualitative approach, making use of participant interviews, classroom observations, document reviews, and artifact reviews.

My study took a unique perspective on assessing SEAL’s impact on academic English language. By identifying culturally and linguistically responsive practices and strategies, I was able to pinpoint ways SEAL teachers help English learners learn academic
English language. Nonetheless, further quantitative and qualitative research is necessary to measure SEAL’s impact on reclassification rates of English learners in SEAL schools. Additional research on the models and strategies underlying the SEAL Instructional Model may provide information on the effectiveness of the components of SEAL. Additionally, the collaborative unit design places significant responsibility on teachers to implement practices and policies. This process allows for teacher agency and creativity; however, it may be problematic in assuring that practices and policies are implemented adequately. Special consideration and accountability measures are critical in assuring proper implementation.

As indicated in the study limitations, this study’s teacher observations were limited to bilingual teachers in a structured English immersion environment. Consequently, teachers possessed the necessary language and cultural knowledge of the dominant population. Additional research with teachers who only speak English would be beneficial to confirm that SEAL makes use of culturally and linguistically responsive practices when teachers do not have these qualities. In future research, it is important to determine the role that SEAL plays in the implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies. This current study cannot determine if the observed practices are directly related to SEAL approaches or if teachers modify instruction to incorporate culturally and linguistically responsive practices.

This study also omitted a tenet in SEAL’s framework, the importance of maintaining multilingualism, as present in SEAL schools with dual language immersion programs. My study could be duplicated in dual language immersion classrooms to compare culturally and

---

11 As articulated in the dissemination section, I participated in a poster presentation where I presented my study’s findings. The most frequent questions I received were, *Does the SEAL model reduce the number of long-term English learners?* and *How could that be assessed and quantified?*
linguistically responsive practices and strategies within the context of bilingual language learning.

Lastly, the SEAL model has begun a pilot program for fourth and fifth grades in the Milagro Unified School district and an original pilot SEAL school district in northern California. As such, this extension of the SEAL Model opens possibilities to explore the impact of culturally and linguistically responsive practices and strategies on academic English language at the upper elementary level.

**Dissemination**

Upon publication of this dissertation, I will create a presentation and informational pamphlet containing the findings of this study, along with the recommendations. The documents will be distributed to the participating schools and districts, as well as to SEAL administration. I will also offer a personal presentation to each of the associated recipients.

On May 3, 2018, I prepared and delivered a poster presentation of my study’s methodology and findings at UCLA’s fifth annual Research and Inquiry Conference. This presentation allowed me to share my findings with the UCLA Graduate School of Education and Informational Studies community and facilitated connections regarding the relevance of my findings within the context of educational research.

Due to this relevance, I find it prudent to publish my findings in an associated publication, such as *Multilingual Educator*, or through the National Association for Bilingual Education. Additionally, I plan to submit a proposal to present at the California Association of Bilingual Education Conference, to be held March 20-23, 2019 in Long Beach, California.

**Conclusion**

The topic of long-term English learners has been a burning passion for me since the conception of this dissertation. Having been an administrator for 12 years, I have
disciplined a multitude of students that are byproducts of a failing system to English learners. I see the deterioration that occurs when students feel devalued and defeated. The joy of learning is stripped from them, and they are convinced that they are failures because year after year they cannot redesignate, nor can they demonstrate proficiency on local and state measures. On the contrary, state measures indicate that they are far below basic or below basic in all measures.

The SEAL model provides a solution. Culturally and linguistically responsive practices and strategies are activated to promote student engagement and context for learning that were once lost with the many students facing the long-term English learner designation. The SEAL Instructional Model is designed with research-based foundations and strategies, giving students collaborative opportunities and multiple exposures to grade-level content while utilizing culturally and linguistically responsive practices and strategies to address English learners’ acquisition of academic English language. SEAL’s focus on preschool through third-grade students is intentional. By assuring a strong foundation in academic English language, SEAL provides hope for students who would otherwise fall through the cracks.
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## APPENDIX B: Participant Descriptions

### Milagro Unified School District Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Position:</th>
<th>Languages Spoken</th>
<th>Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>Preschool Teacher</td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>Previously was a bilingual teacher. Has worked in education for 13 years in preschool. Born in Mexico and immigrated to the United States in the first grade, returning back and forth from Mexico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha</td>
<td>Transitional K/ Kinder Combination Teacher</td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>Previously was a bilingual teacher in a dual-immersion school. Has taught in three different schools in Ventura county, for five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Second grade Teacher</td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>Has taught in two school districts, one in Ventura County and another in Los Angeles County. Has taught fifth, fourth, kindergarten and second.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Second grade Teacher</td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>Has worked with school districts in Ventura County for 23 years. Worked as a head groundskeeper until he faced health concerns related to the position. Has worked as a teacher at Reed Elementary in a 3/4 combo, second, third, and fourth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inés</td>
<td>Third grade Teacher</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Has worked at Reed Elementary for eight years in third, fourth, and fifth grades, with three years in third grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>English/Spanish</td>
<td>Previously was a bilingual teacher for one year. During the passing of Proposition 227 became a teacher in Structured English Immersion Program. She later became a literacy coach and ELD Coordinator. She then became a principal for Reed Elementary in the Milagro Unified School District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Preschool Coordinator</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Comes from a family of educators. Started teaching in a preschool setting at the age of 16 after receiving her GED and started college. The majority of her career was in private and public school settings, however, she did have her own childcare setting for students with autism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>Description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Second grade Teacher English/Spanish</td>
<td>Has been teaching 23 years at Becerra Elementary. Started as a reading recovery teacher in Spanish and English as well as a bilingual teacher and then taught kindergarten for 16 years. Has also taught first and second, along with multiple variations of combination classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola</td>
<td>Second grade Teacher English/Spanish</td>
<td>Started teaching in 1991 but took a five year break to raise her children. Returned to the Vista School District and taught first grade, second, third grade and fifth grade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Teacher on Special Assignment English/Spanish</td>
<td>Started in education at the age of 18 as an instructional aide. Started as a bilingual kindergarten teacher for 15 years, then looped with her students in various combination classes until they were in second grade. After teaching third grade, she became an instructional coach, spanning a career of 30 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubina</td>
<td>Principal English/Spanish</td>
<td>Has been in education for 36 years. Began teaching kindergarten in northern California. After moving to southern California, she taught first, second, third, and summer school in fourth and fifth. She taught first grade for nine years in Vista School District and after teaching second and third, she became the Dean of Instruction and has now served as a principal for six years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SEAL MODULES: PROGRESSION

The Teacher Launch establishes a common understanding of the SEAL Model, its research foundations, the replication and implementation plan, and engages grade-levels in utilizing Next Generation Science, History-Social Science and Common Core standards to create a yearly plan of thematic units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module I: Oral Language</th>
<th>Module II: Intentional, academic and complex language</th>
<th>Module III: Collaborative Practices and Teamwork</th>
<th>Module IV: The World in the Classroom and Authentic Writing</th>
<th>Module V: Literacy</th>
<th>Module VI: Celebration and Joy in the Classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key content:</td>
<td>Key content:</td>
<td>Key content:</td>
<td>Key content:</td>
<td>Key content:</td>
<td>Key content:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research on oral</td>
<td>• New ELD standards, integrated &amp; designated</td>
<td>• Collaboration, teamwork, 4Cs</td>
<td>• Foundational reading standards</td>
<td>• Identity,</td>
<td>• Intentional foundational skills addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language, rel. to</td>
<td>• Graphic organizers</td>
<td>• Visual arts standards</td>
<td>• LA/ELD framework for literacy (&amp; rel. btw.</td>
<td>diversity,</td>
<td>through existing SEAL strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literacy</td>
<td>• Language functions</td>
<td>• Arts Integration</td>
<td>reading/writing)</td>
<td>student voice</td>
<td>• Shared Research Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CCCS Speaking and</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentor texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening &amp; related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Deconstructing Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literature studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writers Notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observation Pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think-Pair-Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw and Label</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Retell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content-based Chants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Exchange Conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language separation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Graph for Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Vocabulary in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Dictation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School to Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content-based ELD for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated ELD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated frames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic organizers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key to cognitive,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(compare and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contrast, description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequence,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantification, cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and effect, description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### YEAR ONE

### YEAR TWO
APPENDIX D: World in the Classroom Graphic

**MIRRORS**
Seeing one's own experiences reflected in the world of school and books. I belong, I exist.

**TOOLS**
Take one's place in the world, to participate, to gain access with the academic skills of literacy and language of power - and with 21st century skills of anti-bias and living in a diverse world.

**WINDOWS**
on the world with exposure to experiences beyond one's own.

---

**WORLD IN THE CLASSROOM**

- Gender
- Religion
- Language
- Economic Class
- Family Structure
- Culture
- "Racial" Experience
- Mental or Physical Challenges
- Nationality, Location, Place

---
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APPENDIX E: Administrator Interview Protocol

The interview will last approximately 45 minutes. You may end your participation at any time. Your identity will be kept confidential. Everything you discuss with me during this interview is strictly confidential. With your permission, I would like to digitally record it so this interview can later be transcribed verbatim. The recording will not be shared with anyone else. If there are points during the interview where you would like me to stop recording, feel free to indicate that to me so I can turn the recorder off.

Format: Semi-structured interview
Estimated Length: 45 mins
RQs Addressed:
1. What are the elements of SEAL observed and documented in the SEAL materials (strategies) that promote culturally and linguistically responsive practices, impacting the development of academic English language of English learners?
2. What do teachers say are their culturally and linguistically responsive practices to address the development of academic English language of English learners?
3. What are the impacts of culturally and linguistically responsive practices on academic language, as self-reported by teachers and administrators, obtainable assessment measures, and in classroom observations?

Interview questions:
1. Tell me about your work experience in education.
   a. What grades have you taught?
   b. What other positions have you held?
   c. Where else have you worked?

2. Tell me about your experience with English learners?
   a. What grades were the students in?
   b. What was your experience teaching English learners?
   c. How was your experience different from teaching non-language learners?

3. Describe your experience with SEAL and the impact it has on your teachers’ instruction.
   a. What challenges have you found?
   b. Tell me about a positive impact it has on your classrooms.

4. Linguistically Responsive Practices:
   a. Is a student’s social situation important to teaching? If so, how so?
   b. What role does a student’s primary language play in their education?
   c. How do you feel about having students who come from homes with different languages?
   d. Is it important for you to know a student’s home language? Why?
   e. Is it important to know the academic background of a student? Why?
   f. How do you determine what an English language learner needs to know to be able to speak and learn in your classroom?
   g. What do you do to help the English learners in your classrooms?
5. Linguistically Responsive Strategies:
   a. What are some of the SEAL strategies that you have observed your teachers using?
   b. How does the _____ strategy (go through each strategy discussed) assist students in learning academic English?

6. Culturally Responsive Practices:
   a. How do your teachers incorporate politics into their teaching? Culture? Ethics?
   b. What role do the students, their families, and their communities play in the students’ education?
   c. Is it important to consider the qualities that students bring to school? If so, why?
   d. How do you address your students’ socio-emotional being?
   e. How does a student’s culture impact their learning?
   f. How does a student’s physical situation or challenges effect a student’s learning?

7. Culturally Responsive Strategies:
   a. What are some of the SEAL strategies that your teachers use to acknowledge your students’ culture?
   b. How does the _____ strategy (go through each strategy) assist students in learning academic English?

8. Academic English Language:
   a. Does SEAL help your teachers teach students vocabulary for the concepts that you are teaching them? If so, how? If not, please explain what is missing.
   b. Does SEAL help your teachers teach English learners the grammatical forms of English? If so, how? If not, please explain what is missing.
   c. Does SEAL help your teachers teach English learners to use elaborate language? If so, how? If not, please explain what is missing.
   d. Does SEAL help your teachers teach English learners to use language that explains academic processes (i.e., retelling the sequence of a story or explaining a scientific process)? If so, how? If not, please explain what is missing.

9. Training
   a. Describe the training that your teachers received from SEAL trainers and District Coaches.
   b. Describe the training that you received from SEAL trainers and District Coaches.
   c. What training, if any, did your teachers get from SEAL trainers or coaches regarding ways to address student’s culture?
   d. What training, if any, did you get from SEAL trainers or coaches regarding ways to address student’s culture?
   e. What training, if any, did your teachers get from SEAL trainers or coaches regarding ways to address student’s language?
f. What training, if any, did you get from SEAL trainers or coaches regarding ways to address student’s language?
APPENDIX F: Coach Interview Protocol

The interview will last approximately 45 minutes. You may end your participation at any time. Your identity will be kept confidential. Everything you discuss with me during this interview is strictly confidential. With your permission, I would like to digitally record it so this interview can later be transcribed verbatim. The recording will not be shared with anyone else. If there are points during the interview where you would like me to stop recording, feel free to indicate that to me so I can turn the recorder off.

**Format:** Semi-structured interview

**Estimated Length:** 45 mins

**RQs Addressed:**

4. What are the elements of SEAL observed and documented in the SEAL materials (strategies) that promote culturally and linguistically responsive practices, impacting the development of academic English language of English learners?

5. What do teachers say are their culturally and linguistically responsive practices to address the development of academic English language of English learners?

6. What are the impacts of culturally and linguistically responsive practices on academic language, as self-reported by teachers and administrators, obtainable assessment measures, and in classroom observations?

**Interview questions:**

10. Tell me about your work experience in education.
   a. What grades have you taught?
   b. Where else have you worked?

11. Tell me about your experience with English learners?
   a. What grades were the students in?
   b. What was your experience teaching English learners?
   c. How was your experience different from teaching non-language learners?

12. Describe your experience with SEAL and the impact it has on your coaching.
   a. What challenges have you found?
   b. Tell me about a positive impact it has on your coaching.

13. Linguistically Responsive Practices:
   a. Is a student’s social situation important in teaching? If so, how so?
   b. What role does a student’s primary language play in their education?
   c. How do you feel about having students who come into your school(s) from homes with different languages?
   d. Is it important for the teachers you coach to know a student’s home language? Why?
   e. Is it important for the teachers you coach to know the academic background of a student? Why?
   f. How do you determine what an English language learner needs to know to be able to speak and learn in the classrooms of the teachers you coach?
g. What do you do to assist the teachers you coach to help the English learners in their classrooms?

14. Linguistically Responsive Strategies:
   a. What are some of the SEAL strategies that you have observed in the classrooms of the teachers you coach?
   b. How do these strategies assist students in learning academic English?

15. Culturally Responsive Practices:
   a. How do you coach teachers to incorporate politics into their teaching? Culture? Ethics?
   b. What role do the students, their families, and their communities play in students’ education?
   c. Is it important to consider the qualities that students bring to school? If so, why?
   d. How do you help coach teachers address their students’ socio-emotional being during instruction?
   e. How does a student’s culture impact their learning?
   f. How does a student’s physical situation or challenges effect a student’s learning?

16. Culturally Responsive Strategies:
   a. What are some of the SEAL strategies that the teachers you coach use to acknowledge your students’ culture?
   b. How do these strategies assist students in learning academic English?

17. Academic English Language:
   a. Does SEAL help the teachers you coach teach students vocabulary for the concepts that you are teaching them? If so, how? If not, please explain what is missing.
   b. Does SEAL help the teachers you coach teach English learners the grammatical forms of English? If so, how? If not, please explain what is missing.
   c. Does SEAL help the teachers you coach teach English learners to use elaborate language? If so, how? If not, please explain what is missing.
   d. Does SEAL help the teachers you coach teach English learners to use language that explains academic processes (i.e., retelling the sequence of a story or explaining a scientific process)? If so, how? If not, please explain what is missing.

18. Training
   a. Describe the training that the teachers you coach received from you and from SEAL trainers.
   b. Describe the training that you received from SEAL trainers.
   c. What training, if any, did the teachers you coach get from you or SEAL trainers regarding ways to address students’ culture?
   d. What training, if any, did you get from SEAL trainers regarding ways to address students’ culture?
e. What training, if any, did the teachers you coach get from you or from SEAL trainers regarding ways to address students’ language?

f. What training, if any, did you get from SEAL trainers regarding ways to address students’ language?
APPENDIX G: Teacher Interview Protocol

The interview will last approximately 45 minutes. You may end your participation at any time. Your identity will be kept confidential. Everything you discuss with me during this interview is strictly confidential. With your permission, I would like to digitally record it so this interview can later be transcribed verbatim. The recording will not be shared with anyone else. If there are points during the interview where you would like me to stop recording, feel free to indicate that to me so I can turn the recorder off.

**Format:** Semi-structured interview  
**Estimated Length:** 45 mins  
**RQs Addressed:**

1. What are the elements of SEAL observed and documented in the SEAL materials (strategies) that promote culturally and linguistically responsive practices, impacting the development of academic English language of English learners?

2. What do teachers say are their culturally and linguistically responsive practices to address the development of academic English language of English learners?

3. What are the impacts of culturally and linguistically responsive practices on academic language, as self-reported by teachers and administrators, obtainable assessment measures, and in classroom observations?

**Interview questions:**

19. Tell me about your work experience in education.  
   a. What grades have you taught?  
   b. Where else have you worked?

20. Tell me about your experience with English learners?  
   a. What grades were the students in?  
   b. What was your experience teaching English learners?  
   c. How was your experience different from teaching non-language learners?

21. Describe your experience with SEAL and the impact it has on your teaching.  
   a. What challenges have you found?  
   b. Tell me about a positive impact it has on your teaching.

22. Artifact  
   a. Today I asked you to bring something related to SEAL that you feel addresses the culture and/or language of your students. Please describe what you have brought and why you brought this particular object.

23. Linguistically Responsive Practices:  
   a. Is a student’s social situation important to your teaching? If so, how so?  
   b. What role does a student’s primary language play in their education?  
   c. How do you feel about having students who come from homes with different languages?  
   d. Is it important for you to know a student’s home language? Why?  
   e. Is it important to know the academic background of a student? Why?
f. How do you determine what an English language learner needs to know to be able to speak and learn in your classroom?
g. What do you do to help your English learners in your classroom?

24. Linguistically Responsive Strategies:
   a. During my observation, I noticed that you used the __________strategy/strategies, what were some of the other SEAL strategies that you used?
   b. How does the _____ strategy (go through each strategy discussed) assist students in learning academic English?

25. Culturally Responsive Practices:
   a. How do you incorporate politics into your teaching? Culture? Ethics?
   b. What role do the students, their families, and their communities play in the students’ education?
   c. Is it important to consider the qualities that students bring to school? If so, why?
   d. How do you address your students’ socio-emotional being during instruction?
   e. How does a student’s culture impact their learning?
   f. How does a student’s physical situation or challenges affect a student’s learning?

26. Culturally Responsive Strategies:
   a. During my observation, I noticed that you used the __________strategy/strategies, what were some of the SEAL strategies that you used to acknowledge your students’ culture?
   b. How does the _____ strategy (go through each strategy) assist students in learning academic English?

27. Academic English Language:
   a. Does SEAL help you teach students vocabulary for the concepts that you are teaching them? If so, how? If not, please explain what is missing.
   b. Does SEAL help you teach English learners the grammatical forms of English? If so, how? If not, please explain what is missing.
   c. Does SEAL help you teach English learners to use elaborate language? If so, how? If not, please explain what is missing.
   d. Does SEAL help you teach English learners to use language that explains academic processes (i.e., retelling the sequence of a story or explaining a scientific process? If so, how? If not, please explain what is missing.

28. Training
   a. Describe the training that you received from SEAL trainers and District Coaches.
   b. What training, if any, did you get from SEAL trainers or coaches regarding ways to address student’s culture?
   c. What training, if any, did you get from SEAL trainers or coaches regarding ways to address student’s language?
APPENDIX H: Reed Elementary Case Study

Culturally Responsive Practices at Reed Elementary

As defined in the theoretical framework of this study, culturally responsive practices are a pedagogical approach embracing students’ social and cultural contributions to assure academic success. Based upon the research outlined along with this definition, I prescribe five components of culturally responsive practices: (a) awareness of race, culture, and ethnicity; (b) incorporates culture, politics, and ethics; (c) revolves around students, parents, and communities; (d) considers the qualities that students bring; and (e) impacts socio-emotional, cultural, and physical being. I describe in this appendix how SEAL teachers provided evidence of these components through interviews and classroom observations.

Awareness of Race, Culture, and Ethnicity

Seven of seven participants articulated the first descriptor: awareness of race, culture, and ethnicity. Each of the participants expressed that race, culture, and ethnicity was an important consideration. Inés discussed a lesson in which the students were read three books regarding recent immigrants and ways in which others reacted to their unfamiliar names. She reflected on the challenges, stating, “Yeah, the children are coming here from other countries and their names don’t necessarily fit the norm for American names and so it’s how they’re dealing with that.” Sasha, Ana, and Joshua each discussed the challenges that newcomers faced upon first arriving into school from other countries. Sasha recalled her first year when she had a student from Mexico. Sasha describes a student that “came in the middle of the school year. Everything was new to him, the culture, everything here was new for him.”
Incorporates Culture, Politics, and Ethics

In addition to an awareness of culture, all participants incorporated culture and ethics into their teaching. Marina, a second-grade teacher, designed an art integration lesson that incorporated a watercolor activity inspired by Frida Kahlo, a prominent Mexican artist (see Figure H1).

![Bulletin board of Frida Kahlo art integration lesson.](image)

In this same classroom, the class was engaged in a discussion on different types of governments (see Figure H2: “Types of Government” Draw and Label). While discussing a monarchy, a student asked what would happen if the monarch didn’t have a child. The teacher responded stating that was a great question and said that perhaps her tía 12 would be the next in line. Of the three teachers observed, two teachers used Spanish during classroom observations. Participants expressed the integration of ethics, mostly in the form of character development. Figure H3 provides a sample of a student writing regarding why laws are important as part of an academic journal entry from a unit on governments.

12 *Tía* is the Spanish word for aunt.
Although the participants all indicated an ease in incorporating evidence, seven of seven participants indicated a hesitance with the inclusion of politics in the classroom. In each of the interviews, participants expressed that they had to be careful in the way they presented their own opinions on politics since there were varying opinions in the community.

**Revolves around Students, Families, and Communities**

Along with the awareness of community culture, all participants expressed the importance of revolving their practices around their students and families. Reed
Elementary’s administrator described family projects that are incorporated in each unit, creating a bridge of communication, as well as an integration of academic practices and home discussions. An additional bridging activity is integrated into each SEAL Unit.

Parents are invited to *gallery walks*, which Inés described as follows:

> The parents came to the classroom and the students took them on a tour to see the different strategies that we’ve been working on and share the content with them. So the students went to say the Narrative Input and told them about the story and used the language that was there and I also showed them the videos that we had made, or they went to the vocabulary in context chart we did...

The gallery walks serve as a culminating activity where students become the docents for the learning that has taken place.

**Considers Qualities Students Bring**

Reed Elementary participants all articulated the importance of valuing the qualities that students brought to school, whether negative or positive. Sasha and Catherine explained the importance of being aware of the parental situation at home and how it could affect the student’s academic performance. Sasha described situations where her students have parents that do not read and therefore are limited in their ability to help their children learn English. Catherine, a preschool administrator, articulated the importance of families reading to their children in Spanish so they could build a solid foundation in their primary language.

**Impacts Socio-Emotional, Cultural, and Physical Being**

In addition to student qualities, seven of seven participants discussed the importance of addressing the socio-emotional, cultural, and physical being of a student. Each of the participants expressed the need for careful considerations of students’ socio-emotional and physical states. Inés outlined various school resources (i.e., counseling, community based therapists, administration) that teachers utilize to work as a team to address individual students’ needs.
Persona Dolls are an instructional strategy unique to the preschool SEAL model used to address socio-emotional and cultural issues. At Reed Elementary, the preschool teacher used a Persona Doll during an observation named Alejandro. In this observation, Alejandro, a near-life-size doll, was brought out to discuss the story that was read. However, the doll is also used as a tool to discuss serious topics with young children. Ana describes a presentation at a local conference that highlighted the use of a Persona Doll:

One of the presentations that we saw at CABE [California Association of Bilingual Educators] with Laurie Olsen where the doll was saying how she wanted her friend to come over, and they do these, like a role play kind of thing. The doll is sad, because she wanted her friend to come over to her house, but the mommy of the friend didn't allow her to come over, because the doll has two mommies. They're tackling these social phenomena in a way that the doll is giving her perspective of how she feels. That's really empowering for a child to be able to say what they feel.

The culturally responsive practices at Reed Elementary demonstrate an approach to addressing students’ academic, cultural, and socio-emotional needs with a culturally responsive lens, addressing part of my first research question. To complete the discussion, I outline how Reed Elementary demonstrates linguistically responsive practices.

**Linguistically Responsive Practices**

In my theoretical framework, I define linguistically responsive practices as a foundational understanding of the linguistic needs of students and adapting practices to see that students achieve academic success. I further define the components of linguistically responsive practice as: (a) sociolinguistic consciousness, (b) valuing linguistic diversity, (c) understanding language tasks, (d) advocates for English learners, and (e) providing scaffolds. This appendix describes how SEAL teachers provide evidence of these components through interviews and classroom observations.

**Sociolinguistic Consciousness**

As discussed in my theoretical framework, a sociolinguistic consciousness is an awareness that language and identity are related and an understanding of the social and
political ramifications that come with language (Lucas & Villegas, 2010). Seven of seven participants at Reed Elementary articulated the relationship between language and culture, as well as the importance of a student’s primary language. Inés’s response reflects the overall sentiments of Reed Elementary participants,

I think [primary language is] something to be valued, I think that being bi-lingual and being able to know more than one language is an asset to the student if they can speak both languages and if they can include them both in their lives, I think it’s part of their culture.

Valuing Linguistic Diversity

During interviews, four of five teachers mentioned that the linguistic culture at Reed Elementary was primarily Spanish-speaking, indicating a lack of linguistic diversity. Nevertheless, all participants articulated valuing linguistic diversity. Sophia described a preschool SEAL unit titled All About Me, encouraging students and families to introduce their traditions, cultures, and languages. Second graders in Marina’s class were read books discussing the names of immigrant children entering American schools, discussing themes of respect and pride for diverse cultures and languages. Marina created a categorical matrix chart to outline these major themes and book details (see Figure 12).

Advocate for English Learners

As teachers mentioned, Spanish is the predominant primary language of students at Reed Elementary. Of the teachers interviewed, four of the five are bilingual in English and Spanish. Regardless of language diversity, all teachers expressed a sense of advocacy for English learners and the importance of addressing language needs. Although Marina speaks both Spanish and English, she recalled having a Japanese speaking student and the challenges that the student must face. She articulated that SEAL encourages the communication with parents and creating an environment that would reduce the intimidation students may feel.
Understanding Language Tasks

Five of seven Reed Elementary teachers and administration related the language tasks to current ELD standards, along with other resources to ascertain students’ linguistic abilities. Inés reflected this understanding in her response:

Well, there’s resources that have defined some of these pieces when we’re looking at standards. The English language development standards are a resource that kind of outline some of the skills the students need to be successful. Experience is part of it, knowing our curriculum and knowing what I’m going to be asking them to do and seeing sometimes where the struggles have been, helping to scaffold and know what they will need in order to reach the level you’re asking them to reach.

Inés discussed the language tasks that made up scaffolding for English learners, coming in various forms and strategies, as seen throughout SEAL culturally and linguistically responsive strategies.

Providing Scaffolds

The participants in this study spoke extensively of the scaffolds utilized to assist English learners. Marina reported using sentence frames, peer interactions, and opportunities for repetitive exposure to the content. Inés described ways in which the SEAL model provides a variety of strategies including visuals, chants, sentence frames, and the modeling of language expected of students.

Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Strategies

Instructional strategies are a major component of the SEAL model. During each module, new strategies are presented and teachers collaborate during unit design release days to incorporate the new strategies presented at recent modules. In Tables H1 through I13, I include the list and description of instructional strategies that I include for this study. The list includes most of the strategies, although a few were not included in this document. The strategies were developed based on the SEAL Instructional Model (see Figure 3). This section on culturally and linguistically responsive models addresses the first
research question posed: *What are the observed elements of SEAL that promote culturally and linguistically responsive practices, impacting ELL’s development of academic English language?* For this study, I identified the instructional strategies from the World in the Classroom as culturally responsive practices.

**Culturally Responsive Strategies**

During each interview, there was a section when I pulled out a list of culturally responsive practices (see Table H1). I explained to each of the participants that this list was what I called the SEAL culturally responsive practices, I then had them identify the strategies that they used in their instruction or that they saw in their teachers’ classrooms. After each interview, I input their responses into the graph. Following all the participant interviews at Reed Elementary, I analyzed the strategies used and highlighted the strategies that were identified by all participants. Findings indicated that seven of seven teachers reported that they used Self-Portraits; however, no observations were made of the SEAL culturally responsive strategies.

Table H1

*Reed Elementary Culturally Responsive Practices Identified during Teacher and Administrator Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culturally Responsive Strategies</th>
<th>Teacher PK</th>
<th>Teacher TK_K</th>
<th>Teacher 2_1</th>
<th>Teacher 2_2</th>
<th>Teacher 3_1</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Preschool Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Portraits</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring names &amp; name changes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting a family oral history</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language diversity in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways to biliteracy awards and budding bilinguals' celebration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Linguistically Responsive Strategies**
In contrast, several linguistically responsive strategies are utilized at Reed elementary. The options for linguistically responsive strategies are significantly greater, including strategies for oral language, writing, and reading and deepened writing. As with the culturally responsive strategies, participants were asked to identify the linguistically responsive strategies they used or observed. As indicated in Table H2, the strategies seen or utilized by all participants are: Think-Pair-Share, Content-Based Chants, Dramatic Play/Research center, Draw and Label, and Graphic Organizers. There were also a few strategies that participants did not mention, but were observed in the classroom at the time of the observations or interviews.
Table H2

Reed Elementary Linguistically Responsive Practices Identified during Teacher and Administrator Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Language</th>
<th>Teacher PK</th>
<th>Teacher TK</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
<th>Administrator/Preschool Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>· Language separation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· T-Graph for social skills</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Think-Pair-Share</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Five Exchange Conversation: Amplification</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Choral Response</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Vocabulary in context</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Content-based chants</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Narrative input</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Vocabulary for Social-Emotional language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Barrier games</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Dictation (Draw &amp; Dictate)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Dramatic play &amp; research center</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Communicate with parents</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Building school to family projects</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Draw &amp; Label</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Interactive Dialogic Read-Aloud</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Graphic organizer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Inquiry chart</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Content-based designated ELD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Language function chants</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Language function wall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Living wall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Art Integration</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Academic process journal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Writing center</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Sentence patterning chart</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Cooperative strip paragraph</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Student publishing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Observation pictures</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Shared research projects</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Deconstructing text</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Literature/Author study</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Writer’s notebook</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Total amount of times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# not mentioned but was observed in the classroom

In addition to identifying the linguistically responsive strategies articulated during interviews, I also created a chart outlining the strategies witnessed during classroom observations. Table H3 indicates each observation and the linguistically responsive strategies observed. Additionally, the chart indicates the total amount of times that the
strategy was used overall. The most utilized strategy used was the Think-Pair-Share, which was observed in five out of six observations (note that the sixth observation was done in a preschool classroom during center time where students engaged with partners or in small group talk). Three of six observations included Content-Based Chants.

Table H3

Reed Elementary Linguistically Responsive Strategies Utilized during Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Linguistically Responsive Strategies observed</th>
<th>Total Times observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Observation 1 (Preschool)</td>
<td>Narractive Input</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choral Response</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-Based Chant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think-pair-share</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persona Doll</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Observation 2 (Preschool)</td>
<td>Dramatic Play</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draw and Dictate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha Observation 1 (Transitional K/Kinder)</td>
<td>Dialogic Read-aloud</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think-pair-share</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choral Response</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-Based Chant</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha Observation 2 (Transitional K/Kinder)</td>
<td>Narrative Input</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think-pair-share</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence Patterning Chart</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Observation 1 (2nd grade)</td>
<td>Draw and label</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think-pair-share</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-Based Chant</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Observation 2 (2nd grade)</td>
<td>Sentence Patterning Chart</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think-pair-share</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Process Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates strategies already included in counts of total times observed.
APPENDIX I: Becerra Elementary Case Study

Culturally Responsive Practices at Becerra Elementary

The physical environment at Becerra Elementary was indicative of the culturally responsive approaches observed during interviews and observations. All four participants articulated each of the descriptors identifying culturally responsive practices. Classroom observations also provided evidence of ways in which the Becerra Elementary teachers use a culturally responsive lens in instruction.

Awareness of Race, Culture, and Ethnicity

Both teacher participants identified the cultural diversity within the Latin@ community at Becerra Elementary. Although 93.9% of the student population is identified as Hispanic/Latin@, there is a diversity within this population. The teacher participants explained that the Latin@s were predominantly composed of children of Mexicans and Central Americans. Nicola recalled a class conversation regarding Cesar Chavez. When she asked the students where his family was from, students responded that he was from Mexico because he spoke Spanish. Nicola then referred to a student in the class and asked if they thought she was Mexican. Students replied that she was because she spoke Spanish and she had a Spanish surname. The student then informed the class that her family was from El Salvador.

Incorporates Culture, Politics, and Ethics

The class discussion regarding Cesar Chavez was a part of SEAL Unit on heroes and also discussed the civil rights movement. Figure 9 illustrates the teacher’s use of SEAL strategies to present information about Cesar Chavez and his plight for justice for farmworkers. Three of the four participants indicated during interviews ways in which they incorporated politics into instruction. Rubina recounted a recent national walk-out bringing attention to gun control policy. The district prepped an informational packet for site
administrators ahead of time, informing them that students and families might decide to participate. As a response, the staff at Becerra Elementary decided to stage a school wide walkout with students and families. Rubina recalled,

They thought it was a great idea that the kids made their posters and they knew, and we kept it kind of PBIS [Positive Behavioral & Intervention Supports], where we said, we were saying, “Safe schools,” we were saying, “Peace.” “No bullying.” “Be nice” and all of those other things.

The walkout served as a political experience for students and families with an emphasis on ethics.

The T-Graph for social skills was a specific SEAL strategy mentioned by all four participants responding to ethics (see Figure 15). Teresa explained that the T-Graphs are utilized to describe varying character traits, giving students an explanation of what specific social skills—like cooperation, respect, and interdependence—look like and sound like. As Marcia explains, the use of this strategy gives students the tools to “navigate through difficult situations with each other, and not just give up on it, or have the teacher settle it, but to work it out. So, teaching them those skills that they’ll take with them.”

**Revolves around Students, Parents, and Communities**

As indicated in the example of the school-wide walkout, families are incorporated into the school culture at Becerra Elementary. Families are also invited into classrooms to share their oral history in second grade. Marcia described a recent SEAL unit on family oral history, where parents were invited to come in and discuss their experiences living in another country, their culture, and anything else they cared to share. Teresa also described district-wide home connection communications that invite families to share what they know about the unit topic and impart their cultural experiences.
Considers the Qualities that Students Bring

As indicated with all culturally responsive practices descriptors, four of four participants considered the qualities that students bring to school. Rubina explained the importance of valuing student qualities:

Just so that we can be more accepting and more understanding and just embrace one and other and being able to make students aware of the differences and the similarities, and just always take advantage of the ways that we can bring in our families with qualities that they have or things that they do that maybe others ... that others can learn from. I think, yeah, everybody’s qualities are so important.

Student qualities relates closely to children’s socio-emotional, cultural, and physical being.

Impacts Socio-Emotional, Cultural, and Physical Being

Nicola identified socio-emotional issues as baggage to which teachers need to be sensitive. She stated that teachers need to provide the instruction that students may be missing at home and provide a safe, secure environment. All Becerra Elementary participants articulated the importance of creating a safe and nurturing environment for their students. Four of four participants used the term affective filter in interview responses. This refers to Krashen’s Affective Filter Hypothesis (Krashen, 1987). The hypothesis correlates anxiety with second language acquisition and identifies higher motivation with an increase in second language acquisition. Therefore, the higher the level of self-esteem and self-confidence, the higher the acquisition of the second language.

Linguistically Responsive Practices

Krashen’s (1987) theories on affective filter hypothesis and comprehensible input are foundational theories for researchers studying linguistically responsive practices. Conversely, linguistically responsive theory layers the importance of language and culture and their relationship with sociolinguistic consciousness (Lucas, 2010).
Sociolinguistic Consciousness

Although Becerra Elementary participants did not utilize the term sociolinguistic awareness, all of their responses expressed the importance of understanding their students’ social, cultural, and linguistic background in order to be able to best serve their needs.

Teresa further articulated:

Again, finding those connections with the child. Where are they coming from? What do I have with this child within their schema that I can build on? Or where are there some possible areas where I need to be sensitive? Right? And that anti-bias curriculum. And those issues that might be sensitive that we can use as an opportunity to teach our entire class that everyone is different and unique, and “different” is an asset, not a deficit.

Teresa referred to the anti-bias curriculum discussed in the theoretical framework of this study. SEAL training on World in the Classroom highlights anti-bias curriculum to discuss the importance of culture, language, disabilities, etc.

Valuing Linguistic Diversity

Like Reed Elementary, Becerra Elementary has a high density of Spanish speaking students. Of the participants interviewed, four of four are bilingual in English and Spanish. Three of four participants taught in a bilingual program. Three of four participants referred to the decline in parents promoting bilingualism in the home, stating that this would result in a hindrance to their students. All of the participants’ voices valued linguistic diversity.

Teresa referred to the importance of a student’s primary language, stating,

There are connections we can make. That, I think, has been a problem in education for some, is that they see children that come with other primary languages and think they know nothing. Where, when we take the time to get to know what they know in their primary language, we can learn that they know so much.

Understanding Language Task

Once teachers assess what students know in both English and Spanish, it is necessary for them to understand the language tasks and progressions of language to address the students’ needs (Bailey & Heritage, 2014; Lucas, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).
Two of four participants discussed the use of ELD standards along with the ELA/ELD Framework to gain insight into the language tasks of English learners. Four of four participants discussed the use of systematic ELD in order to address the language needs of students. Nicola made use of cognates (centro/center and molde/mold) during an observation on the process of making chocolate. The use of primary language to transfer academic language at a word level helps students develop academic English language. As Teresa suggested, “We look at, again, what they know in their primary language, what they know in English, and we look at which skills are easily transferable between languages, and which skills we need to intentionally teach, or create that bridge.”

**Advocates for English Learners**

Valuing and utilizing primary language in the classroom are forms of advocacy for English learners. During the four observations, teachers used Spanish in every lesson observed. All participants also expressed their investment in their students. Nicola directly commented, “But when it comes to my students, I’m their advocate.”

**Providing Scaffolds**

A precursor to advocacy for English learners is understanding the strengths and barriers that the students possess. Vista School District engaged in a shadowing activity where the teachers and administrators all shadow a student for the day. The intent is to reveal ways to incorporate intentional student talk. Teresa works with teachers in collaborative conversations to discuss ways to scaffold student learning. She described the discussion thusly:

And, that’s where teachers see the value in creating thoughtful Think-Pair-Share opportunities, utilizing collaborative grouping more intentionally and more frequently throughout the day. When students are in independent centers, are there language stems for them to have that conversation?
Teachers also work collaboratively to integrate instructional strategies to scaffold student language. Both teachers had multiple frames available for their students and used written as well as oral frames to guide their students’ language (see Figure I1).

![Figure I1. Sentence frames on needs and wants.](image)

**Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Strategies**

As documented with Reed Elementary, Becerra Elementary participants were asked to identify the culturally responsive strategies that they used in the classroom or observed in classrooms. All participants identified self-portraits, expressing myself, and conducting a family oral history (see Table 21). Although none of the culturally responsive strategies were observed during the lessons that were observed, student work was posted of exploring names and expressing myself.
Table I1

*Becerra Elementary Culturally Responsive Practices Identified during Teacher and Administrator Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culturally Responsive Strategies</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
<th>Teacher 4</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>· Self Portraits</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Exploring names &amp; name changes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Expressing myself</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Conducting a family oral history</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Language diversity in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Pathways to biliteracy awards and budding bilinguals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· celebration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Becerra Elementary participants also identified linguistically responsive practices used and observed (see Table I2). Of these strategies, the following were identified by all of the participants: T-Graph for social skills, Think-Pair-Share, choral response, vocabulary in context, Content-Based Chants, Narrative Input, Draw and Label, graphic organizers, Inquiry Chart, content-based ELD, language function wall, art integration, Academic Process Journal, sentence patterning chart, and cooperative paragraphs.
Table I2

Becerra Elementary Linguistically Responsive Practices Identified during Teacher and Administrator Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Language</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Administrator MA</th>
<th>TOTA MD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language separation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Graph for social skills</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think-Pair-Share</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Exchange Conversation: Amplification</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral Response</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary in context</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content-based chants</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative input</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary for Social-Emotional language</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier games</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation (Draw &amp; Dictate)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic play &amp; research center</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate with parents</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building school to family projects</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw &amp; Label</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Dialogic Read-Aloud</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic organizer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry chart</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content-based designated ELD</td>
<td>x #</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language function chants</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language function wall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Integration</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic process journal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence patterning chart</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative strip paragraph</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading &amp; Deepened Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation pictures</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared research projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deconstructing text</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature/Author study</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer’s notebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student publishing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# not mentioned but was observed in the classroom

I also created a chart outlining the linguistically responsive strategies observed. The strategies observed in all observations were Think-Pair-Share and the Content-Based Chant. The strategies observed in two sessions were the sentence patterning chart, vocabulary in context chart, and the Draw and Label. Both teachers provided lessons that
built upon the prior lesson, which allowed me to observe two lessons on the sentence patternning chart and two lessons on the Draw and Label (see Table I3).

Table I3

_Becerra Elementary Linguistically Responsive Strategies Utilized during Observations_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Linguistically Responsive Strategies observed</th>
<th>Total Times observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Observation 1.1 (2nd grade)</td>
<td>T-Graph for Social Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary in Context Chart</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-Based Chant</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think-pair-share</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence Patterning Chart</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Observation 1.2 (2nd grade)</td>
<td>Think-pair-share</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-Based Chant</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary in Context Chart</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence Patterning Chart</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Observation 2.1 (2nd grade)</td>
<td>Draw and Label</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think-pair-share</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Process Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-Based Chant</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Observation 2.2 (2nd grade)</td>
<td>Draw and Label</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think-pair-share</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-Based Chant</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates strategies already included in counts of total times observed.
**APPENDIX J: Academic English Language Data**

**Descriptor: Choosing precise language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>How addresses descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK/K class learns from Dialogic Read-Aloud: hoisted, dainty, have mercy, suffering, risk, gauze, lugging, unique, stunned and engage in conversations with these words. Teacher states sentence frame before the students engage in the conversation. <strong>Well, the dialogic read aloud, we have to do it three times. Say the first time I read it, I remember using the word hoisted, like to hoist up, and I had to show them to pull something. The second time around, I actually drew it and I said, “I know that’s a really hard word. It’s a fifth grade word, boys and girls, but you guys are all so smart, you guys are going to learn this word.” I go and repeat it again...</strong>(Sasha)**</td>
<td>Teacher in a TK/K classroom is on day 3 of a Dialogic Read-Aloud. In the strategy, teachers have marked the book with post-it notes with questions and highlight key vocabulary. In this lesson the teacher pulls vocabulary words and in some cases provides hand motions (i.e., hoisted) The teacher describes during her interview how she taught the word hoisted with the Dialogic Read-Aloud.</td>
<td>Students are being taught a unit on Community workers. This book is about a mouse that has to go to the dentist. Students learn words that would not be typically known by native speakers in transitional kinder or kinder, but build upon their vocabulary. This builds word level knowledge that provides vocabulary to further engage in academic language conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oh, my goodness, absolutely! Vocabulary, I think, is probably the greatest strength I see ... and it goes hand-in-hand with oral language opportunity, because they’re practicing them. But the vocabulary that is taught is based on State Standards. So, it is access to grade-level curriculum and vocabulary:</strong></td>
<td>Interview with a Teacher on Special Assignment where she is asked if SEAL helps teachers with the development of vocabulary. Tier 2 and Tier 3 refers to levels of complexity, the higher the tier the more complex the word.</td>
<td>Quote indicates that units are developed based on state standards, giving access to vocabulary that is on grade-level and that relates to the standards required at the given grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it is intentional from the first day of the unit. The first day of the unit, we tell teachers, “Have those chants up.” The chants are academic vocabulary chants that are Tier-2, Tier-3 words that teachers can return to…(Teresa)

**Sentence Level**

The sentence patterning chart is completed with the students in a whole group setting. At the start of the lesson, the chart is blank and the teacher begins with the noun, which is related to the unit theme. Students then brainstorm adjectives, verbs, adverbs, and prepositional phrases. Once the chart is completed, students are chosen to go up to the chart and chose the various sentence parts. The class then sing using the words chosen.

Figure 24: Second grade Sentence Patterning Chart

Students are taught the forms of a sentence (as will be discussed in the grammatical forms section). The following activity is writing sentences independently using the sentence patterning chart as a frame for their sentences.

The vocabulary in context chart is filled out with the class. The “new word” are key academic vocabulary related to the unit theme. The teacher asks students if they have heard the word and records H=Heard before or NH=Not Heard before. Students are asked to discuss what they think the meaning of the word is based upon the sentence on the sentence strip (context clues). Following the discussion, the class comes up with the final meaning, with guidance of the teacher. There are also language extensions listed.

Figure 19: Vocabulary in Context Chart

Vocabulary in Context is not only teaching academic vocabulary, but it’s teaching a critical comprehension skills that lots of our long-term English learners don’t yet know. It’s context clues, this strategy actually works at the word and sentence level. Students are exposed to academic vocabulary and then see the word in a sentence. Students are taught to use surrounding words to pull context clues to figure out what the word means.
and, “How do I figure out a word when it’s embedded in a paragraph or in a story? I need to read around that word.” (Teresa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeah, so they’re ... you know I hear them changing their words now when we’re writing in our daily journals, when they’re going back and edit, you know, go back, what else can you use, is there something else you can say? So, then they start pulling that vocabulary from their SEAL themes and units into their writing, into their collaboration when they’re speaking with each other, you hear it amongst themselves also, not just in their writing. (Marcia)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students use vocabulary that they are learning in lessons to edit their writing in their Academic Process Journals. The students gain vocabulary based on the units (identified as key academic vocabulary) to edit their writing and to engage in the discourse regarding the given theme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discourse Level**

**When SEAL came onboard, it was all about academic language. I thought, this is going to be awesome, because it’s going to take the work that we’ve done, and further it, so that our kids are really working on developing our language skills, and they’re able to be confident in their communication. (Ana)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This is from an interview with the principal from Reed Elementary.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ana’s quote indicates that SEAL has increased the level of confidence in the students’ communication, therefore positively impacting their discourse with the use of academic language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Okay, so I told ‘em, I said, “Well, tell me about your</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is an Academic Process Journal entry of a transitional kindergarten student. The student was not yet writing words, therefore she was doing a Draw and Tell. The teacher presented this as an artifact and her quote indicates what the student said during her description of her drawing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The words that the student used, volcano, lava, river, mountains were all academic vocabulary from their unit on earth science. Although the student could not yet write the words, the Academic Process Journal and the Draw and Tell strategy gave the student the opportunity to use the academic vocabulary in discourse with the teacher,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"And she said, she's like, “Well, this is my volcano, and there's lava.” She said, “This was a river running through the mountains,” if I recall that. I think right here, I want to say that she was trying to draw a person, which would be a geologist. (Sasha) hence increasing her vocabulary for conversations regarding earth science.

| 5 of 6 observations saw the use of Think-Pair-Share (1 not observed was during centers and did not provide an opportunity) | A widely-used strategy, Think-Pair-Share was used in almost all observations and was identified as a strategy used by all the participants in this study. Think-Pair-Share is a discussion technique where the teacher poses a question or a discussion topic and the students engage in student-to-student discourse. | The Think-Pair-Share strategy is one strategy that is used to process the information being taught in the classroom. Teachers ask intentional questions and in some observations, give students the sentence frames to start their statement. Students engage in discourse utilizing the academic concepts and vocabulary being taught. |

### Demonstrating Completeness of Grammatical Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>How addresses descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>The sentence patterning chart is described in the prior section addressing precise language at the sentence level.</td>
<td>In addition to teaching precise language at the sentence level, The sentence patterning chart also assists students in learning the grammatical forms of academic English. Teachers ask students to provide examples of each part of speech, students then engage in oral practice of the sentence. In an observation in Marcia’s second grade classroom, the class had multiple opportunities to edit their chart, removing words that were less relevant (i.e., famous) and adding words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that were more complex (i.e., strategic).

**Students use sentence frames to have models of correct use academic English vocabulary. Sentence frames provide samples of grammatically correct forms to discuss the academic content.**

**This chart takes key academic vocabulary and provides sentence frames for use of key academic vocabulary.**

---

**Figure 13: Sentence frames**

**Then, within a unit they have a form that they're working on. Are you describing? Are you sequencing events, or whatever it is? Throughout that whole unit, you're focusing on that different grammatical form, so that the kids really understand what that means. Then it's embedded into everything that's going on. (Ana)**

**This quote comes from Ana, the principal at Reed Elementary. In the quote, she refers to the language function that is assigned to each unit. Each unit also includes a grammatical form (i.e., sentences with developed adjectives, introduction of adverbs, etc.)**

**This quote demonstrates that each unit identifies a key grammatical form as well as a language function, as will be referred to in the next section.**

---

### Providing Full Explanatory of Nature of the Discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>How addresses descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>The Draw and Label is a strategy where teachers use images, and key vocabulary to instruct. The chart begins blank with a pencil drawing that the teacher goes over in marker in front of the class. Sections are reviewed at a time and themes are separated by color. In this Draw and Label the teacher is discussing the life cycle of a condor. The pictures are</td>
<td>The teacher’s quote indicates how the Draw and Label is used to retell academic and scientific processes. In this example, the students use the chart to explain the life cycle of an animal, which is an explanation of the nature of a particular discourse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 7: Third grade Draw and Label on Condors**

**Draw and Labels are a really great piece to do for re-telling**
of the academic processes.
And looking at that, or scientific processes. So for example, like we have a little life cycle one on this one, so it’s really explaining the life cycle of the condor raptor.

(Inés)

| Figure 8: Third grade Language Function Wall on Cause and Effect |
| In each unit there is a language function identified (i.e., cause and effect, sequencing, compare and contrast). In the language function wall, the language function is introduced and graphic organizers that can be used for that language function are placed on the chart. As in this chart, additional features are added throughout the unit. In this case the key vocabulary and sentence frames were added. The chart is referred to throughout the unit. |

The language function wall addresses a specific language function and serves as a strategy for students to use to fully explain the nature of a specific discourse, in this case cause and effect. Sentence frames are also provided to assist students with the grammatical forms to use with the discourse form.

| Through the use of graphic organizers, and the Language Function Wall. Yes, Module 2! There are some sample Language Function Walls. In Module 2, SEAL goes over the various graphic organizers for the different cognitive skills. So, again, the sequence or description or quantification or classification. SEAL has a component where they train teachers on the use of graphic organizers, and really leveraging them, to help kids understand that cognitive skill, but also to teach them the language that goes along; so, the language of description, or the language of |
| This is taken from the interview with Teresa, teacher on special assignment, where she is responding to how SEAL addresses the full explanatory nature of discourse. She describes the language function wall displayed above. |

This is an interview response that articulates the use of a language function wall.
sequencing. While we may introduce it during integrated content time, we will take that same language function during designated ELD, and specifically teach the language of sequence, or teach the transitional words, at the students’ EL level. (Teresa)

And, the Language Function Wall, and the planning of the Language Function Wall, I think, is probably one of the most powerful things to come from SEAL, because of the intentionality of teaching the cognitive skills that are required, as well as the language, and knowing which grammatical aspects will trip them up, right, for our English learners. (Teresa)

In the Narrative Input, the pictures of the stories are placed on cards and the teacher reads the story on the back of the card as they or the students place the cards in sequential order. This picture was an artifact submitted by Teresa, however, a Narrative Input was observed in Sophia’s preschool class and Sasha’s transitional kindergarten/kindergarten class.

The Narrative Input is a strategy used to sequence the events in a story. Teachers repeat the story and place the cards in order and on following days, the students go up to place the cards.

Figure 10: Narrative Input Seen in PK & TK/K classroom
As with the Draw and Label of the life-cycle of a condor, this Draw and Label follows the processing of cocoa to make chocolate.

The Draw and Label can be used to describe a process, as in this example. During two observations where the Draw and Label strategy was used, the teacher followed up the lesson with a student entry (drawing and written) into their academic language journals where they labeled the key vocabulary and students were given the opportunity to describe their individual drawings.

Figure 18: Draw and Label on the Processing of Cocoa
### APPENDIX K: Responses Indicating how Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Strategies Impact Academic English Language

**Responses to Linguistically responsive strategies and how they impact academic learning**

Protocol Question: Of the linguistically responsive strategies you mentioned, how do they assist students in learning academic English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reed Elementary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually, for them to see at times like when we do the chants. If we do the color separation, for them to see like the ribbon that you start from left to right, when they see us writing or counting the letters or spelling a few of the vocabulary words that we use for the morning message. We just started with the, maybe that’s why you were saying, the super, duper sentence, you know, where they build their own sentence. So, for them to start building and kind of knowing a little bit of grammatical things that we do, it helps them a lot. Even with reading you know, the narrative input it’s repetition that they, the story that they find it and for them to help us and even for them to put it as a free choice while they’re playing, at times, puppets from the story, like the runaway piggy that we have in the library, we have the puppets just for them to get them and try to read the story with them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|  |  |
| **Sasha** |  |
| Well, for example, like the draw and label, since we’re doing community helpers, a lot of students don’t know the correct name for certain objects, certain tools. So, like a hydrant, they’re like, “Oh, that yellow thing, I’ve seen it before,” but they don’t know what it was. “It’s a hydrant, say it with me. Hydrant.” So, just repeating it over and over again helps them build that vocabulary, helps them to articulate their English speaking, and it just teaches them the correct language of it, the correct names of it. When I do the five-exchange conversation, this is really informal, I just say, “Oh, what are you drawing?” We just talk back and forth, and say they’re doing a little Draw and Label of a firefighter. “Oh, what is that?” Then I know, “Oh, they don’t remember what that’s called” so I go, “Oh, that’s a fire-resistant jacket.” Helping to reprocess that information and then they go, “Oh yeah, that’s what it’s called.” So helping them develop and remember that language, and I also use the vocabulary words that we use for the unit, as a … I say, “Community” and they say, “Community, a place where people work and live together.” So, every time I stop, I say that, they know exactly what to say. They know what the meaning is. I do that all the time, too. I would probably have to do it … Well, the dialogic read aloud, we have to do it three times. Say the first time I read it, I remember using the word hoisted, like to hoist up, and I had to show them to pull something. The second time around, I actually drew it and I said, “I know that’s a really hard word. It’s a fifth grade word, boys and girls, but you guys are all so smart, you guys are going to learn this word.” I go and repeat it again, but I can’t do that with every single vocabulary word which is really hard, but I just try my best to help them remember it, but I know it has to be multiple times for them to actually keep it in their brain. Or, sometimes something comes up where like, “Boys and girls, we’ve heard that word before. Does anybody remember what that word means?” Some kids remember it. “It means this.” |  |

| Marina |  |
| They all do because … the drawn labels especially I love because today, there’s government right now and they’re talking about the legislature and congress and the executive branch and the executive branch and we’re talking about the supreme court, |
these are words that they’re using conversation now and they don’t even really know that they’ve learned the vocabulary, it wasn’t Dale write the word supreme court and draw a picture, it is part of the conversation. Just today they’re sitting there and kids are like “Well what happens when the supreme court doesn’t like a law? What happens if the president vetoes a law?” They love the word veto, they want to veto everything now. It’s just a conversation, sometimes I’ll say okay, this is a second grade classroom, that kid is small and he’s talking to me about the executive powers and whether or not the supreme court has more power than the executive branch and that is amazing to me. Then I think what do their parents think when they walk in the door and say hey mom what do you think about the supreme court’s decision on TV? They must just lose their mind because I can tell you my kids would never, they did not come home with that kind of academic language at all and they’re comfortable in the English language, they did not, I don’t think it was taught that way.

Joshua- I’ll say anecdotally, I am noticing that when they do all the assignments, they are using the vocabulary. I hear it more. Or they’ll reckon, “Oh, I see that word.” So anecdotally I am seeing a little bit of more enthusiasm and they’re pointing out when they do see those words in context, in other contexts.
I kind of do this ELD, but again, it’s kind of tied up in here and whatever writing thing we’re doing. It’s just a different way of teaching. I’m not saying SEAL’s all that bad. It’s just I’m just starting to get the hang of it and after a couple years ...

Inés- Seeing the same academic vocabulary in multiple places I think is one way that a lot of those strategies connect. We’ve seen in the Chants and then you see it in a draw and label and then in the sentence patterning and then in the vocab in context and those words just become part of the classroom that’s just common language and therefore I feel like it just becomes normal to be using that language because you’re seeing it everywhere around you, so I think that that’s one of the ways that it really does support English learners.

Ana- All of them. All of them assist in students learning academic language. Your graphic organizers, we’ve always known that it’s just a tool for kids to be able to organize their ideas. If they have their ideas organized, they’re going to be able to communicate it. That’s a great tool. The draw and label is a way for them to receive content, but in a way that’s also organized in a certain way, so that cognitively they’re able to organize the information in their brain, and it’s able to make sense. Obviously your content-based chants are reviewing vocabulary that’s high level, but in a way that makes sense to them, and then it has movement, and music, which are things that we know that are able to excel how kids learn. The barrier games, the kids love. I just saw one yesterday where it’s all this language that the kids are producing as they’re playing the game. The dramatic play and research center is crucial. I just feel like, I think teachers have to be really strategic about what they ask them to do there. It could just be play, but if you structure it in a way where you’re giving them sentence frames, or you’re giving them tools, or maybe certain things that they can discuss, they’ll be more focused on their play, so that they can be using the language as they go. Choral response is really good for your newcomers, where it builds their confidence, so that if they’re not so sure about what’s happening, you’re lowering that effective filter for them, and able to produce the language, so that they can move to the next level. Think-pair-share, I mean there’s no better way really in my opinion to get kids to talk. And, if you’re giving them sentence frames that are focused, then the think-pair-share I’ve always thought is one of the strongest things you can do for kids, especially if there’s teacher modeling that comes prior to that. Let me
see. I think that building school to family projects and communication with parents, all of that is really important. Because, if a parent knows that they’re working on a particular unit, the parent can do their best to support what’s going on at home. Also, just the interest that they would take on what’s happening. Then the child knows that, “Oh, I get to go home and talk to mommy about it.” Then there’s a bigger motivation to learn what’s happening in the classroom, and then go home and tell parents about what’s happening. The academic process journal, if you’re practicing the language orally, but you’re not writing it, then you’re not addressing all of the things cognitively you need to be able to do, so that they can be very fluent and very confident in their communication skills. Then some of this other stuff, writer’s notebook is really good, because of the writing as well and student publishing. There’s no way anything can be as good as you feeling good about something that you’ve done.

Catherine- Yes. Yes, I would say. I would say the draw, tell, and label has been good with that because the pictures are there and they’re having to find the correct ... We don’t say ... We call them trash trucks. We don’t ... So, yes. I’d say that some of the strategies have helped. But they, it’s because it’s handed to them. They’re not going above and beyond. And that’s what we’re going to look at next, is for them to go above and beyond.

Becerra Elementary

Marcia- Definitely, in our draw and label, a lot of it ... like this unit we’re doing one on chocolate, and we’re doing a flow map, so they need to know the sequence, the order, same thing when we’re doing a narrative input. A narrative input provides us an opportunity to do that.

Nicola- Academic English. Vocabulary, using it, reminding them sometimes to use it. It allows me to see where they’re at also. Poems, oh my goodness they’re so powerful. The bio-poems tells me a lot about them, their background. Yeah, cooperative strip, it also helps me to know which students like to work together. Because believe it or not, sometimes ... last year I had a hard time with them having them put into groups and working together. They did not like collaborating whatsoever. I mean I really struggled with that last year. This year it was good, it was good. There’s still some that just sit there. But now they’re starting to come around. But that was a tough one. It also helps some of them lower their filter, because they don’t like to speak in front of everybody. Like I have a student, S she does not speak at all. She’s a selective mute. She’ll only talk to her friends, she won’t talk to me at all. I think putting her in groups with her friend, I make sure she’s with her, that way she has her filter lowered and she’s able to communicate with her friends. They’ll tell me, “Oh S said....” I’m like, “Okay, good.” At least I know what she’s, she’s able to talk to her partner. So, sentence pattern, the cooperative strip I love that, that really helps them to collaborate together. They’ll sit there together and think about what sentence they want to write and then they pass that sentence. It’s almost like a self-editing too. In helping each other add more to it.

Teresa- I think that the strategies all provide multiple opportunities, through the use of Art Costa’s training, right, the Think-Pair-Share opportunities. They’re constantly having those opportunities to have new content and language put in through a dual-coding method ... Bob Marzano’s research, right? So, they’re seeing it, but they’re also hearing it, and they’re saying it, and they’re experiencing it with the pictures, and through kinesthetic motions: they’re writing about it. So, we’re constantly utilizing multiple modalities through the use of all of these
strategies. Yeah, they’re immersed in the language, and they’re constantly practicing it, here, there, and everywhere, so that there are echoes throughout their day. They’re seeing it on the Walls, they’re seeing it in actual authentic text, they’re writing about it, the teacher is intentionally modeling the use. And, the Language Function Wall, and the planning of the Language Function Wall, I think, is probably one of the most powerful things to come from SEAL, because of the intentionality of teaching the cognitive skills that are required, as well as the language, and knowing which grammatical aspects will trip them up, right, for our English learners. What are the tricky nuances of English, and what do I specifically need to teach because of things that transfer or don’t transfer? And so, making that intentional teaching on the part of the teacher.

All of them are just so incredibly powerful when it comes to instructing English learners.

Rubina: Well, I think for one, when they work together in the small groups with their cooperative paragraphs, with think, pair, shares, I think that it enables students that are either not feeling comfortable or confident enough to speak up, now they are, because they’re working in a small group. And then with the reinforcement of the focus walls, and just the chants, and repeating that strong vocabulary, and knowing the meaning, I think all of those help them greatly.

Responses to Culturally responsive strategies and how they impact academic learning

Protocol Question: Of the culturally responsive strategies you mentioned, how do they assist students in learning academic English?

Reed Elementary

Sophia: I guess in the sense that they identify themselves or they feel part of their classroom. You know, they’re here for quite a few hours. Some of them are here for six, seven, eight, some of them even 10 hours. For them, it’s like their home. So, obviously for them to feel welcome or identify to know that there is some culture from them, it does help them to feel comfortable and happy to be actually here. Cause that ...

Sasha: Oh, well I think the oral history about their family helps, because I can tell when parents help them or not. The kids that have gotten help, you can tell, because they have the pictures, they have the writing in there, and even if it’s in Spanish, there’s a lot of kids that have their parents write it in Spanish. I just, I have ‘em go up there, but the kids, some of them don’t know how to read, but they explain it anyway. Or I say, “Oh, this is that.” I translate it in English. Other kids have brought me in a piece of paper, and it was just one word writing on everything. Like, no pictures, nothing, so I kind of felt bad for them. Because the other kids had this elaborate, like some of them had elaborate pictures. Some pictures in there, you could tell they ... Some kids had nothing. I felt really bad. I’m like, “That’s okay.” I said, “You know what? I’m going to give you time to go draw a picture about this” and then they presented it. But their academic language, well, it’s very minimal for their age. So, I don’t know how that would transfer to that. I mean, I don’t know, ‘cause they’re so little. I don’t know how they would. Yeah, it informs me about ‘em and how much help they get at home. For me, that’s what it is.

Marina: Well with self portraits there’s a lot of describing themselves, so we’re taking our simple sentences and making them more colorful using more figurative language and when they describe themselves, which is somebody they know very well, so it’s a good topic for them. Certainly the oral family history lends itself to sequence very well and that was, we do this at the beginning of the school year because it helps, it’s building
towards writing, so first this happens, so transition was in there, commas, punctuation, getting them ready to then write a sequence about someone else, which lends itself to [inaudible] very well.

Joshua: I think just a happier child is maybe more apt to participate. So the more participation they get, probably the more learning they’re gonna get. The more they’ll get out of the education.

Inés: Does it help them with academic English? Well I felt like it was more kind of on that socio-emotional level, like that they’re connecting to the classroom and to the school and to themselves, and feeling I guess involved or feeling more connected to the school and the classroom and what’s going on. I would see it on that level I guess.

Ana: I think to see something that they’ve created, and to see their actual self around the classroom really takes ownership, and this is my classroom. I’m here. This is me. That builds confidence. I think it also builds a feeling of acceptance. Like, my teacher accepts me for who I am, and whatever I bring. All that confidence then is able to transfer into academic skills that they have. Not only that, but like if they feel confident about what’s on, they’re more apt to sharing, when they do the think-pair-share, and they’re more able to put their ideas out, because they feel accepted. I think that really celebrating that kids are different, and they all bring different things with them, and they all have strengths that they have, and that celebration within the classroom allows them to see, you know what, I might not be a really good reader, but my writing is awesome, and I love my writing. If they excel in one thing, it kind of helps them with all the other things, and the other things are able to have an impact that way. I mean, obviously expressing themselves would ... What’s the question again? Expressing themselves, the first part of learning a language is being able to silently take the language in, and then being able to start with your utterances, and building the language. When you have the confidence to really give your ideas, that’s when you’re really making a shift in the language. I think you need that to then be able to academically be able to express yourself, and being able to take your knowledge into the content that you’re learning. That’s the last level of being able to acquire a language.

Catherine: I wouldn’t say, honestly. I guess the self portraits. We tied in the paint charts that you get from- And they have fascinating names for some of their paints. I guess I would say the self portraits because we would talk about wavy hair, or kinky hair, or ... So I would say that, that would be one.

Becerra Elementary

Marcia: I think like on the self-portraits, I know for me anytime I do any kind of art I try to tie in writing. So, for example, if they’re writing about themselves, I want them to reflect, and we do a lot of poetry, so, again, academically they’re writing, they’re using adjectives, they’re describing themselves, they’re validating who they are.

So, he comes in once a week, and we just had a lesson with him yesterday, that’s why it came to my mind, and he’s been teaching lots of emotions and feelings, so, I just thought of him when we were doing the adjectives, you know, on how to describe a feeling, because that’s what we were talking about yesterday, and it was like on yesterday’s feelings were ashamed, so I just thought of ... I don’t know, I just made a connection.

Nicola: Well, some of them, when they describe themselves in the bio-poem I always tell them not to use Tier One words, like happy, good. I say, “You want to select words that describe you at a Tier Three.” At the beginning they didn’t understand what I was saying, Tier One, you know. So I told them that, because I know some teachers will say a penny
word or a dollar word. So I try to expose them to that vocabulary that I've been exposed to. I say, “You want to try to use Tier Three words. So we do that. I try to use my verbs here or my synonym words. I use those and they have dictionary books, so they'll look. So that’s what it means, and if it’s a Spanish word and they want to use it, I allow them to use it also. But I also ask them to please find out a word that explains it in English.

Well also, we did a bio-poem on Abraham Lincoln, I was trying to remember who it was. Or Martin Luther King, Jr. we did the important thing about Martin Luther King, Jr. So it’s just recalling some events that happened and using the proper vocabulary that I had exposed them already to. So I think that’s one way of doing it, in any poem I think, with it.

Teresa- I think that the strategies are all a wonderful place to begin our learning, because we know that, when we are teaching cognitive skills and the language of those cognitive skills, the best place to start is with familiar. And, so, when students are talking about themselves, it’s their avenue in ... we can utilize it as teachers as, one, a formative assessment, getting to know them, so that we can be culturally responsive; but we can always tap into any of these strategies to go from where they are or who they are, to where we want them to be. So, for example, with Self-Portraits, it’s an opportunity for us to get to know who this child is, to allow this child the avenue to speak about who they are, but it also gives us an avenue into comparing and contrasting, for example. Where this child can then compare and contrast themselves with another student in the room, and we can then infuse the vocabulary of compare and contrast, and language structures of compare and contrast, and teach adjective and noun placement in English, as opposed to adjective and noun placement in Spanish.

So, lots of language opportunities here, not only to develop social vocabulary, but academic vocabulary. So, they are wonderful places to begin, but also to return to throughout the year, for every cognitive skill.

Rubina- Think about when they learn about other cultures and they learn about ... they are able to put themselves in it. They understand. I think it’s very important for them to be able to compare, when they’re comparing/contrasting the differences and similarities, and just, like I said, understanding. “Oh, yeah, this is me and this is my family and this is where we come from.” They could talk about, and just the vocabulary that they learn about others and expressing the feelings, the emotions, the different and similarities in their cultures and in their traditions, I think that come ... they see it and are able to express it in both languages. I love the whole fact when they compare the cognates and that type of thing because they’re seeing that, “Yes, I have. Maybe I’m not using it, but I hear it at home.” Or I see, “Yeah, chocolate.” That type of thing. I see that that’s ... all of those things are very important to just feeling proud of who they are.
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