

A Case Study on Instructional Coaching for Teachers of English Language Learners

Lauren Odell, Modesto City Schools Modesto, CA

Lilia Ruvalcaba, Oxnard College Oxnard, CA (statistical analysis)

Abstract: One of the fastest rising student populations in California schools and other states are English Language Learners. Yet, teacher preparation programs do not adequately prepare teachers to support the needs of language learning in the context of their own classrooms. This creates a chasm of equity and access for our most needy students. However, despite this dangerous trend of unpreparedness, there are promising practices that have begun to emerge for supporting classroom teachers. Instructional coaching is one of them. The objective for this case study on The English Learner Group (TELG) was: (1) to analyze the effect of job-embedded professional development, if any, on English Learner students' academic achievement as measured by California State Assessments Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) results from the 2017-2018 Academic Year, and (2) to provide Dr. Sam Nofziger, the owner of TELG, with specific insights into the perceptions of his employees and the school districts TELG has served. There were four noteworthy findings which included an increase of ELL growth as measured by the SBAC and a decrease in the achievement gap between ELLs and English Only students as measured by the SBAC.

It is important to note that this case study was submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements in class EDL 561 with the Collaborative Online Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CODEL) program. CODEL is a joint Ed.D. program with California State University, Fresno and CSU Channel Islands. This project was initially conducted by doctoral students: Phyllis Grillo, Jazzie Murphy, Lauren Odell, and Lilia Ruvalcaba. Statistical analysis was performed by Ms. Ruvalcaba. The project was significantly edited and submitted for the purposes of CLEAR by Lauren Odell.

Keywords: *English Learners, Instructional Coaching, Induction Program, teacher preparedness, job-embedded professional development.*

Introduction

One of the fastest-growing student populations in the classroom is English Language Learners (ELLs) and it is projected that by 2025 nearly 25 percent of public-school students will be ELLs (NEA Policy Brief, June 2005). As demand rises, so does the need for training educational professionals, including district and site administrators, along with site teachers and support staff. It is critical that those within the educational community understand and address the

significant struggles ELL face in our public schools, as well as the supports and training needed by their classroom teachers.

The state of California, along with other states across the nation, requires annual testing of students. One such test is the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). The SBAC is part of California's testing program and is used not only to track whether students are ready and able to pursue higher educational opportunities, but also to hold districts, schools and teachers accountable for success or failure of students.

The purpose of this case study was to examine the services being provided at the site and what, if any, impact the services have on the performance of English learners. The CEO is interested in learning more about correlations between consultants, clients, services rendered, and academic performance of English learners as measured by California State Assessments Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium (SBAC) and English Learner Performance Assessment of California (ELPAC). This evaluation will specifically look at services provided during the 2017-2018 academic school year.

Company and Project Background

The English Learner Group (TELG), located in Fresno, California was founded in 2013 by Dr. Sam Nofziger. TELG self-describes as a “professional group of educators dedicated to the academic achievement of English learners” (“The English Learner Group,” 2018) as well as “serving the community of students whose first language is not English” (“The English Learner Group,” 2018). The English Learner Group, led by Dr. Sam Nofziger and a team of approximately 14 consultants (also referred to as TELG employees hereafter), offers a variety of services including administrative coaching (AC), instructional coaching (IC), professional development (PD), and systems coaching (SC) to a variety of school sites and school districts within the state of California (“The English Learner Group,” 2018).

Dr. Nofziger has an extensive background in education, including serving as an elementary school teacher (in both bilingual and English classrooms), an instructional coach as well as a school site and county administrator (“The English Learner Group,” 2018). Dr. Nofziger earned a BA in Liberal Studies and a credential from Fresno State University in 1987, a MA in Bilingual Cross-Cultural Education from Fresno Pacific University in 1996, and an Ed.D. from Northcentral University in 2016. He also holds a Multiple Subjects Teaching Credential, a Bilingual Cross-Cultural Special Credential, and an Administrative Services Credential from the State of California (“The English Learner Group,” 2018). Each of the consultants working in concert with Dr. Nofziger also have extensive backgrounds in education. Consultant backgrounds include, but are not limited to, teachers, administrators, literacy specialists, veteran support coaches, intervention teachers, and testing coaches. All consultants have a minimum of a bachelor's degree, most have master's degree and/or various educational credentials, and a couple have doctorate degrees.

As outlined in the both the original and revised Scope of Work, Dr. Nofziger was asked and provided the researchers with access to information on his clients, the schools and districts with which he worked. In return, the researchers agreed to provide complete confidentiality of all participants.

The finalized evaluation questions are listed below:

1. What was the impact, if any, on English Learner student achievement (as measured by SBAC) for clients who received TELG services?
2. Is there a difference between perceived TELG employee satisfaction and support received from the administration or district?

3. Is there a difference between TELG employee background and student achievement data, and overall TELG employee satisfaction?

Literature Review

Research in the field of English Language Learners (ELLs) is not new. However, as federal, state, and local laws evolve in regard to societal pressures and opinions of language instruction, immigrants, and politics, so does the interest in the overall subject. Nevertheless, the achievement gap between ELLs and English Only students (EOs) persists. Moreover, teachers continue to work with ELLs as best they can, yet without adequate training. Thus, the question remains: what difference, if any, does targeted professional development for teachers of ELLs make on student achievement?

Theoretical Framework. The theoretical framework used in this study is based on the work from Coady, Harper and de Jong (2011). They found that those teachers who have been specifically trained to instruct ELLs experience a greater sense of self-efficacy of reaching their ELL student population. They also assess the cultural and societal needs of ELLs in a more accurate manner. Teachers who have been given direct support in learning how to teach ELLs in both language and content areas have higher student achievement than those who do not. It is likely that providing these experiences to teachers is the key to closing the achievement gap.

Federal and State Context. In 1981, the courts mandated that ELLs are required to have designated English Language Development (ELD) time within the instructional minutes of their day by both state and federal law (Castaneda v. Pickard, 1981). Beginning in 2018, California utilizes two types of ELD: Designated ELD and Integrated ELD (ELA-ELD California State Framework, 2015). Designated ELD is time intentionally focused on language development, needed for ELLs with significantly limited English. Integrated ELD is language development integrated into content learning, used for ELLs with some limited English, but enough to be successful without a targeted class.

It is a critical note that ELD is not English Language Arts (ELA). This was established in 1974 with the watershed court case wherein the courts ruled that students with primary languages other than English still had the right to content learning regardless of the languages they spoke. (Lau v. Nichols, 1974). The common term used for this is “content access”.

In practice, this means is that secondary students (those in grades 6 - 12) must take an ELA course and ELD course when their English is significantly limited. This leads to students not taking other elective courses and compacts their schedules. For example, an English Language Learner must take an ELD course rather than an art elective or choir class. They must take the English intervention (the ELD course) instead.

To add to the complexity, nearly all ELD courses are not a-g approved (a-g, 2018). In the state of California, the University of California (UC) system has created prerequisites for all incoming freshman. These prerequisites are called “a-g”. “The intent of the ‘a-g’ subject requirements are to ensure that students have attained a body of general knowledge that will provide breadth and perspective to new, more advanced study” (University of California, Office of the President UCOP, 2018). However, nearly all ELD courses are not a-g eligible. Ultimately, ELLs who are not a-g eligible cannot attend the California State University (CSU) or UC system. Thus, ELLs seem to be at a greater disadvantage than EOs from the start in the very academic structures created to support them. It is important to note here that the researchers do not consider ELLs culturally, or in any other way, disadvantaged in any manner from non-ELLs, and come from a foundational mindset that all students have an abundance of cultural and social capital.

Trending Themes of Teaching for English Learners. In the field of educating ELLs, there have been two main schools of thought: grammar-based language learning and a communicative language school. In 1999, Pica researched the grammar-based approach and found that children do not respond positively to this approach overall. According to Pica, Canale, and Swain, the communicative based approach is more successful as it allows students to begin to communicate immediately, without the worry of incorrect grammar, form, and functions (Pica 1999, Canale & Swain 1980). Once a student has mastered basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) then they can begin to tackle cognitive academic language proficiency (CALPs).

In contrast, there are programs that provide effective ELL instruction include pedagogy regarding providing ELLs meaningful context (Coady, Harper & de Jong 2011). For example, a structure that has proved to be effective is Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). SIOP includes content objectives, language objectives, sentence frames for non-linguistic representations, visual cues, verbal participation and practice, scaffolding, advanced graphic organizers and more. Research has been conducted in classrooms that utilize the SIOP model (Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K., 2006; Kareva, V., & Echevarria, J. 2013) and McIntyre, et al. (2010) found those with access to the SIOP model outperformed those without access in both content learning and language learning.

Another popular framework utilized is called Sheltered Instruction. Specifically, in California, it is termed Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) (SDAIE, 2017). This framework provides strategies for students to learn content at the same time as building their knowledge of language and the structures required of the English language in which to communicate effectively. “SDAIE is a teaching approach intended for teaching various academic content (such as social studies, science or literature) using the English language to students who are still learning English” (SDAIE, 2017).

As discussed, platforms exist that are research-based and proven to be best practices in the efforts to support ELLs in both the learning of language as well as the learning of content, such as history, science, and mathematics. However, these platforms are not widely known or taught in teacher preparation programs or “induction” programs. Induction programs are post-bachelor degree programs that provide the necessary training required by law for a teacher to enter their first classroom. Since these platforms are not taught in induction programs, if ELLs are taught these research-based strategies, does it make a difference in student achievement?

With the above in mind, we look to the specific needs of the average ELLs and EO. Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock (2001) researched strategies that had the greatest impact within the classroom. Their meta-analysis found nine strategies that were most effective for student success. Additionally, in 2006, Hill and Flynn followed this data with an additional analysis. However, this time, the analysis was focused on the needs of ELLs. While the data revealed that the nine strategies remained the same, the priority, or statistical significance, of the strategies changed (see Table 1).

Table 1: Effective Strategies for Student Success

For ALL students	For EL Students
1. Identifying similarities and differences	1. Setting objectives and providing feedback
2. Summarizing and note taking	2. Nonlinguistic representations
3. Reinforcing effort and providing recognition	3. Cues, questions, and advance organizers
4. Homework and Practice	4. Learning groups
5. Nonlinguistic representations	5. Summarizing and note taking
6. Learning groups	6. Homework and Practice
7. Setting objectives and providing feedback	7. Reinforcing effort and providing recognition
8. Generating and testing hypotheses	8. Generating and testing hypotheses
9. Cues, questions, and advanced organizers	9. Identifying similarities and differences

In 2013, Hill and Miller updated Hill and Flynn’s work to include specific application for Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the new English Language Descriptors of California, which included Emerging, Expanding, and Bridging (2013). Again, the effect size of the nine strategies had not altered from the original data analysis of the ELL priorities.

Current Teacher Preparation. Students who choose the field of PK-12 education must complete teacher preparation studies. In the state of California, these programs are offered at private institutions, four-year colleges, as well as universities. Once the initial teacher preparation program--typically one year in length--is completed, a person is preliminarily qualified to teach. They receive a “preliminary credential”. However, even though the state of California and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) deems these individuals to be preliminarily prepared to begin their teaching career, not all of them receive quality training, or in some cases no training at all, regarding ELLs. Darling Hammond et al. (2009) reports, “Teachers are not getting adequate training in teaching special education or limited English proficiency (LEP) students. More than two-thirds of teachers nationally had not had even one day of training in supporting the learning of special education or LEP students during the previous three years” (2009).

The CTC adopted new standards for the teaching profession (CSTPs) in 2009. The changes included specific language to include all students with all needs. Other adjustments included adding additional sub-standards such as 3.6, which states: “Addressing the needs of ELLs and students with special needs to provide equitable access to the content” (CSTPs, 2009). In 2005, a survey was conducted by Gandara, Maxwell, Jolly & Driscoll that studied over 5,000 Californian teachers. In the study teachers revealed their biggest challenges as teachers. These challenges included struggles with instruction of ELLs. This leads the researcher to wonder why there is a significant struggle as compared to other types of ELLs or EOs. It is perhaps that teachers are not adequately trained in language development.

Another study completed in 2004 by Harper and de Jong noted that many programs refer to best practices for all and “good teaching”. This good teaching is supposed to be sufficient for all learners with all needs. Professional development is essential as we have evidence that not all programs even provide specific training. Diego (2013) provides another option to pre-classroom experience, which includes internships or extended field service. This alternative could be included as part of a teacher induction program. Others have suggested that induction programs

also require teachers to take a content course in a foreign language to understand the enormity of difficulty ELLs face in not only the language, but as well as the content learning. For example, Washburn (2008) teaches a class only in Chinese as a type of shock experience for those who have not experienced learning content in an entirely foreign language. All of these studies note that what is currently provided in our institutions of higher learning is not adequate for the daily needs of a PK-12 public school teacher with ELLs.

Professional Development. The author of this study has noted that there are research-based strategies known to support the achievement of ELLs in classes, such as SDAIE and SIOP. However, little Professional Development (PD) is provided in a meaningful way for those teachers to explore these strategies and apply them in a meaningful way within the context of their classroom. Research shows the amount and type, or structure of the PD, also matters. According to an extensive report published in 2009 by Darling-Hammond et al., while American teachers participate in PD, it is of little comparison to that of their international peers. The amounts of PD teachers are receiving is not having a positive effect on student achievement results. Darling-Hammond et al. found that “Research suggests that professional development of 14 hours or less has no effect on student learning, while longer-duration programs show positive and significant effects on student achievement” (p. 20).

For the purposes of this study, the researcher summarized the most common types of PD found in PK-12 institutions, which includes learning seminars that take place outside the classroom and peer-coaching within the classroom. By far, most PD is located outside the context of the teacher’s own classroom and far from the actual students they work with day-to-day. The researcher chose to focus on peer-coaching, coupled with PD providing the theory behind the coaching. Peer-coaching allows teachers to work together planning lessons, watching each other teach in demonstration-style learning, and reviewing practices to differentiate for the needs of the students. Darling Hammond et al. summarizes their research with the finding that teachers who receive coaching are more likely to practice and integrate their new learning than those who do not have access to coaches and receive a more traditional PD platform (2009).

Many policies and practices of ELLs vary with the current politicians in office. However, watershed court cases keep foundational practices in place: ELLs must receive language development along with grade level content learning. Most teacher induction programs do not adequately prepare teachers for the daunting task to teach this population both language development and content. Those that receive PD typically receive seminars where they are required to leave their own classroom and students to learn theory. However, research shows a fresh take on PD, peer-coaching, can make a significant difference in student achievement. It is this peer-coaching style of PD that was provided by TELG and studied by the researchers.

Evaluation Plan. The purpose of this case study was to examine the services being provided at the site and what, if any, impact the services have on the performance of English learners. The CEO was interested in learning more about correlations between consultants, clients, services rendered, and academic performance of English learners as measured by California State Assessments Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) and English Learner Performance Assessment of California (ELPAC).

Table 2: Evaluation Project Plan

Evaluation Questions	What Information is needed?	How will you obtain the information?	How will you analyze the information you obtained?
1. What was the impact, if any, on English Learner student achievement (as measured by SBAC) for clients who received TELG services?	ELPAC, SBAC scores; Districts who received services, which services rendered; timeframe for services rendered	TELG	Comparative analysis of ELPAC/SBAC scores by District, disaggregated by individual school sites who received TELG services
2. Is there a difference between perceived TELG employee satisfaction and support received from the administration or district?	Client list/contact information; ELPAC, SBAC scores; Districts who received services, which services rendered; timeframe for services rendered	TELG will provide contact list for clients;	Qualtrics to measure satisfaction; Comparative analysis of ELPAC/SBAC scores by District, disaggregated by service(s) rendered
3. Is there a difference between TELG employee background and student achievement data, and overall TELG employee satisfaction?	Employee contact list; ELPAC, SBAC scores; Districts who received services, which services rendered; timeframe for services rendered	TELG will provide contact list for employees;	Qualtrics to measure , employee satisfaction; Comparative analysis of ELPAC/SBAC scores by District, disaggregated by service(s) rendered

The goal for this program evaluation was not provide the CEO with an overview of the services provided and a summation of time spent at each school site/district, but to provide him with some insight on the best ways to market TELG services; to also market services in ways that are both impactful and grounded in research. Lastly, the researcher hoped to give the CEO some insight on how best to cultivate effective employees who are satisfied with their work and their results.

Methodology

This evaluation utilizes a mixed methods approach, employing both a comparative analysis of the quantitative data and a content analysis of the qualitative data to highlight/support any comments around district/administration support. To prepare this evaluation, ELA SBAC scores for California's EOs and ELLs were collected from the California Assessment of Student

Performance and Progress (CAASPP) website. The data was used to identify ELL achievement as compared to EO achievement, and to also further compare the achievement of ELLs enrolled in schools that received TELG services to the achievement of ELLs enrolled in schools that did not receive TELG services. To evaluate TELG employee satisfaction and their backgrounds, a Qualtrics survey was administered to 14 employees who worked for TELG in the 2017-18 academic year and provided coaching services. Comments were collected to analyze TELG employees' satisfaction of support received from the school site's administration or district.

Participants. The participants for this evaluation were TELG consultants who provided services during the 2017-18 academic year. A contact list was provided to the researcher by the CEO. There were 14 consultants in the population and as such that it was critical to garner as many participants as possible. After an IRB was approved, each consultant was invited to participate and all 14 consultants agreed. The researcher prepared an informed consent form and emailed it as part of the Qualtrics survey.

Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected from respondents and housed in Qualtrics on a server maintained by California State University, Channel Islands. Any personal identifying information was removed to protect respondent privacy, maintain confidentiality and remove any potential researcher bias.

Instruments. Once the researcher was able to confirm the evaluation questions and purpose of the study with the appropriate data released, a survey was created to gather the desired information. Considerations were given to Survey Monkey, Google Forms, and Qualtrics. Qualtrics was chosen for its overall dependability and statistical analytics. The survey instrument included 10 questions related to consultant background, 17 questions about administrative coaching services, 11 questions about instructional coaching services, and 3 transitional/informational questions to support the flow of the survey. Dependent on the number of school sites served, the survey questions repeated allowing respondents to provide unique responses for each school site. The next step in the evaluation process was to create and distribute a multiple question survey using the software Qualtrics, a simple to use web-based survey tool to conduct survey research, evaluations and other data collection activities. The survey focused on the following key areas: (1) employee background (including but not limited to age, employment status, highest position held.); (2) TELG services provided; (3) employee satisfaction with school site; (4) data used to measure satisfaction; and (5) willingness to continue providing services to the school site.

In addition to the consultant background data collection, the name of the school site(s) served was also captured. The survey included multiple choice and Likert scale questions. Lastly, one question allowed for each respondent to provide comments on each site/district. Fourteen consultants from TELG were surveyed and participation totaled 100 percent.

Data Collection

Quantitative. The responses collected in the Qualtrics survey analyzed TELG employee satisfaction and their satisfaction with school sites served. English Language Arts SBAC scores for California's EOs and ELLs were collected from the CAASPP website to measure the comprehensive performance of California's students and to further compare their performance with that of ELLs who received TELG services. The quantitative survey data was exported from the Qualtrics platform into Google Sheets to be coded and then imported into IBM's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. The test scores were exported from the CAASPP website into Microsoft Excel to be coded and then imported into SPSS to be analyzed to identify,

if any, growth or decline in ELL achievement, and to highlight the impact of TELG services. For the purposes of comparison, the researchers collected and analyzed archival test scores from the CAASPP website. These data were also exported into Microsoft Excel and further analyzed along the most recent academic year test scores. In evaluating survey data, the researchers found that the errors in skip logic required some aspects of the data to be aligned manually after being exported.

Qualitative. At the end of the Qualtrics administrative/instructional survey question blocks, respondents were provided the opportunity to share comments about each school site. Of the fourteen respondents, eleven provided twenty-three comments and generated 41 phrases/words about the individual school site or district they worked with. Taking a content analysis approach, the researchers coded the qualitative responses into three themes: Supportive, Neutral, and Non-Supportive. Each theme was used to determine if the patterns in the narrative responses related to the perceived support each consultant received from the district and/or TELG employee satisfaction.

Data Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected and analyzed for the purpose of this program evaluation. Employee demographics such as age, gender, additional language spoken, employment status, last position, educational and professional background, and retirement status were collected. Data about TELG services provided include, identifying a school/district where TELG services were provided, number of days served, TELG services provided, number of days spent overnight working with the school site, the type of services provided, the level of satisfaction with their relationship with the school/district, the data utilized to determine if respondent's work made a difference on student achievement, and respondent's interest in future employment with that school or district.

The data was exported from Qualtrics into google sheets. Data was reviewed for patterns and responses were organized by the school/district and TELG services provided. Fourteen participants responded to providing services to 31 schools/districts. The services provided were organized by school sites and districts.

The demographic data was reviewed, analyzed and organized using Qualtrics, Google Sheets, and Nvivo software for both qualitative and quantitative analysis (see Appendices F-I). The data regarding TELG services was reviewed, organized and analyzed using SPSS. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to test the difference between means that reflect participant satisfaction, such as overall satisfaction with the school, overall satisfaction with the school based on data, and the willingness to work with the school in the future. The independent variables were gender, age, number of language participant speaks, educational background, position held, use of data, services provided, retirement status, number of schools served and student achievement.

A dependent t-test analysis was used to answer the first question, what was the impact, if any, on English Learner student achievement, as measured by SBAC, for clients who received TELG services? Using SPSS, the dependent t-test compared the means of 2017 ELL student achievement to 2018 ELL student achievement on the CAASPP ELA SBAC. An additional dependent t-Test was used to compare the mean achievement gap on ELA SBAC between 2017 ELLs and EOs and 2018 ELLs and EOs.

An ANOVA and Pearson correlation coefficients were used to answer the third question: is there a difference between TELG employee background and student achievement data, and overall TELG employee satisfaction? Using SPSS, the ANOVA was used to determine if there is a difference among participant satisfaction and their categorical demographics. A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine if an association exists between any two variables among the participant's background, participant's satisfaction, and student achievement.

The qualitative data received through the survey was processed using a content analysis approach. Each comment or piece of data was categorized, classified, summarized and tabulated. Three themes emerged. The three themes were categorized as Supportive, Neutral and Non-Supportive. Additionally, the comments were then classified further by whether or not the data referred to a specific population. The identified populations included, in alphabetical order, consultants, district administrators, site administrators, site staff/teachers.

Confidentiality and Data Integrity. Throughout each step of the program evaluation, the researchers were cautious in ensuring the integrity of the data was maintained. In developing the survey instrument, the researchers repeated questions in each survey block to maintain consistency. Respondent confidentiality was explained in the informed consent form in an effort to solicit transparent responses.

The survey was sent to 14 TELG employees and 100% of those employees responded, making the survey reliable. However, TELG's CEO introduced the program evaluation to his employees. Posing as a threat to internal validity, although employees were assured anonymity, employees may have felt compelled to participate and as a result potentially were not as forthcoming in their responses.

Comparison. ELL achievement data, as measured by the ELA SBAC scores, was collected and compared with scores of EOs, and movement was compared from the 2016-17 academic year to the 2017-18 academic year. In addition to comparing ELLs to EOs, individual school sites that received TELG services were compared to California's ELLs. The researcher also sought to compare the school site test scores after receiving TELG's services to the scores prior to TELG's work. TELG employee satisfaction was gathered in an effort to examine potential connections to ELL student achievement.

Limitations. As with any research, there are limitations which affect the outcome of the study. This evaluation is no exception. The limitations of this evaluation, along with the mitigating actions taken by the researcher, are outlined below.

Sample Size. The sample size of the evaluation was limited to the fourteen consultants employed by TELG, which is a small population. While the researcher was able to secure the responses from all fourteen respondents, which represents 100 percent response rate, it is possible the 100 percent participation may have come as a result of the request to complete the survey coming from the owner of the TELG, Dr. Sam Nofziger. This request to complete the survey could have been perceived by the respondents as a mandatory requirement to employment as opposed to participation being optional. To mitigate this limitation, the researchers provided all respondents with information clearly stating participation was voluntary. Additionally, even though 100 percent of the population responded, the overall size of the population remained small. To mitigate for the small size of the population, inquiry about satisfaction was requested in three settings, relationship with the school, in response to the data, and the willingness to work with the school/district in the future.

Lack of Available/Reliable Data. When the original research questions were developed in the Scope of Work, the first question was designed to evaluate the impact, if any, on the

comparison between services provided and the results of the state test scores. The researcher expected the state test results to be released in early September, which would have provided sufficient time to analyze the data and meet the delivery deadline for this evaluation and assessment report of October 20, 2018. Unfortunately, state test scores for all school and district sites were embargoed, with no release date identified. This delay forced the researcher to retool the evaluation questions several times. However, the test data was finally released on October 2, 2018, which provided an opportunity for the researchers to create the finalized evaluation questions and answer them.

Instrument Used to Collect the Data. An issue which arose during the collection of the data was that although respondents were promised anonymity, for reasons unknown to the researchers, the names of the respondents were revealed to the researcher. To correct this error in data collection, identifying information was removed from the final survey data. The school site information was used to reference the state data. The researcher destroyed the identifiable raw data.

Self-Reported Data. As with any survey completed by respondents which contains quantitative and/or qualitative data, the data is considered self-reported. This means the resulting data cannot be independently verified. In other words, the researchers have taken the responses of the survey at its face value. With any self-reported data, there is the possibility it can contain sources of bias including, but not limited to selective memory, attribution, and/or exaggeration. Selective memory can include remember or not remember experiences or events that occurred at some point in the past accurately. Attribution can be the act of attributing positive or negative events/experience/outcomes to external forces. Exaggeration can represent the act of misrepresenting outcomes or embellishing events as more or less significantly than occurred.

Findings

Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected from respondents through collected through a survey created in Qualtrics. The quantitative survey data was exported from the Qualtrics platform, exported into google sheets and then imported into SPSS to be analyzed. The test scores were exported from the CAASPP website. The tables, below, were created during the data analysis. This data analysis was used to answer the three-evaluation questions in the Revised Scope of Work and are a part of the findings of this evaluation.

Participants' Background. Please see Table 3: Demographics - Frequency and Percentages for Demographic Characteristics of the Participants, below:

Table 3: Demographics.

Frequency and Percentages for Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Variable	n	%
Gender		
Male	2	14.3%
Female	12	85.7%
Age		
35-44	2	14.3%
45-54	3	21.4%
55-64	3	21.4%
65+	6	42.9%
Language		
Armenian	1	7.1%
Spanish	6	42.9%
None or No response	7	50.0%
Level of education		
Doctorate	2	14.3%
Masters	11	88.6%
Teaching credential	1	7.1%
Highest position		
Superintendent office	3	21.4%
District admin	3	21.4%
County admin	3	21.4%
Site admin	2	14.3%
TOSA	3	21.4%

Demographics.**Gender.**

Two of the participants are male (14.3%), and 12 of the participants are female (85.7%).

Age.

Two participants (14.3%) identify themselves between ages 35-44, three participants (21.4%) identify themselves between ages 45-54, three participants (21.4%) identified themselves between ages 55-64, and four participants (42.9%) identify themselves as 65 or older.

Language.

One of the participants (7.1%) speaks Armenian, six of the participants (42.9%) speak Spanish, two of the participants (14.3%) reported no other language, and five of the participants (35.7%) are the unknown, no response was given.

Education.

Two of the participants (14.3%) have a doctorate, eleven (88.6%) have a masters, and administration credential and one (7.1%) has a teaching credential.

Employment.

Three of the participants (21.4%) highest level job was Superintendent, Associate Superintendent, or Assistant Superintendent, three of the participants (21.4%) highest level job

was district administration, three of the participants (21.4%) highest level job was county administration, two of the participants (14.3%) highest level was site administration, and three of the participants (21.4%) highest level job was teacher on special assignment (TOSA).

Table 4: Retirement

Frequency and percentages of the Retired Status for the Participants.

Variable	n	%
Retired		
No	5	35.7%
Yes	9	64.3%
Months retired		
6-12	6	66.7%
12-18	1	11.1%
Other	2	22.2%

Retirement.

Five of the participants (35.7%) were not retired, and nine of the participants (64.3%) were retired. The mean months retired before joining TELG was 18.56 with a S.D. of 21.97.

TELG Services Provided by Participant to School/District

Table 5: TELG services provided per site

Type of service	n	%
Admin coaching	9	30.0%
Admin & Inst. coaching	9	30.0%
Inst. coaching	12	40.0%
Total	30	100.0%

Sites Served. Participants were asked to enter a number for how many schools they served during the 2017-2018 school year. The mean number of sites per participants was 5.5 (N=14) with a S.D. of 3.04. The minimum number of schools a participant served was one school, and the maximum was ten schools. The fourteen participants provided TELG services to thirty schools. The following data is gathered from the survey questions regarding participants satisfaction as TELG coach.

Of the 30 sites that received TELG services, nine (30.0%) received administrative coaching only, nine (30.0%) received both administrative and instructional coaching, and 12 (40.0%) received instruction service only.

Days of Service. Participants were asked how many days they provide services to each school on behalf of TELG in the 2017-2018 school year. The mean number of days of service provided per sites by a participant was 12.3 (N=30) with a S.D. of 9.92. The minimum number of

days of service provided per site was one day and the maximum was 41 days.

Overnight accommodations. Participants were asked how many overnights accommodations, if any, were required to do their work with each school. Six participants required overnight accommodations, the mean number of overnight accommodations for the six was 18.3 (N=6) with a S.D. of 13.9.

Table 6: Satisfaction with School Relationship by Participants that Provided Administrative Services

Level of satisfaction	n	%
Not at all satisfied (1)	0	0.0%
A little satisfied (2)	1	5.9%
Mostly satisfied (3)	3	17.6%
Definitely Satisfied (4)	13	76.5%
Total	17	100.0%

Satisfaction. The 17 participants that provided administrative coaching were asked to choose their level of satisfaction with each school from a list. Of the 17 participants, that provided administrative coaching, one participant (5.9%) was a little satisfied, three (17.6%) were mostly satisfied, and 13 (76.5%) were definitely satisfied. The mean for participant's satisfaction with each school was 3.7 (N=17) with an S.D. of 0.59. Additional data related to subsequent survey questions were found to be insignificant for this program evaluation.

Findings

Evaluation Question One. To answer the first evaluation question, *What was the impact, if any, on English Learner student achievement (as measured by SBAC) for clients who received TELG services?* SBAC data from 2017 and 2018 for ELs and EOs was analyzed using dependent t-test on SPSS (see Table 7). The four variables from a data sets are as follows:

- 1) ELLs Met Standards or Exceeded Standards in 2017 compared to ELLs Met Standards or Exceeded Standards in 2018.
- 2) ELLs Not Meeting Standards or were Nearly Meeting Standards in 2017 compared to ELLs Not Meeting Standards or Nearly Meeting Standards in 2018.
- 3) ELLs Met Standards or Exceeded Standards more than EOs Met Standards or Exceeded Standards and therefore closed the achievement gap in 2017 compared to 2018.
- 4) ELLs Not Meeting Standards or Nearly Meeting Standards less than EOs, and therefore closed the achievement gap in 2017 compared to 2018.

Table 7: Dependent t-test, Means, standard deviations, and sample sizes for the measures of English Learner and English Only vs English Learner

Variable	2017	2018
EL meets or exceeds		
Mean	10.63	12.50
Standard deviation	6.93	6.92
N	47	
EO v. EL achievement gap		
Mean	33.83	33.36
Standard deviation	16.19	20.32
N	47	

What was revealed was that there is a significant difference ($t = -2.135$, $df = 46$, $p = .038$) in mean English Learner who meets or exceeds which increases from 2017 ($M = 10.63$) to the 2018 ($M = 12.50$). In other words, schools/districts that received TELG services increased their SBAC mean score in the positive direction by 1.83 with a slight difference in standard deviations from the previous year. Furthermore, the achievement gap between EOs and ELs decreased slightly, a positive trend, though there is no difference ($t = .169$, $df = 46$, $p = .866$) in mean EOs versus ELs who meet or exceed from 2017 ($M = 33.83$) to 2018 ($M = 33.36$). Statistically speaking, the trend of decrease of the ELL achievement gap was slight. However, in educational settings, a 0.50% decrease in the achievement gap is a good move in the right direction for closing the achievement gap between EOs and ELLs.

State achievement also verifies the significance of growth for those working with TELG. state-wide, ELLs grew 0.53% from 2017 to 2018. For TELG schools that received services grew 1.98% from 2017 to 2018. Also, on average for the state of California, the achievement gap of EOs and ELLs grew by 0.53%, while TELG decreased the achievement gap by 0.47% closing the achievement gap.

Evaluation Question Two. In an attempt to answer the second evaluation question, *Is there a difference between perceived TELG employee satisfaction and support received from the administration or district?* The researcher determined that the qualitative data received and analyzed could not provide an answer to Evaluation Question Two. While there are many factors which led to the inability of the researchers to answer this question, the primary factor is that qualitative data is defined as data that can be observed and recorded through one-on-one interviews, focus groups and other similar methods. However, the qualitative data collected for this evaluation was generated through two questions in a single survey, the answers were self-reported, and the respondents never observed.

Although the question of perceived employee satisfaction and support received from the administration or district cannot be answered, there were other interesting connections revealed through the data relating to support received and respondent satisfaction. It was found that there was a potential connection between the level of support at the school/district site and employee satisfaction (see Appendix F-I).

A total of fourteen respondents completed the survey for this evaluation. Of the 14 who completed the survey, 11 respondents voluntarily provided additional comments to the survey question, "Please use the box below to add any additional comments in regards to this school/district." A total of 23 individual comments were received. Of the 23 comments received, a total of 41 phrases/words were identified relating to the school/district. Three identifiable themes emerged. Those three themes are Supportive, Neutral or Non-Supportive. Of the 41 total responses received, 22 phrases/words or 53.7 percent were categorized as Supportive, three or 7.3 percent categorized as Neutral, and 16 phrases/words or 39 percent categorized as Non-Supportive (see Appendix F).

Additionally, as the three identified themes were coded, another theme emerged which revealed to the researcher that there were four influential groups at the school/district level. Those four influential groups include Site Staff/Teachers, Site Administrators, District Administrators and Consultants. A total of 30 phrases/words were provided by the respondents and coded as influential groups. Of the 30 phrases/words indicating an influential group, the most frequently denoted influential group was Site Administrators with 15 responses or 50 percent of the total responses, followed by Site Staff/Teachers with 9 responses or 30 percent of the total responses. Consultants and district administrators with received 3 responses or 10 percent of the total responses each.

By then further categorizing the responses by influential group, it was revealed that five phrases/words or 12.2 percent of the responses were coded as Supportive for Site Staff/Teachers and five phrases/words or 12.2 percent were coded as Non-Supportive for Site Staff/Teachers. There were zero Neutral phrases/words coded for Site Staff/Teachers. Additionally, fifteen phrases/words or 36.6 percent of the phrases/words were coded as Supportive to Site Administrators, nine phrases/words or 22 percent were coded as Non-Supportive to Site Administrators, and two phrases/words or 4.9 percent were coded as Neutral for Site Administrators. Only one phrase/word or 2.4 percent were coded as Supportive for District Administrators, three phrases/words or 7.3 percent coded as Non-Supportive and one phrase/word or 2.4 percent coded Neutral for District Administrators.

The results stated above are of particular value on their own because it shows that respondents appear to have reported receiving overall support at the School/District level, but when looking at the data on general satisfaction, there is an additional potential connection found. In a separate survey question, respondents were asked, *"In general terms, how satisfied were you with your relationship with this school/ district?"*. The respondents were given four ratings to select from: Not Satisfied, A Little Satisfied, Mostly Satisfied and Definitely Satisfied. A total of eleven responses or 78.6 percent responses were received. Of those 11 responses, 1 response or 9.1 percent indicated the respondents were a Little Satisfied, 8 responses or 72.7 percent indicated they were Definitely Satisfied, and 18.2 percent or two responses indicated they were Mostly Satisfied. No responses indicated respondents were not satisfied (see Appendix I).

While more research is needed determine what, if any, connection exists between site support and employee satisfaction, it appears a supportive site administrator has the potential to positively affect the level of consultant satisfaction. Additionally, there may also be a connection between supportive Site Staff/Teachers.

Evaluation Question Three. In an effort to answer the final evaluation question, *Is there a difference between TELG employee background and student achievement data, and overall TELG employee satisfaction?* ANOVA test was conducted on SPSS to identify any differences between the means among overall satisfaction, overall satisfaction using data, and the willingness

to work for the school/district. The group variables chosen are, the age group, language, highest degree, last professional position held, retirement status, and type of services provided by TELG participants (see Appendix G).

Table 8: Mean and Standard Deviation of Participants Demographics, and Sample Size.

Variable	Standard Mean	Sample Deviation	Size
Age group	2.87	1.02	31
Language	.52	.51	31
Highest degree	3.31	.72	31
Last position held	1.97	.48	31
Retirement status	.55	.51	31
Type of service	1.94	.77	31

The ANOVA results did not show any significant difference in the means of overall satisfaction, overall satisfaction using data, and the willingness to work for the school/district of each of the group variables of age, language, highest degree, last professional position held, retirement status, and type of services provided by TELG participants (see Appendix I). Additionally, Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to determine if an association exists between any two continuous variables among the participants, their satisfaction based on services provided, and student achievement on the SBAC. Table 23a illustrated the descriptive data of the continuous variables.

Table 9: Mean and Standard Deviation of Participant Services Provided, Satisfaction, and Sample Size.

Variable	Standard Mean	Sample Deviation	Size
Number of schools served	6.59	3.21	29
Days served per school	12.13	9.82	31
SBAC Achievement Score	2.34	1.48	28
Part. satis. with Admin Services	2.61	.70	18
Part. satis. with Inst. Services	2.27	.83	22
Part. overall satis. with TELG services	2.40	.77	31
Part. overall satis. based on data	.68	.48	31
Willingness to work in the future	1.58	.67	31

The Pearson correlation coefficient results did not show any significant difference in the correlation involving the number of schools served nor the days each participant served each school. The resulting correlations between participant satisfaction based on the services provided and student achievement on the SBAC are shown in below.

Table 10: Pearson correlation between participant demographic, overall satisfaction and SBAC Achievement Score

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. SBAC Achievement Score						
2. Admin Satisfied	.64**					
3. Instruct Satisfied	.53*	.74*				
4. Overall satisfied	.58**	.96**	.97**			
5. Overall satisfied, data	.76**	.84**	.74**	.79**		
6. Overall future work	.42*	.46	.41	.40*	.50**	

Note. * indicates $p < 0.05$; ** indicates $p < 0.01$

The positive, high and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .64$, $p < .001$) between SBAC Achievement Score and TELG participant's satisfaction with administrative services indicates that the high SBAC Achievement Score is very strongly related to high TELG participant's satisfaction with administrative services provided.

The positive, moderate and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .53$, $p < .05$) between SBAC Achievement Score and TELG participant's satisfaction with instructional services indicates that the high SBAC Achievement Score is moderately related to high TELG participant's satisfaction with instructional services provided.

The positive, very high and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .74$, $p < .05$) between TELG participant's satisfaction with administrative services and TELG participant's satisfaction with instructional services indicates that the high TELG participant's satisfaction with administrative services provided is very strongly related to high TELG participant's satisfaction with instructional services provided.

The positive, moderate and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .58$, $p < .001$) between SBAC Achievement Score and TELG participant's overall satisfaction indicates that the high SBAC Achievement Score is moderately related to high TELG participant's overall satisfaction with services provided.

The positive, very high and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .96$, $p < .001$) between TELG participant's satisfaction with administrative services and TELG participant's overall satisfaction indicates that the high TELG participant's satisfaction with administrative services provided is very strongly related to high TELG participant's overall satisfaction.

The positive, very high and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .97$, $p < .001$) between TELG participant's satisfaction with instructional services and TELG participant's overall satisfaction indicates that the high TELG participant's satisfaction with instructional services

provided is very strongly related to high TELG participant's overall satisfaction with services provided.

The positive, very high and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .76, p < .001$) between SBAC Achievement Score and TELG participant's overall satisfaction based on data indicates that the higher SBAC Achievement Score is very strongly related to high TELG participant's overall satisfaction with services provided, based on the data.

The positive, very high and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .84, p < .001$) between TELG participant's satisfaction with administrative services and TELG participant's overall satisfaction based on data indicates that the high TELG participant's satisfaction with administrative services provided is very strongly related to high TELG participant's overall satisfaction with services provided.

The positive, very high and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .74, p < .001$) between TELG participant's satisfaction with instructional services and TELG participant's overall satisfaction based on data indicates that the high TELG participant's satisfaction with instructional services provided is very strongly related to high TELG participant's overall satisfaction with services provided, based on the data.

The positive, very high and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .79, p < .001$) between TELG participant's overall satisfaction and TELG participant's overall satisfaction based on data indicates that the high TELG participant's overall satisfaction with services provided is very strongly related to high TELG participant's overall satisfaction with services provided, based on the data.

The positive, moderate and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .42, p < .05$) between SBAC Achievement Score and TELG participants willing to work with the school/district in the future indicates that the higher SBAC Achievement Score is moderately related to high willingness of TELG participant to work with that school/in the future.

The positive, moderate and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .40, p < .05$) between TELG participant's overall satisfaction and TELG participants willing to work with the school/district in the future indicates that the high TELG participant's overall satisfaction with services provided is moderately related to high TELG participant willingness to work with that school/in the future.

The positive, moderate and significant correlation coefficient ($r = .50, p < .001$) between TELG participant's overall satisfaction based on data and TELG participants willing to work with the school/district in the future indicates that the high TELG participant's overall satisfaction with services provided, based on the data is moderately related to high TELG participant willingness to work with that school/in the future.

Conclusion

To answer the first research question, *what was the impact, if any, on English Learner student achievement (as measured by SBAC) for clients who received TELG services?* TELG services have a significant positive increase in the mean of the SBAC score for the schools they serve in the year 2018, compared to the 2017 SBAC data. The achievement gap remained relatively the same, except for a slight decrease in differences, closing the achievement gap between EOs and ELs. Additionally, the State achievement from 2017 to 2018 was 0.53%, yet TELG schools that received services grew 1.98% from 2017 to 2018.

To answer the third research question, *Is there a difference between TELG employee background and student achievement data, and overall TELG employee satisfaction?* There are

positive, substantial, and significant Pearson correlation coefficients among the TELG participants administrative, instructional or overall satisfaction, willingness to work and SBAC achievement data. In other words, The TELG consultants are satisfied the work performed at the schools and the higher the satisfaction, the higher the SBAC achievement scores.

Concerning TELG employee background and student achievement or participant satisfaction, the results did not show any significant difference based on the background of the TELG participants nor the services they provided.

Recommendations

Four key recommendations are provided below.

1. Strengthen communication between district and TELG employees.
2. Continue with the PD platform provided by TE
3. Further research TELG effect on ELL as data becomes available for future years.
4. Conduct additional research as new districts and states are served by TELG.

Strengthen Communication. There were some comments provided by TELG employees that suggested that the district/administration did not always provide TELG employees with the adequate support. Some reported that they were “disappointed” and felt as though there was a “lack of buy in”. Establishing regular meetings between the TELG employee, the district/administration, and perhaps TELG’s CEO to discuss successes/challenges. This may provide an opportunity to increase collegiality and address any perceived challenges as quickly as possible. The researchers found that when TELG employees felt supported by the administration, their satisfaction improved, and at those campuses, ELs students performed better.

Continue with the PD platform. The PD provided by TELG is working to increase ELL achievement data and decrease the achievement gap between EOs and ELLs. Continue to provide the theoretical learning coupled with the peer-coaching for in-class application of the theory learned by teachers of ELLs.

Further research with ELPAC. As English Language Proficiency Assessment of California (ELPAC) scores are made available by the State of California, use the data to further research EL achievement results. Also, apply the same methodology to future SBAC assessments to measure growth in additional years.

Conduct Additional Research with TELG. TELG company is quickly expanding. As they expand into additional districts and states other than California, further studies should be conducted on their professional development, in particular, their instructional coaching model. The objective for this case study on The English Learner Group (TELG) was: (1) to analyze the effect of job-embedded professional development, if any, on English Learner students’ academic achievement as measured by California State Assessments Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) results from the 2017-2018 Academic Year, and (2) to provide Dr. Sam Nofziger, the owner of TELG, with specific insights into the perceptions of his employees and the school districts TELG has served. Though several elements of data were embargoed by the state of California for timely evaluation of original elements, the final three elements evaluated were still of use to TELG. The three questions asked were: (1) What was the impact, if any, on English Learner student achievement (as measured by SBAC) for clients who received TELG services? (2) Is there a difference between perceived TELG employee satisfaction and support received from the administration of district? (3) Is there a difference between TELG employee background and student achievement data, and overall TELG employee satisfaction?

What was the impact, if any, on English Learner student achievement (as measured by SBAC) for clients who received TELG services?

The researcher found those ELL students who received support from TELG grew more than 3.5 times other ELLs in the state of California. Moreover, the ELLs grew faster than EOs, thus they closed the achievement gap. In contrast, the achievement gap in the state of California grew 0.54% for EOs and compared to ELLs. Also, the schools/districts that received TELG services had a significantly increased their SBAC mean score, a change in the positive direction of 1.83 from 2017 (M = 10.63) to 2018 (M = 12.50).

Is there a difference between perceived TELG employee satisfaction and support received from the administration or district?

The researcher determined that this question could not to be answered due to many factors as enumerated earlier in this evaluation. However, the effect of a supportive Site Administrator on consultant satisfaction seem to indicate a strong connection between those two categories. Additionally, when a supportive Staff/Teacher is added to the equation, the potential for consultant satisfaction can increase as well. The result is the opportunity for increased satisfaction for all parties, which may prove to be beneficial in the long-term for TELG.

Is there a difference between TELG employee background and student achievement data, and overall TELG employee satisfaction?

The researcher found little to report in the way of TELG employee background, student achievement data, and employee satisfaction. In general, those with higher degrees served more sites. The more days an employee served, the more they were likely to also travel and have overnight stays. There was a strong connection between overall satisfaction with site served and with satisfaction with data results. Also, if the employee was satisfied with the site, they would be willing to return and work with them in the future.

In short, TELG's work is making a positive difference with ELLs with whom they work. This is good news for families, school districts and the state of California at large. The moral imperative to ensure that all of California's students are succeeding is at the helm of TELG's work.

References

- a-g. (2018.) Retrieved from <https://www.ucop.edu/agguide>
- CAASPP Data. (2018). Retrieved from <http://www.caaspp.org/>
- Castañeda v. Pickard. (1981). Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/legalobligationsltr.asp>.
- ELA/ELD California State Framework. (2015). Retrieved from https://www.scoe.net/castandards/Documents/summary_ela-eld_framework.pdf
- California Commission on Teaching Credentials. (2018.) Data retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/leaflets/cl560c.pdf?sfvrsn=8db75dfc_2
- California English Language Descriptors. (2018.). Data retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/eldstndspublication14.pdf>
- California Standards for the Teaching Profession. (2009). Data retrieved from <https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/cstp-2009.pdf>
- Coady, M., Harper, C., & de Jong, E. (2011). From preservice to practice: Mainstream elementary teacher beliefs of preparation and efficacy with English language learners in the state of Florida. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 34(2), 223-239.
- CSU Long Beach. (2018). Library Guide, Qualtrics. Retrieved from <https://csulb.libguides.com/qualtrics>.
- De Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 101-124.
- Diego, D. J. (2013). Teacher preparation, professional development, and long-term English learners. *International Journal of Education*, 5(4), p1-p18.
- Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2006). School reform and standards-based education: A model for English-language learners. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(4), 195-211.
- Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). Listening to Teachers of English Language Learners: A Survey of California Teachers' Challenges, Experiences, and Professional Development Needs. Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE (NJ1).
- Garmstrom, A.L., & Costa, R. J. (2002). *Cognitive Coaching; Developing Self Directed Leaders and Learners*. 2nd ed. Maryland: Roman and Littlefield.
- Hammond, L. D., Wei, R. C, Andree A., Richardson, N., & Ophanos S. (2009). Professional Learning in the Learning Profession: A Status Report on Teacher Development in the United States and Abroad. *The School Redesign Network at Stanford University and National Staff Development Council*. CA: National Staff Development Council.
- Harper, C. and Jong, E. (2004), Misconceptions About Teaching English-language Learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48(2): 152-162. doi:10.1598/JAAL.48.2.6
- Hill, J., & Flynn, K. (2006). Classroom Instruction That Works with English Language Learners Denver, CO: McRel.
- Hill, J., & Miller, K. (2013). Classroom Instruction that Works with English Language Learners Denver, CO: McRel.
- Kareva, V., & Echevarria, J. (2013). Using the SIOP Model for Effective Content Teaching with Second and Foreign Language Learners. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 1(2), 239-248.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. Jossey-Bass Publishing.

- Lankshear, C., Gee, J. P., Knobe, M., Searle, C. (2002). *Changing Literacies*. PA: Open University Press.
- Lau v. Nichols. (1974). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-el-201501.pdf>
- Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. (2001). *Classroom Instruction that Works*. Denver, CO: McRel.
- McIntyre, E., Kyle, D., Chen, C. T., Muñoz, M., & Beldon, S. (2010). Teacher learning and ELL reading achievement in sheltered instruction classrooms: Linking professional development to student development. *Literacy research and instruction*, 49(4), 334-351.
- National Education Association. (2005). *Research Talking Points for English Learners*. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/home/13598.html>.
- Pica, T. (1999). Tradition and Transition in English Language Teaching Methodology. *Pergamon*. 28, 1-18.
- SDAIE. (2017.) Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Specially_designed_academic_instruction_in_English.
- The English Learner Group. (2018). Home page. Retrieved from <http://www.theenglishlearnergroup.com>.
- The English Learner Group. (2018). Contact page. Retrieved from <http://theenglishlearnergroup.com/contact>.
- Washburn, G. N. (2008). Alone, confused, and frustrated: Developing empathy and strategies for working with English language learners. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 81(6), 247-250.
- Young, E. (2010). Challenges to conceptualizing and actualizing culturally relevant pedagogy: How viable is the theory in classroom practice? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(3), 248-260.