

Acknowledgements

Author

Rebecca Vonderlack-Navarro, PhD
Senior Policy Analyst

Editor

Barbara Buell

Cristina Pacione-Zayas
Education Director

Sylvia Puente
Executive Director

About the Series: This is a three-part series written by the Latino Policy Forum (see Appendix for the preparation of the brief series). The purpose of the series is to promote the importance of linguistic and cultural responsiveness in both pre-and in-service teacher preparation. The initial policy brief provides demographic data and research to illustrate the rise of diversity within the Illinois student population and how it differs with the largely white, female, and monolingual workforce. The second summarizes growing scholarly consensus on the specified knowledge and skills all teachers need to be linguistically responsive. The final brief summarizes current education policies and implications for linguistically and culturally diverse students followed by a call to action with a specific policy framework for change.

Changing education systems—like raising a child—takes the efforts of the entire community: educators, parents, policy-makers, elected and appointed officials, nonprofit leaders, community representatives, students themselves, and many others. It is the Forum's expectation that this series will have a positive impact on all those who are directly or indirectly concerned about teacher preparedness for today's classroom.

The Latino Policy Forum is the only organization in the Chicago-area that facilitates the involvement of Latinos at all levels of public decision-making. The Forum strives to improve education outcomes, advocate for affordable housing, promote just immigration policies, and engage diverse sectors of the community. It does this by conducting analysis to inform, influence, and lead, all with an understanding that advancing Latinos advances a shared future.

Our mission: To build the power, influence, and leadership of the Latino community through collective action to transform public policies that ensure the well-being of our community and society as a whole. The Latino Policy Forum works to ensure that all Latino children have access to high-quality education services that are linguistically and culturally responsive.

The Latino Policy Forum would like to thank **The Joyce Foundation**, whose generous support funded the planning process and production of this report.

The Forum offers sincere “gracias” to an extensive team of collaborators. This brief series would not have been possible without the generous contribution of time and talent from the following individuals:

Generously funded by
TheJoyceFoundation

Advisory Work Group

Elizabeth Cardenas-Lopez, *Chicago Public Schools Language and Cultural Education*

Patricia Chamberlain, *Erikson Institute*

Victoria Chou, *Dominican University*

Dr. James Cohen, *Northern Illinois University*

Dr. Miguel Fernandez, *Chicago State University*

Dr. Margo Gottlieb, *Illinois Resource Center and World-Class Instructional Design*

Dr. Amy Heineke, *Loyola University Chicago*

Gloria Henllan-Jones, *Illinois Federation of Teachers*

Theresa Insalaco, *Illinois Federation of Teachers*

Vanessa Larson, *Illinois Federation of Teachers*

Dr. Kristin Lems, *National Louis University*

Dr. Luisiana Melendez, *Erikson Institute*

Dr. Peggy Mueller, *Chicago Community Trust*

Olivia Mulcahy, *Illinois Resource Center*

Dr. Ngoc-Diep Nguyen, *Northeastern Illinois University*

Erica Okezie - Phillips, *McCormick Foundation*

Victor Perez, *Illinois Education Association*

Beatriz Ponce de León, *Chicago Community Trust*

Delia Rico, *Christopher House Elementary Chicago Public Schools*

Dr. Elizabeth Skinner, *Illinois State University*

Dr. Sonia Soltero, *DePaul University*

Dr. Simeon Stumme, *Concordia University Chicago*

Joyce Weiner, *Ounce of Prevention Fund*

Josie Yanguas, *Illinois Resource Center*

Dr. Judy Yturriago, *Northeastern Illinois University*

The views expressed in this brief series are explicitly those of the Latino Policy Forum and should not be taken to represent the views of any of our contributors, volunteers, work group members, or their affiliated organizations.

Linguistic and Cultural Competency Standards as Part of Teacher Pre- and In-Service Preparation: A Comprehensive Illinois Policy Framework

While a “majority-minority” student population has long been a reality in Chicago, 2011 marked the first time that minority students were the majority in kindergarten, first, second, and third grade classrooms *across all of Illinois* (for further demographic information and sources see Brief 1 of series). A large part of this demographic shift is comprised of students who come from immigrant families, hold a range of native- and English-language abilities, and are adapting to the U.S. school system.

Linguistically and culturally diverse students, particularly English Language Learners (ELLs)¹, need opportunities to learn high-levels of academic content while also developing academic language. A well-prepared teacher is equipped with the specialized skills to address these dual demands. With the increase of this population, it is reasonable and logical that all teachers be prepared to teach them. The heightened teacher accountability standards along with amplified language and literacy demands of the Common Core State Standards intensifies this imperative.

Despite the need for educators to have additional training and preparation, too often students are taught by teachers who lack such preparation.² The policy framework articulated in this brief aims to ameliorate this substantial challenge. First, the brief summarizes various federal and state education policies and their influence on linguistically and culturally diverse students, with particular emphasis on ELLs. Second,

“The problem is that no nation has got better by focusing on individual teachers as the driver. Better performing countries did not set out to have a very good teacher here and another good one there, and so on. They were successful because they developed the entire teaching profession – raising the bar for all.”

Michael Fullan (2011) *Choosing the wrong drivers for whole system reform*. Centre For Strategic Education Seminar Series Paper No. 204, May 2011:

<http://www.schoolclimate.org/climate/documents/policy/school-reform-drivers.pdf>

it provides a comprehensive policy framework to ensure all teachers are linguistically and culturally competent.

The development of this policy framework draws on a review of research regarding language, literacy and teacher preparation along with insights from a pre- and in-service teacher preparation work group convened by the Forum (see appendix). The views expressed in this brief are explicitly those of the Latino Policy Forum and should not be taken to represent the views of any of our contributors, volunteers, committee members, or their affiliated organizations.

I. Setting the Stage: National- and State-level Policy Context

Various practices, whether intentional or not, shape the everyday instruction of linguistically and culturally diverse students and, for ELLs more specifically, can also encourage their quick transition into general education classrooms (See Drop Box 1 for how students are classified). This section is a sampling of federal and state policies intended to enhance teacher quality, standardize achievement, and intensify accountability and the implications they pose for educating today’s range of linguistically and culturally diverse students.

Historically ELL classifications have been simply defined—ELL versus non-ELL. Today clearer more nuanced descriptions are necessary. The categories in the following chart provide a broader consideration for the range of linguistically and culturally diverse students present in today’s schools.

No Child Left Behind Act, 2002

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (NCLB) provided intensified consideration for ELLs by disaggregating their scores and holding schools accountable for their English language development and academic content knowledge.⁵ The legislation, however, is not without criticism.

NCLB mandates that ELLs take standardized tests in English,

DROP BOX 1

Descriptions of Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students

- › **Heritage speakers (never ELLs):** from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds and fully proficient in English. They tend to be students who speak a language other than English in the home at various levels of proficiency, but may not be literate in that language.
- › **Current ELLs:** students who are not yet proficient in English and require language supports. These students are generally enrolled in a Transitional Bilingual Education program or Transitional Program of Instruction.²¹
- › **Reclassified ELLs:** students who have been reclassified because they have met the state criteria for English language proficiency.
- › **Linguistically and culturally diverse students with special needs:** any of the aforementioned students with an individualized education plan (IEP).²²

whether or not they have reached language proficiency.⁶ Because the assessment is administered in English it does not account for academic gains that might be more accurately assessed in the student's home language. Increased use of standardized testing poses a significant conundrum because of the emerging diverse student population.

While there is no shortage of critiques on the overall merits of standardized testing, for those on their way to learning English, the reliability, validity, and fairness of such accountability measures are especially dubious: "Simply put, when children do not understand the language of the test, they are unable to demonstrate what they have learned," according to assessment expert James Crawford.⁷

Although such tests intend to assess content knowledge (e.g. of science or mathematical concepts), the results are often invalid, as many ELLs are required to take them before their English language skills are developed enough to comprehend the questions. Accountability measures also cause some districts to only focus on standardized state testing while neglecting data that could help instructional improvement, especially classroom-based formative assessments in the home language. (See Drop Box 2 for further assessment considerations.)⁸

The legacy of high stakes accountability attached to testing in English places emphasis on remedial reading skills in English resulting in inappropriate literacy interventions (see brief 2 for further detail). NCLB also places priority on quick English language proficiency. As a result, instruction that equally values the development of subject matter and academic skills—which might be better accessed in the home language that a student better understands—is deemphasized.⁹

In addition, NCLB's emphasis on "highly qualified teachers" underscores the depth of their content knowledge with no

mention of their linguistic and cultural competence. This perpetuates the myth that teaching ELLs involves "just good teaching" or, at best, a generic set of instructional modifications. Attention and resources dedicated to providing teachers with specialized knowledge and skills necessary to differentiate instruction are downplayed. Such teaching makes subject matter accessible for students whose first language is not English.¹⁰

NCLB compliance along with student demographic shifts are significant as referenced in the first brief. There is a growing number of linguistically and culturally diverse students in classrooms with greatly varied levels of English skills and academic content knowledge. Many teachers have not received the appropriate coursework or professional development to support the effective inclusion of these students.

Race to the Top and Teacher Quality, 2009

The focus on teacher quality—preparation, certification, and evaluation—has accelerated within the Race to the Top (RTT) Fund established by the Obama administration. In order to receive a competitive grant and consequent flexibility not available under the rigid NCLB, state recipients need to illustrate initiatives aimed at "recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most."¹¹

Overhauled Teacher Evaluation, Tenure, and Dismissal

One of the most contentious components of teacher quality reforms is determining how to measure and identify an effective teacher. A feature of RTT is the effort to overhaul long-standing evaluation systems that rate the majority of

DROP BOX 2

Assessment Considerations for Increasingly Diverse School Populations

While standardized tests in English present significant challenges for ELLs, arguments to entirely do away with them are neither politically feasible nor necessary. At the same time, culturally and linguistically valid assessments are critical to accurately measuring the achievement gains of ELLs. This entails assessments that are purposefully designed to support student home language and cultural values. Rather than relying on one source of data, many educators endorse the use of a continuum of assessments: instructional, common instructional, interim, and standardized. This would be inclusive of assessments designed by teachers and reflective of their school population along with those that are externally imposed.

Common instructional assessments are created locally by educators to provide personal and school-level accountability. This includes information that is classroom specific (e.g. common learning objectives or evidence to redirect a lesson plan) along with agreed-upon measures across multiple classrooms developed collaboratively by teachers and leaders within professional learning communities. Such locally determined assessments can account for the cultural and linguistic composition of the school (e.g. English language proficiencies, availability of technological resources, types of language supports, etc.).

Interim and standardized assessments, by contrast, are created by test developers and externally mandated with wider implications for district and state-level accountability. The latter measures allow for little participation from teachers and school leaders and generally do not take students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds into account.

In *Breaking Through, Effective Instruction and Assessment for Reaching English Learners* (2012), Dr. Margo Gottlieb provides this helpful chart, adapted here, to distinguish different forms of achievement measures and their implications for English learners.

Common Instructional Assessment for Measuring Academic Achievement	Interim and Standardized Achievement Tests
Designed and developed specifically for English learners	Not necessarily designed, piloted, or field tested on sufficient numbers of English learners
Created by educators for educators	Created by test developers
Have strong ties to curriculum and are representative of instruction	Have loose ties to curriculum and instruction
Consist of performance-based tasks and projects with high levels of student interaction and original student work	Consist of items often discrete and skill-based and may represent low levels of cognitive engagement
Represent what is valued in classroom teaching and learning	Does not necessarily represent what is valued in teaching and learning
May possess validity, but are not necessarily highly reliable for language learners	May be highly reliable but are not necessarily valid for language learners
Needed to help balance educational accountability	Dominate educational accountability

Similar to No Child Left Behind, the assessments for the Common Core State Standards will be used to hold schools accountable to English language development and standardized tests of academic content knowledge. A window of opportunity is emerging for the educational community to provide wider considerations of the variety of assessments at its disposal and the relative weight attached to their influence.

A true account of how ELLs are progressing within an era of heightened standards and accountability will require the use of assessments that are valid for ELLs, considerate of classroom practice, and provide timely feedback for differentiated instruction.

As classrooms across Illinois become increasingly diverse, elevating the use of the culturally and linguistically sensitive instruments available in common instructional assessment should provide the essential "counterbalance," as Dr. Gottlieb contends, to the often inaccurate nature of standardized testing.

teachers as satisfactory or above, regardless of student achievement.

Proponents argue that in order to make evaluations meaningful (i.e. identify and reward capable educators), student data and classroom observations are to contribute to a teacher's yearly rating. Ratings serve as the foundation for determining tenure protection and who is affected first in layoffs. Less apparent, however, is what teacher effectiveness denotes for students who are on their way to learning English.

Even before the federal push, Illinois was considered ahead of the curve in passing teacher evaluation legislation. The Illinois Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010, to be fully phased in by 2017, mandates that districts design and implement evaluations for teachers and principals to include quantifiable measures of student performance data on standardized tests and an observational rubric to monitor professional practice.¹²

The evaluation system has provoked debate of how much influence should be given to student performance data on standardized tests and if the system reinforces teaching to the test. In addition, there is doubt about the logistical and financial limitations of time consuming training and testing for thousands of Illinois administrators on the new on-line evaluation system.¹³

Even more cloudy are the implications of the evaluation system for educators of students from varied linguistic and cultural backgrounds. As the Common Core State Standards continue to be implemented, much remains to be known about its assessment system. Illinois is part of the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), which has developed the K-12 assessment system aligned to the Common Core State Standards implemented in 2014-2015 school year. (PARCC Accommodations Manual is available at: <http://www.parcconline.org/print/parcc-draft-accommodations-manual>.)¹⁴

Questions remain about PARCC modifications for ELLs and the validity and reliability of the assessments if they are normed for native English speakers. It is also unclear if and how various assessments will be incorporated into the state accountability system.

The observational rubric for Illinois has generated debate regarding the extent to which it was designed, piloted, or field tested for linguistically and culturally diverse students. Perhaps another important question might be why the rubric was not tested on students younger than 4th grade. This is a concern for early childhood educators in general, but also because a large number of ELLs are in this age group (e.g. 65% of ELLs are within the preK-3rd grade span¹⁵). While there are efforts to develop resources to support the rubric in



early childhood settings, it is unclear if similar steps will be taken to support the evaluation of linguistically responsive instruction.¹⁶

Teacher Candidate Licensure

An attempt to improve educator effectiveness is the new Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) for teacher candidates to attain licensure, piloted during the 2013-2014 school year with roll-out starting September 1, 2015. It is not yet known how sensitive the tool and its evaluators will be to linguistically and culturally responsive instruction.

As evidence of teaching practice, the pre-service assessment process requires teacher candidates to submit artifacts (e.g. 15 minute video clips, lesson plans, and student work samples) and commentaries (e.g. description, rationale, and self-reflection of lesson plans, preparation, and teaching practice). Prospective teachers are then evaluated across five areas: planning, instruction, assessment, analyzing teaching, and academic language.

The nationally benchmarked assessment allows candidates to demonstrate the knowledge and skills considered essential for student learning. The assessment is developed in partnership with the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE), the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, and Pearson PLC (an education publishing and assessment service). It is seen as an integral addition to other state assessments of basic skills, subject matter knowledge, coursework, and faculty observation of field experiences.

The goal of the edTPA is dual-pronged: first, to certify that prospective teachers meet the necessary standards and skills demanded by the profession; second, to urge pre-service programs to promote these components within their preparation. The edTPA outcomes are considered a data source for analyzing pre-service candidates and programs strengths and weaknesses.

The standardized high-stakes nature of the assessment has raised concern. It is up to each state to determine the edTPA passing score, which governs the proportion of candidates who receive licensure. Still in the pilot phase, much remains to be known for how this will play out in Illinois. It is important that edTPA have linguistically and culturally responsive standards to guide the evaluation of candidates within diverse settings.¹⁷

Opportunity for Change: Illinois Teacher Licensure

Illinois is also in the process of streamlining teacher licensure as a means of decreasing the number of certifications from 66 to 3: Professional Educator License, Educator License with Stipulations, and Substitute License. The new legislation also fortifies alternate routes to Educator License and streamlines multiple alternative programs into one. The change will include a new endorsement system according to grade span, content area, and student population.¹⁸ There are also adopted rules aimed at strengthening the content expertise for endorsements.¹⁹

Along with the changes in licensure, teacher preparation programs are revamping to demonstrate how their programs meet the following standards: Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, the Core Technology Standards, Content-Area Standards for Educators, the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics, Illinois Early Learning Standards, and the Illinois Learning Standards based on the Common Core.²⁰

The new revamped Illinois licensing system creates the opportunity to add linguistic and cultural teaching standards. In 2013 ELL standards were being developed by the Illinois State Board of Education to guide bilingual and ESL endorsements. At this point in time, the standards do not apply to general education candidates.

The newly articulated standards for ELLs can do more than influence pre-service coursework for bilingual/ESL specialists. Now is an opportune time to have the standards influence the profession in the following linguistically and culturally responsive ways:

- ▶ Apply specific competencies to pre-service coursework for all educators
- ▶ Influence content for ongoing professional development;
- ▶ Intensify priority for field experiences within diverse settings;
- ▶ Influence certification exams and their evaluators;
- ▶ Guide the design and implementation of a supplementary observational rubric for teacher evaluations built around the standards. Prior to implementation the tool would also be piloted and field tested for diverse students at multiple grade levels.

Extending the standards across the profession would ensure that the vast changes intended to improve teacher quality would consider every student present in today's classroom. While the Illinois State Board of Education is already spearheading efforts to create standards for the bilingual and ESL endorsements, it will take a myriad of stakeholders to create system wide change.

II. Call to Action: Preparing All Teachers for Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students

1 **RECOMMENDATION** Implement standards to drive pre-service coursework specific to preparing linguistically and culturally responsive teachers. The teaching standards would be informed by a coherent framework with appropriate specificity for bilingual, ESL, and general education pre-service PreK-12th grade teachers.

The teaching standards could include:

- ▶ Theoretical, pedagogical, and methodological knowledge and skills of first and second language development applicable across the birth-12th grade span;
- ▶ Inclusive of the spectrum of linguistic and cultural diverse students comprised of ELLs, Reclassified ELLs, special education, and heritage speakers;
- ▶ Understanding the validity, purposes and forms of assessments, and the use of multiple measures for decision-making;

- ▶ Culturally responsive curriculum and instruction;
- ▶ Sociopolitical dimensions of language use and language education (see brief 2 for a further articulation of these ideas).

2 **RECOMMENDATION** Ensure quality implementation of linguistically and culturally responsive teaching standards within all pre-service teacher programs to include two- and four- year institutions and alternative education programs.

All levels of teacher preparation at the Associate, Baccalaureate, and Masters Degree levels are to include comprehensive up-to-date knowledge, techniques, and methods for teaching students from varied linguistic, cultural, and ability backgrounds.

Novice teachers within alternative licensure programs are also in need of such preparation. Many of them are placed with high numbers of ELLs and research finds their preparation on the appropriate pedagogical strategies to support student



language and content knowledge development is scant.²¹

The NCLB designation as highly qualified teacher needs to include appropriate knowledge and skills based on the teaching standards for linguistic and cultural diverse students.

3 **RECOMMENDATION**
Implement pre- and in-service preparation policies and guidelines so the teaching standards influence: (1) licensure examinations (2) field experiences (3) faculty expertise (4) ongoing professional development (5) teacher evaluations and (6) school- and district-level collaboration. Each of these specified areas is addressed below.

1. Licensure exams and evaluators

Licensure exams directed by the standards can certify that teachers work effectively with students with diverse language and learning needs.

2. Field experiences

This can be facilitated by joint partnerships—school districts, early childhood education providers, community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education—to support teacher candidates receiving culturally and

linguistically rich apprenticeship experiences that connect theory with practice. These partnerships can be mutually beneficially to attend to supply and demand needs. This also includes the development and expansion of international teacher and faculty exchange programs to incentivize language immersion. Potential partners to foster this goal could be foundations, federal grants, consortium agreements of institutional cooperation, and sabbatical for faculty.

3. Faculty expertise

If pre-service is to keep pace with diverse student populations, priority needs to be placed on attracting faculty with such expertise. This goal must also take precedence within community colleges where the majority of early childhood staff is educated. The Associate level, in particular, often lacks sufficient coursework for preparing teachers of children from birth-to-age eight who are not proficient in English.

Institutions of higher education can also create and implement a Seal of Competency that acknowledges excellence in preparing teachers who serve linguistically and culturally diverse students. The Seal could be driven by a monitoring system partially informed by a voluntary survey of teacher candidates to rate their readiness. The Seal could be accompanied by a public relations campaign to boast the pre-service program's reputation and visibility.

Faculty with expertise in linguistic and cultural competence can also conduct and disseminate research to highlight best



practices in promoting multilingualism in public schools, with specific consideration for the effectiveness and scalability of various instructional and curricular methods. University experts can work in conjunction with foundation and government entities to collect and analyze longitudinal data as part of program evaluations. Such research, particularly the collection of data over time, could be disaggregated across a number of variables to inform policy and practice: race/ethnicity, parent education level, family income, immigrant generation status, national origin, and home language.²²

4. Ongoing professional development

Veteran teachers need routine and ongoing opportunities for learning based on the teaching standards for linguistically and culturally diverse students. This would allow teachers to learn from each other and other experts in the field about up-to-date research and other resources pertinent to this student population. Ideally, this type of in-service preparation would be experiential and collaborative.

5. Teacher evaluations

When compared to value-added models, teacher observation rubrics can function as practical, formative evaluation tools that can inform with greater specificity how teachers can modify their practice to meet the needs of their students. With articulated linguistic and cultural teaching standards, school districts can specify expectations for teachers of diverse students. Clear expectations can foster meaningful feedback and improve teaching practices and behaviors that can elevate student outcomes.

Preferably, the teaching standards would allow for coordinated expectations within pre-service coursework, ongoing professional development, and the observational tool for teacher evaluations.

6. School- and district-level collaboration

Professional learning communities (PLCs) can be a critical vehicle to foster collaboration between content and language teachers. School leaders play a pivotal role in championing inclusive teamwork and consensus building at school and district levels. By upholding planning time and communication, leadership can promote information sharing and goals in regards to common assessment, academic language development, culturally responsive curriculum decisions, grading, and creating links between Common Core and Language Development standards.²³

To foster this goal, bilingual/ESL teacher specialists are to be represented in leadership roles at both school and district levels along with teacher unions to influence planning, curriculum, instruction, family and community engagement,

assessment, professional development and conditions for learning. Increased representation of language specialists can endorse that expectations around the achievement of linguistically and culturally diverse students are school- and district-wide goals.

Informed leaders can also advocate that lead bilingual teachers/administrators be allotted time to use their expertise outside of bilingual programming to educate and influence school-wide concerns as they relate to linguistically and culturally diverse students. Teacher specialists can work as consultants to mainstream teachers or as classroom aides to provide support in addressing both linguistic and academic student needs. The specialists could also support monolingual teachers with parents and families who speak languages other than English.

Along with teachers, school counselors, psychologists, speech pathologists, and social workers can be a part of school-wide efforts to support and foster the socio-emotional and academic needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students.

III. Conclusion

As referenced earlier in this brief (page 7, “Opportunities for Change: Illinois Teacher Licensure”) the implementation of the teaching standards across various aspects of the profession creates an opportunity to initiate a state-led taskforce of pre- and in- service experts in the field of educating linguistically and culturally diverse students. This task force would also collaborate with leaders within the Illinois State Board of Education, Deans of Education and Teacher Preparation Department Chairs, parents and other stakeholders. In addition, the linguistic and cultural teaching standards can be promoted within other school professions: school counselors, psychologists, speech pathologists, and social workers.

Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students is a critical task that requires both systemic and programmatic change. This brief summarized current education policies and implications for linguistic and culturally diverse students followed by a call to action with a framework for change.

The foundation for teacher effectiveness is how well they are prepared to teach the children who are in front of them. As the student demographic continues to transform, teachers—along with principals and all other educators—must be prepared with the knowledge and skills to capitalize on the rich language and cultural assets in today’s students. The future of Illinois is inevitably tied to the educational success of of this vibrant and growing student population.

Appendix: Preparation of the Brief Series

Through a six-month process, the Latino Policy Forum sought to take a wider look at how Illinois might ensure that all students have access to culturally and linguistically relevant education. The process entailed the following:

- ▶ Conducting a review of research regarding language, literacy and teacher preparation and the demographics of the Illinois ELL population.
- ▶ Convening a pre- and in-service teacher preparation work group to review, reflect on, and make suggestions to developing a statewide approach to fortify teacher preparation for linguistically and culturally diverse students. Their comments provided insight in the development of this policy brief series.
- ▶ Developing this brief series to include recommendations to provide linguistically and culturally responsive teacher preparation.

The work group represented educators and philanthropic leaders with extensive experience in language education and pre-service

and/or in-service preparation. Through smaller breakout sessions, members discussed the various impediments and potential solutions to strengthen linguistically and culturally diverse student achievement. Widely respected education research and data analyses support the themes and feedback generated by the work group: amplified coursework and content on linguistic and cultural competencies, strengthening higher education capacity to prepare linguistically and culturally responsive candidates, priority for diverse fieldwork experiences, heightened professional knowledge on the complexity of linguistically and culturally diverse students with special needs. These will be discussed in briefs two and three.

The views expressed in this brief are explicitly those of the Latino Policy Forum and should not be taken to represent the views of any of our contributors, volunteers, committee members, or their affiliated organizations.

Endnotes

- ¹ The acronyms English Language Learners (ELL), English as a Second Language (ESL), and Dual Language Learner (DLL) have historic roots among educators of children whose native language is not English. In Illinois the use of English Learners (EL) has also begun to be used. Among academics none is considered incorrect, and although they are often used interchangeably, some individuals or groups may have strong preferences for one or another. For the sake of consistency with references, citations, quotes, etc. the acronym ELL will be used throughout this report.
- ² Hopkins, Megan and Amy J. Heineke (In Press). "Teach For America and English Language Learners: Shortcomings of the Organization's Training Model," *Critical Education*.
- ³ ELLs are generally placed in two types of instructional programs: (1) Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE), when 20 or more ELLs of the same language classification are enrolled in the same class or center, instruction is offered in the student's home language with additional English as a Second Language instruction. (2) Transitional Program of Instruction (TPI), when 19 or less ELLs of one or more native languages are in a classroom instruction is offered in English but assistance is offered in the native language as determined by the student's level of English proficiency.
- ⁴ Personal communication with ELL expert Dr. Margo Gottlieb served to inform these categories.
- ⁵ Flores, Stella M., Jeanne Batalova, and Michael Fix. (2012). "The Educational Trajectories of English Language Learners in Texas." 10th Anniversary Migration Policy Institute. Accessed November 10, 2014: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/TexasELLs.pdf>
- ⁶ Villegas, Ana Maria and Tamara Lucas (2011). "Preparing Classroom Teachers for English Language Learners: The Policy Context," *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A Resource for Teacher Educators*, Edited by Tamara Lucas. Routledge, NY.
- ⁷ Crawford, James (2012). "What does a valid and reliable accountability system for English language learners need to include?" in *English Language Learners at School: A Guide for Administrators*, Edited by Else Hamayan and Rebecca Freeman Field. Caslon Publishing: Philadelphia, PA.
- ⁸ August, D. and Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language minority youth and children*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
Valdes, Guadalupe and Martha Castellon (2011). "English Language Learners in American Schools. Characteristics and Challenges," *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A Resource for Teacher Educators*, Edited by Tamara Lucas. Routledge, NY.
- Bilingual Education and World Language Commission. (2010). *Language education: Preparing Chicago public school students for a global community*. Chicago: Chicago Public Schools. Accessed January 16, 2012: <http://www.olce.org/pdfs/BEWL/BEWLpercent20Commissionpercent20Fullpercent20Reportpercent20v7.pdf>
- Gottlieb, Margo and Diep Nguyen (2007). *Assessment and Accountability in Language Education Programs. A Guide for Administrators and Teachers*. Caslon Publishing: Philadelphia
- ⁹ Villegas, Ana Maria and Tamara Lucas (2011). "Preparing Classroom Teachers for English Language Learners: The Policy Context," *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A Resource for Teacher Educators*, Edited by Tamara Lucas. Routledge, NY.
- ¹⁰ Harper, Candace A. and Ester J. de Jong (2009), "English language teacher expertise: the elephant in the room," *Language and Education*, Vol. 23, No. 2, March 2009, 137-151
- Villegas, Ana Maria and Tamara Lucas (2011). "Preparing Classroom Teachers for English Language Learners: The Policy Context," *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A Resource for Teacher Educators*, Edited by Tamara Lucas. Routledge, NY.
- ¹¹ Crowe, Edward. "Getting Better at Teacher Preparation and State Accountability Strategies, Innovations, and Challenges
- ¹² "Illinois State Board of Education Comprehensive Strategic Plan for Elementary and Secondary Education," Progress Report June 2011. Accessed June 3, 2013: http://www.isbe.net/reports/strategic_plan11.pdf
- ¹³ "Education for Our Future: First Report and Recommendations of the Illinois P-20 Council to the Governor, the General Assembly, and the People of Illinois." (January 2011). Accessed April 14, 2013: http://www.iccb.org/pdf/reports/Final_P20_Report.pdf
- Bock, Jessica (August 12, 2012). "TEACHERS Missouri, Illinois set to give teacher performance new scrutiny amid national push," stltoday.com. Accessed August 20, 2012: http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/education/missouri-illinois-set-to-give-teacher-performance-new-scrutiny-amid/article_54325af5-4011-548d-ba3a-3d9155e5693f.html
- ¹⁴ "Education for Our Future: First Report and Recommendations of the Illinois P-20 Council to the Governor, the General Assembly, and the People of Illinois." (January 2011). Accessed April 14, 2013: http://www.iccb.org/pdf/reports/Final_P20_Report.pdf
- ¹⁵ Illinois State Board of Education, Bilingual Education Programs and English Language Learners in Illinois SY2012 Statistical Report . http://isbe.net/research/pdfs/ell_program_stat_report11.pdf
- ¹⁶ 2013 Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT) with Early

Endnotes *continued*

- Learning Supports. Danielson Synopsis at the Center for the Study of Education Policy Illinois State University. Accessed September 4, 2013: <http://education.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/csep/Danielson%20Synopsis%20for%20webpage.pdf>
- ¹⁷ Accessed June 3, 2013: <http://scale.stanford.edu/teaching/edtpa>
Accessed June 20, 2013: <http://edtpa.aacte.org/faq#23>
- ¹⁸ Accessed July 6, 2015: <http://www.isbe.net/licensure/pdf/ELIS-faq.pdf>
- ¹⁹ "Illinois State Board of Education Comprehensive Strategic Plan for Elementary and Secondary Education," Progress Report June 2011. Accessed June 3, 2013: http://www.isbe.net/reports/strategic_plan11.pdf
- ²⁰ "Illinois State Board of Education Comprehensive Strategic Plan for Elementary and Secondary Education," Progress Report June 2011. Accessed June 3, 2013: http://www.isbe.net/reports/strategic_plan11.pdf
- ²¹ Hopkins, Megan and Amy J. Heineke (In Press). "Teach For America and English Language Learners: Shortcomings of the Organization's Training Model," *Critical Education*.
- ²² Castro, Dina C., Eugene E. Garcia, and Amy M. Markos "Dual Language Learners: Research informing Policy. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute, Center for Early Care and Education—Dual Language Learners. Accessed June 24, 2013: http://cecerdll.fpg.unc.edu/sites/cecerdll.fpg.unc.edu/files/imce/documents/%232961_NatPressClubBrief3.pdf
- ²³ Gottlieb, Margo (2012). "Tips from the Top." *The Journal of Communication and Education Language Magazine*. Accessed January 5, 2013: http://languagemagazine.com/?page_id=4951