

Interdisciplinary collaboration in a teacher education preparation program: Integrating ESL and content to strengthen teacher candidates' understanding

Mary Petron, Ph.D.
Sam Houston State University

Burcu Ates, Ph.D.
Sam Houston State University

Jill Pagels, Ed.D.
Sam Houston State University

Abstract

As the population of Emergent Bilinguals/English learners (EB/ELs) in Texas public schools continues to rise, educator preparation programs face increasing pressure to ensure that all teacher candidates are adequately prepared to meet their diverse needs. This article highlights the mismatch between teacher preparation and the instructional needs of EB/ELs, particularly the limited integration of ESL strategies and accommodations into content-area methods courses. Drawing on research and a case study at Sam Houston State University, the authors explore how ESL faculty collaborated with content methods instructors to revise a common lesson plan template (CLPT) by embedding Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) components throughout. The resulting template, CLPT-ESL, requires teacher candidates to integrate purposeful language accommodations across all lesson plan stages, fostering more linguistically responsive instruction. Initial pilot results suggest the revised template increased teacher candidate engagement, deepened understanding of language supports, and enhanced lesson delivery for EB/ELs in field placements. The article concludes with practical recommendations for institutions seeking to embed ESL strategies and accommodations into general teacher preparation coursework, even in programs with limited stand-alone ESL courses.

Keywords: English as a second language, lesson planning, emergent bilinguals, sheltered instruction

Nationally, the percentage of public-school students identified as Emergent Bilinguals/English learners (EB/ELs) has been steadily increasing. In fall 2021, EB/ELs accounted for 10.6% of public-school students in the United States (NCES, 2024). Notably, Texas had the highest percentage among all states, with 20.2% of its public-school students classified as EB/ELs (NCES, 2024). According to the recent data from the Texas Education Agency (2024), approximately 5.5 million students were enrolled in Texas public schools during the 2023-2024 school year. The percentage of students classified as EB/ELs in 2023-24 school year rose to 24.3% (Texas Education Agency, 2024). These numbers highlight the growing linguistic diversity in Texas classrooms and emphasize the critical need for resources, support systems, and educational policies that address the needs of EB/ELs within the state's educational framework.

There is also a growing mismatch between the backgrounds of PreK-12 teachers and the students they serve, especially EB/ELs. While classrooms are becoming increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse, the majority of teachers continue to be White, middle class, monolingual English speakers, and predominantly female (Li & Peters, 2020; Nieto, 2018). This mismatch can pose challenges in delivering instruction that is culturally and linguistically responsive to the needs of EB/ELs.

EB/ELs are frequently placed with teachers who lack the specialized knowledge and instructional strategies needed to support their language development effectively (Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, & Driscoll, 2005; Gándara & Santibañez, 2016; Li & Peters, 2020; Osipova & Lao, 2022). Some teachers have no formal preparation at all, or only limited exposure gained through isolated courses or professional development workshops completed to fulfill

required training hours (Gándara, et al., 2005; He, et al., 2011; Li & Peters, 2020).

Literature Review

The Role of Teacher Preparation Programs

The increasing number of EB/ELs in Texas public schools presents both obstacles and opportunities for teacher educators. In teacher preparation programs there is a need to prepare teacher candidates who can successfully deliver effective instruction to the culturally and linguistically diverse student population they will encounter in their future classrooms (Bland, et al., 2023). However, faculty in teacher education programs who have long since left the classroom may have little experience and training working with EB/ELs. To address this issue, some universities in Texas have stand-alone courses taught by ESL faculty in their degree plans. The College of Education at SHSU is committed to addressing this need by offering three dedicated ESL methodology courses to train future educators to support EB/ELs effectively.

We searched multiple undergraduate course catalogs from Texas universities for the EC-6 Core Subjects certification. We found that some universities have ESL methodology courses required in their degree plans, while others do not. For example, the flagship Texas A&M University offers two courses: English as a Second Language I and English as a Second Language II. At Texas A&M University Kingsville, teacher candidates are required to take one ESL related course, choosing between Teaching Emergent Bilingual Students or Literacy Development for English Language Learners. The University of Texas Permian Basin offers one 3-credit course: Second Language Acquisition Principles EC-6. A few universities, such as Texas State University, offer an EC-6 Core Subjects with an ESL Certification track. Only students on that track are required to take a 6-credit ESL block, which includes a field component. The University of North Texas has a similar track in its B.S. in Education program: EC-6 Core Subjects with Science of Teaching Reading and ESL Supplemental. This track requires students to take two ESL courses: Understanding and Teaching Multilingual Students and Teaching English as an Additional Language. Several universities such as Stephen F. Austin University and Lamar University do not offer any required ESL-focused courses in their teacher preparation program. Even so, the siloes of expertise typical in educator preparation programs may hinder teacher candidates from understanding how specialty classes like ESL and Special Education fit into general education classrooms.

Certainly, some university programs may integrate the needs of EB/ELs into regular course work,

like methods courses. However, a cursory look at education textbooks shows that EL instruction is often not a priority in textbooks. For example, Mann (2016) examined five elementary-level English Language Arts (ELA) methods textbooks used in teacher education programs at Florida universities and found out that less than 5% of the content in four of them focused on teaching methods, curriculum, or assessment for EB/ELs. The study demonstrated textbook authors seem to place less value on the knowledge and practices needed to teach EB/ELs compared to those for native English speakers. EB/ELs were often stereotyped as a single group of struggling readers, defined mainly by what they lacked in English proficiency. It has been our experience that EL instruction is often the last chapter of the book which teacher educators may not have time to address with any rigor or again because they lack the knowledge base. Therefore, it is imperative that all teacher educators develop a knowledge base of working with EB/ELs so that their needs can be addressed *throughout* all courses (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). This forges a connection that is beneficial for teacher candidates. In addition, the textbooks selected for teacher education programs should be culturally responsive, portraying EB/ELs not from a deficit perspective, but recognizing the strengths and assets they bring to the classroom.

Costa et al., (2005) emphasized that teacher educators must actively engage in learning about language and culture themselves so they can meaningfully incorporate this knowledge into their own disciplines and better support their teacher candidates in working with EB/ELs. Roy-Campbell (2013) noted that literacy teacher educators who prepare future teachers to work with EB/ELs need more formal preparation to effectively meet the needs of EB/ELs. Hallman and Meineke (2017) analyzed teacher educators' responses to questions about teaching diverse learners and EB/ELs within the context of English Language Arts preservice teacher education programs. In their analysis of the focus group discussions, an overarching theme surfaced, "combination of external pressures (e.g., lack of licensure/certification in many states), as well as internal pressures (e.g., absence of coursework addressing the teaching of EB/ELs within teacher education programs) contribute to this [teaching about diverse learners and EB/ELs within the context of English Language Arts] area of pre-service teacher education as overlooked." (p. 77). In addition, the teacher educators frequently highlighted the importance of infusion of content, related to the teaching of EB/ELs.

Effective Instruction for Preservice Teachers

There has been a shift in teacher education preparation that moves from isolated methods courses to a comprehensive professional preparation program (Hollins & Warner, 2021). The Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) published the Clinical Teaching Standards (2023) that encompasses 11 Standards for teacher education preparation programs. Standard 2 - Coherence addresses the need for programs to “connect methods, foundations, and clinical coursework to create meaningful content, tasks, and activities...” (ATE, 2023, p.5).

All teacher candidates need to be prepared to teach EB/ELs. Summarizing the literature on preparing non-specialist teachers for culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms, Lucas and Grinberg (2008) reported, among other things, key adjustments teacher education preparation programs can implement (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). Structural changes are described in three categories: add a course, modify existing courses by infusing attention to teaching EB/ELs, and add or modify preprogram requirements. As noted above, some Texas universities have shifted to standalone ESL courses. Yet, a key language related skill for teachers is the integration of language instruction in content classes. Fostering collaboration across the boundaries of educational preparation programs is recommended. As PreK-12 teachers are encouraged to have interdisciplinary collaboration, so are faculty in teacher education preparation programs.

Effective Instruction for EB/ELs

Sheltered language instruction and content-based language teaching has been used for several decades to support second language growth while learning academic content. Several framework systems, such as Experiential Language Learning, Task Based Instruction (TBI), Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), and the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) are used. The SIOP Model is research supported (Echevarria, et al., 2024). Integrating language learning across all content areas from math to social studies is critical to EB/ELs success (I & Martinez, 2020; Rutt, et al., 2020).

The SIOP model is a research-based framework developed in 2004 (Echevarria et al., 2024) used across all content areas to support EB/ELs and is organized around eight key components (Echevarria et al., 2024). To successfully implement the model, teachers need to follow these steps. First, in *Lesson Preparation*, the teachers clearly define content and language objectives and choose appropriate materials and activities for EB/ELs. In *Building Background*, the instruction connects students’ prior knowledge and experiences to new concepts while explicitly teaching the key vocabulary. In *Comprehensible*

Input, the teachers use modeling, visuals, and well-paced speech to make the content understandable. In *Strategies*, the students are taught and encouraged to use learning strategies, including higher-order thinking and problem-solving. In *Interaction*, the lessons include meaningful opportunities for discussion, group work, and peer collaboration to support language development. In *Practice and Application*, the students engage in hands-on activities that allow them to apply content and language knowledge. In *Lesson Delivery*, the teachers present lessons that meet the stated objectives and maintain a high level of student engagement throughout. Finally, in *Review and Assessment*, the lessons include regular reviews of key concepts and ongoing assessments to monitor the student progress (Echevarria et al., 2024). The SIOP Model is used in ESL methodology courses in SHSU’s educator preparation program.

The diverse learning needs of EB/EL students can be addressed through purposeful planning of both content and language objectives using the SIOP model and could bridge the gap in academic achievement (Duff, 2023). Research has shown that teachers who implement the SIOP Model with fidelity see measurable gains in EB/ELs’ academic achievement and English language proficiency (Short, et al., 2012). Several studies emphasize the SIOP Model’s strength in increasing student engagement and improving outcomes in diverse classrooms (Piazza et al., 2020; Daniel & Pray, 2017; Desjardins, 2020; Furr & Garcia, 2018). For example, McIntyre et al. (2010) found that consistent use of SIOP strategies fostered greater participation and comprehension among EB/ELs. Moreover, teacher professional development focused on the SIOP framework has been linked to increased awareness and application of linguistically responsive teaching practices (de Jong et al., 2013). Critics of the model note the challenges of full implementation, particularly in settings with limited resources or insufficient training. However, proponents argue that even partial implementation can yield significant benefits when tailored to meet the specific needs of EB/ELs in a given context (Daniel & Conlin, 2015).

The Study

The purpose of this study was to examine and document our efforts to improve teacher candidates’ ability to deliver effective instruction to EB/ELs in mainstream pre-K and elementary school classrooms. These efforts included the cross-disciplinary integration of ESL methods into the general content methods coursework in the first semester of year-long clinical teaching. The idea was to directly embed ESL methods into the existing framework of general teacher preparation in science and social studies

methods courses. We had long noted that while teacher candidates were effective in designing SIOP lesson plans, these ESL components were not present in their general lesson plans, even though EL/EB students were represented in the classrooms where they did their clinical teaching.

This study used a case study approach to examine how SHSU prepares future teachers to work with EB/EL students. A case study is beneficial to understanding a program in-depth, especially when the goal is to learn more about how it works in practice (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Saldaña & Omasta, 2022). We used an instrumental case study design (Stake, 1995), which means the focus was not just on describing the SHSU program but also on learning from it to inform broader conversations about preparing teachers for culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. This type of case study is often used in teacher education and TESOL research because it helps uncover how teachers learn, grow, and apply what they are taught (de Oliveira & Yough, 2021; Johnson, 2021).

At SHSU, all teacher candidates complete ESL methodology coursework that prepares them to work with EB/ELs. In our ESL Methodology II course, they learn about the SIOP model and how to apply it through lesson planning and practice. Many of our students complete their clinical teaching in schools with high numbers of EB/ELs, which gives them real-world opportunities to implement these strategies.

To better understand how our program supports teacher learning, we reviewed a range of materials, including course syllabi, student lesson plans, field placement records, and reflective writings. We also examined notes from ESL course instructors, faculty meetings and program planning sessions that focused on integrating ESL practices. These data helped us see not only what is taught, but how it is applied and improved over time. Using a case study helped us tell the story of SHSU's approach and what others can learn from it. As Merriam and Tisdell (2016) remind us, case studies are especially useful in education because they let us understand the "how" and "why" behind good teaching practices in real-world settings.

Context

Sam Houston State University (SHSU), located in Huntsville, Texas, is a regional public institution with a long-standing commitment to teacher preparation and educational excellence. Founded in 1879 as Sam Houston Normal Institute, it was one of the first teacher-training schools in Texas. The university's mission remains deeply rooted in its origins as a normal school emphasizing hands-on, practice-based learning experiences, particularly in the field of education. SHSU enrolls around 21,000 students,

many of whom are first-generation college students. The College of Education is particularly committed to bridging theory and practice and maintains strong partnerships with school districts to provide a year-long clinical teaching program that offers immersive experiences for teacher candidates.

As teacher educators in the Bilingual/ESL program, we have taught all of the ESL methodology courses in the educator preparation program. In addition, we have provided comprehensive training on ESL methodologies and instructional strategies to a wide range of educators across our region. This includes in-service teachers working in local school districts, faculty members at regional universities, and educators attending sessions at regional education service centers. Many of these educators had not previously received formal coursework in ESL and expressed a strong desire to enhance their ability to effectively support EB/ELs in their classrooms. Teacher educators also attended with the desire to integrate ESL instruction into the classes they teach. Through these efforts, we have aimed to build capacity in communities where access to specialized ESL training was limited, fostering more inclusive and responsive instructional practices for culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Overview of ESL Methodology Courses and the Need for Integration

The SHSU educator preparation program provides a foundation in ESL methodology courses that prepare preservice teachers with research-based strategies supporting English learners. There are three key ESL methodology courses in the PreK-3, and EC-6 specializations:

1. Second Language Acquisition is an introductory course which focuses on language acquisition theories and philosophies, bilingual/ESL program structures, and curriculum development aligned with educational policies. There is no required field experience component.
2. English as a Second Language Methodology I introduces ESL instructional strategies, specifically focusing on second language literacy skills in reading and writing, SIOP lesson planning, and classroom observation, with a required 10-hour field experience. This course is taken concurrently with a 6-credit literacy block which has a field component, and students complete their ESL hours in the same setting.
3. English as a Second Language Methodology II emphasizes the research-based SIOP model and the importance of integrating language instruction with content-area instruction for EB/ELs. It

includes the design of curricular materials and assessments and requires 15 hours of field experience. This course is taken concurrently during the first semester of the year-long clinical teaching (YCT), where teacher candidates are in the schools three days a week. They complete their ESL hours at the same school.

Middle level education students also take three ESL classes, but their configuration in the degree is different. Therefore, we only describe the PreK-3 and EC-6 programs in this article.

Despite these foundational course offerings, the challenge lies in incorporating ESL-specific accommodations into the various lesson plan templates across teacher preparation courses, particularly in content-area methods courses. While the teacher candidates in ESL methodology courses receive explicit guidance on ESL strategies and scaffolds, they often lack the direct focus of integration in other instructional plans. This gap results in surface-level accommodations, without deeper understanding of how to support language development in math, science, literacy, or social studies lessons. By integrating ESL accommodations at every stage of lesson planning, the teacher candidates gain a more comprehensive and intentional approach to working with EB/ELs.

Joining Forces

In ESL Methodology I, students learn the SIOP method and write SIOP lesson plans. SIOP was chosen because of the research base and the fact that it provided a blueprint to follow for teacher candidates. This helps teacher candidates consider EB/ELs' needs *throughout* a lesson. ESL Methodology II has a field component and is taken with the content methods courses of science and social studies. Since the educator preparation follows the yearlong clinical teaching model, students are in the classroom three days a week where they are able to work with EB/ELs. In ESL Methodology II students were required to design and teach a SIOP lesson that addressed at least two different levels of language proficiency (beginner, intermediate, advanced and advanced high) in Texas represented in their field placements during these days in the field.

ESL faculty had debated the value of having students design and teach another SIOP lesson plan. There was a disconnect between what students designed and taught in their content methods courses and the lesson they designed and taught as a requirement of the ESL Methodology II course. This disconnect was apparent because students did not include the same kinds of accommodations when submitting lesson plans in the

content methods. Instead, they copied and pasted an English Language Proficiency Standard and added an accommodation, like having a bilingual buddy or providing a bilingual dictionary. No consideration was given to the proficiency level of the EB/ELs in the classroom or the need to provide accommodations throughout a lesson. At the same time, content methods faculty felt they needed to stay in their lane because they themselves lacked training in ESL. Our discussions in the ESL program focused on the need to diminish the siloes between ESL and general education faculty and coursework by bringing ESL into content methods in a way that made sense for students. These discussions came at a critical time when our teacher preparation program was engaged in discussions on a unified scope and sequence.

In the educator preparation program, a push was made to interconnect classes so that students would have a sense of continuity, as well develop a strong scope and sequence in the educator preparation program. In the summer of 2023, the social studies and science methods classes developed a draft of a common lesson plan template (CLPT) for the program. This effort was made to standardize the lesson plan format, rather than having each instructor use whatever format they chose. While faculty believe in academic freedom, too much freedom resulted in confusion from the student perspective. The CLPT would initially be adopted in fall 2024 into the methods courses during the students' final year. ESL faculty were initially not in these discussions. However, through Pre-K-3 and EC-6 cross-disciplinary discussions that occurred with all faculty involved in first semester of clinical teaching, we were able to better understand the CLPT and convey our ideas about integrating ESL into this framework.

The CLPT did have a section entitled, "strategies for supporting all learners" and included a space for EB/ELs where specific strategies could be listed. However, this was not suitable for the goals of ESL faculty because the students needed to make purposeful accommodations for EB/ELs *throughout* the *entire* lesson plan, rather than list some strategies at the beginning of the lesson plan. General methods faculty were receptive to this change. The goal was to integrate SIOP components into the CLPT. For example, in content methods, the students were to begin the lesson by activating prior knowledge as the warm-up or connecting the dots. In contrast, the SIOP Model requires that a teacher *build* background by linking to the EB/ELs experience and prior knowledge, as well as pre-teach any necessary vocabulary. While it is true that there is diversity in the prior knowledge among children in any classroom, it is also true that EB/ELs are very diverse from English-speaking students. EB/ELs may have had prior schooling in another country and even in the U.S. many learned the content in a language they did not understand. Furthermore,

their vocabulary knowledge is very different from that of native English speakers. In any given lesson, native English speakers may be learning Tier 3 vocabulary like *metamorphosis*, there are also many common Tier 2 words that EB/ELs do not know.

ESL faculty went through the entire CLPT and added SIOP components throughout to create the CLPT-ESL (see Appendix A). Essentially, our discussions, our work and the decisions we made focused on how SIOP could be used to enhance the existing CLPT. We were particularly concerned about differences in proficiency levels and the need to go beyond a generic list of accommodations. In addition to the aforementioned building background, students would be required to state how comprehensible input would be provided, like slowing down their speech. They also needed to detail what learning strategies would be used, like summarizing the text and providing a variety of question types that promote higher order thinking. Opportunities for interaction also need to be planned out. Details on how EB/ELs would be grouped and how EB/ELs would be scaffolded to ensure participation like sentence stems needed to be provided. Practicing and applying the information taught through the use of additional manipulatives and activities that practice all four modes of language (listening, speaking, reading and writing) need to be specified. Finally, students need to integrate how content and language would be reviewed at the end of each lesson.

The CLPT-ESL was presented in draft form to content methods faculty. Initially, they were uncomfortable assessing whether students successfully integrated SIOP components, as this was outside their area of expertise. Therefore, the CLPT-ESL became an assignment in the ESL Methodology II companion course. Content methods faculty would not be required to assess whether or not these SIOP components were appropriate. Instead, this was an assignment in the ESL companion class and evaluated by ESL faculty. However, we are beginning to change this by providing all faculty with the necessary resources (see Appendix B). ESL faculty also included professional development in the form of discussions and mini-lessons during the joint meetings. Content methods faculty understood the need to work in unity even if some were initially uncomfortable. Our goal was not to turn these faculty into ESL experts, but rather to assist them in recognizing key ESL elements that should be present in lesson plans.

Student and Professor Feedback

CLPT-ESL was piloted in one class in fall 2024. Informal feedback was gathered at the end of the course. Students were overwhelmingly in favor of doing the CLPT-

ESL rather than another SIOP lesson plan. They felt like they truly understood how to address the needs of EB/ELs in a “regular” lesson. It helped them view the lesson as a whole and make accommodations accordingly. One student noted, “Before, we just put some accommodations in, but that doesn’t help when you have a beginner and an advanced [EL] in the same class because they are not the same.” Another stated, “I get now how you can’t just put in some accommodations at the beginning and be done with it. You have to think about what is needed in the whole lesson.” In addition, since students had taught the lesson, they commented on how much more engaged the EB/ELs in the classroom were. One student stated, “Usually, the EL just waits for her friend to translate for her. This time, she started to participate before that happened because I think she understood more.”

The course instructor also reported greater student engagement and discussion in the university setting. Discussions about ESL instruction were much richer than previously. For example, the instructor noted that her students, “really engaged in a discussion about proficiency levels and how what worked for an intermediate level EL was not enough for the beginner in the class and they brainstormed ways to meet the beginner’s needs.” The instructor also noted that during the field debriefing sessions, students were “offering suggestions to their classmates when something did not work.” While the CLPT-ESL was only piloted in one course, all ESL faculty discussed the CLPT-ESL. There was consensus that all ESL Methodology II courses would follow suit and implement the CLPT-ESL in spring 2025.

Currently, there are discussions about implementing elements of the CLPT-ESL in field courses before YCT. Students at these levels are learning to develop lesson planning and therefore, lesson plans are less detailed and more scaffolded. Math Methods, Field I, has no ESL companion course, but methods faculty agreed to integrate elements like language objectives. Literacy Methods, Field II, does have a companion course and discussions are underway to add ESL elements. However, ESL faculty will continue using the SIOP lesson plan because it forms the basis of the CLPT-ESL in Field III.

Suggestions for educator preparation programs

Most educator preparation programs do not have the luxury of two ESL field courses. Most faculty outside of ESL do not have familiarity with SIOP Model. However, education preparation faculty have the obligation to prepare future teachers for today’s classrooms (Samson & Collins, 2012). EB/ELs are part of those classrooms, especially in Texas. Integrating ESL strategies throughout an entire lesson is critical. Even with limited training, all professors

can require and evaluate ESL accommodations into their lesson plan templates to some degree. Adding ESL prompts to their lesson plan templates, as the CLPT-ESL illustrates, is a step in the right direction. It moves beyond the siloes of expertise typical in educator preparation programs that may hinder preservice teachers from understanding how

specialty areas like ESL and Special Education fit into general education classrooms. It is not necessary to know the SIOP Model. Even implementing some strategies and accommodations through the lesson moves us beyond the box of special needs students on many lesson plans.

References

- Association of Teacher Educators (2023). *Clinical experience standards* (3rd ed.). Association of Teacher Educators. [ate_2023_clinical_experience_standards_final_rev_011524_digital.pdf](https://www.ate2023.org/clinical-experience-standards-final-rev-011524-digital.pdf)
- Bland, J. A., Wojcikiewicz, S. K., Darling-Hammond, L., & Wei, W. (2023). *Strengthening pathways into the teaching profession in Texas: Challenges and opportunities*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://doi.org/10.54300/957.902>
- Costa, J., McPhail, G., Smith, J., & Brisk, M. E. (2005). The challenge of infusing the teacher education curriculum with scholarship on English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(5), 104-118.
- Daniel, S. M., & Conlin, L. (2015). Shifting attention back to students within the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(1), 169–187.
- Daniel, S. M., & Pray, L. (2017). Learning to Teach English Language Learners: A Study of Elementary School Teachers' Sense-Making in an ELL Endorsement Program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(4), 787–819. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.347>
- de Jong, E. J., Harper, C. A., & Coady, M. R. (2013). Enhanced mainstream teacher expertise for teaching English language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(1), 69–89.
- de Oliveira, L. C., & Yough, M. (2021). Teacher preparation for multilingual learners: A critical issue in TESOL. *TESOL Journal*, 12(3), e00570. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.570>
- Desjardins, A. (2020). Effective Sheltered Content Instruction for English Language Learners. *BU Journal of Graduate Studies in Education*, 12(2), 15–18. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1263051>
- Duff, K.R. (2023). *A case study of teacher and administrator perceptions of the implementation of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model and its influence on student achievement in science and on levels of English language acquisition*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston-Clear Lake] University of Houston-Clear Lake Alfred R. Neumann Library. <https://uhcl-ir.tdl.org/items/905dc329-dce8-4eac-bd56-c4c5c39fd620>
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M.E., Short, D. & Toppel, K. (2024). *Making content comprehensible for multilingual learners: The SIOP model* (6th ed). Pearson.
- Furr, C. & Garcia, B. (2018). Best practices in teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students: A case study. Texas Association for Literacy Education Yearbook, 5, 24-34. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1290995>
- Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005, May). *Listening to teachers of English language learners: A survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs* [Report]. Policy Analysis for California Education. <https://edpolicyinca.org/publications/listening-teachers-english-language-learners>
- Gándara, P., & Santibañez, L. (2016). The teachers our English language learners need. *Educational Leadership*, 73(5), 32-37.
- Hallman, H. L. & Meineke, H. R. (2016). Addressing the teaching of English language learners in the United States: A case study of teacher educators' response. *Brock Education Journal*, 26(1), 68-82.
- He, Y., Prater, K., & Steed, T. (2011): Moving beyond 'just good teaching': ESL professional development for all teachers. *Professional Development in Education*, 37(1), 7-18.
- Hollins, E. R., & Warner, C. K. (2021). *Evaluating the clinical component of teacher preparation programs*. National Academy of Education. https://naeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/2nd-pp-for-NAEd-EITPP-Paper-5-Hollins_Warner.pdf
- I, Ji-Yeong, & Martinez, R. (2020). *Teaching math for emergent bilinguals: Building on Culture, Language, and Identity*. Iowa State University Digital Press. <https://doi.org/10.31274/isudp.2020.57>
- Johnson, K. E. (2021). Language teacher education. In N. Van Deusen-Scholl & S. May (Eds.), *Language teacher education* (4th ed., pp. 1–14). Springer.
- Li, N., & Peters, A. W. (2020). Preparing K-12 teachers for ELLs: Improving teachers' L2 knowledge and strategies through innovative professional development. *Urban Education*, 55(10), 1489–1506. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916656902>
- Lucas, T. & Grinberg, J. (2008). Responding to the linguistic reality of mainstream classrooms: Preparing all teachers to teach ELLs. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, S. & D. J. McIntyre, *Handbook on Teacher Education*, (3rd ed.). (pp 606-636). Routledge.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A.M. (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators* (pp. 55-72). Routledge.
- McIntyre, E., Kyle, D. W., Chen, C.-T., & Henrichsen, L. (2008). *Six principles for teaching English language learners in all classrooms*. SAGE Publications.
- Mann, D. (2016). *Preparing pre-service teachers to educate emerging bilingual students: A textual analysis of teacher education curriculum in elementary-level language arts methods textbooks* (Publication No. FA00004747) [Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. <https://fau.digital.flvc.org/islandora/object/fau%3A33938>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to* ISSN: 2474-3976 online

design and implementation (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

- National Center for Education Statistics. (2024). *English Learners in Public Schools*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.
<https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgf>.
- Nieto, S. (2018). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Osipova, A. V., & Lao, R. S. (2022). Breaking the cycle of failure for culturally and linguistically diverse learners with exceptional needs: Recommendations for improvement of teacher preparation programs. *New Waves-Educational Research and Development Journal*, 25(2), 1-25.
- Piazza, S. V., Williams, C., Protacio, M. S., David, V., Tigchelaar, M., & Kuo, H.-C. (2020). Improving Instruction for English Learners: A Professional Development Study Using SIOP. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, 9(3), 383-405.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1281863.pdf>
- Roy-Campbell, Z. M. (2013). Who educates teacher educators about English language learners?. *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts*, 52 (3).
https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons/vol52/iss3/4
- Rutt, A., Mumba, F., & Kibler, A. (2020). Preparing preservice teachers to teach science to english learners: A review. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 58(5), 598-631.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21673>
- Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M. (2022). *Qualitative research: Analyzing life* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Samson, J. F., & Collins, B. A. (2012). *Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English language learners: Applying research to policy and practice for teacher effectiveness*. Center for American Progress. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED535608>
- Short, D. J., Fidelman, C. G., & Louguit, M. (2012). Developing academic language in English language learners through sheltered instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(2), 334–361.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Sage.
- Texas Education Agency. (2024). *Enrollment in Texas public schools, 2023-24*. (Document No. GE24 601 06). Austin, TX. Author.
<https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/school-performance/accountability-research/enrollment-trends>

Appendix A
SoTL Common Lesson Plan Template + ESL

Teacher Candidate Name:		Lesson Date/Time:	
Grade Level and Subject:		Estimated Time for Lesson:	

Lesson Foundation	
Standard(s) <u>TEKS/ PK Guidelines</u>	<i>Include the <u>knowledge statement</u> and the <u>student expectation</u> for this lesson plan.</i>
Other Specialized Standards For example, <u>NGSS</u> , <u>NCTM</u> , <u>ELPS</u> , <u>ISTE</u> , etc)	
Learning Goal(s) and/or Objective(s) <u>T-TESS 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2,</u>	<i>Ensure your goal(s)/objective(s) align(s) with the TEKS and standards above and is written in student-friendly language. Include a language objective as appropriate.</i>
Language Objective(s)	<i>Include lesson-specific language objective(s), based on the ELPS, written in student-friendly language.</i>

<p>To Be Remembered Content</p> <p><u>T-TESS 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5</u></p>	<p>Specific Content: Describe the specific content knowledge needed to teach the learning goal for this lesson. Provide enough detail to ensure the teacher understands the relevant content of this lesson.</p> <p>Target Prior Knowledge: What is the relevant prior knowledge that will be most helpful for learning the lesson’s key ideas? <i>Is there any prior knowledge that an EL may be lacking? (eg. U.S. monuments)</i></p> <p>Key Vocabulary: What new and/or important terms are part of this lesson? Include the term and the <i>student/EL friendly definition.</i></p> <p>Misconceptions: What are some common misconceptions, related to this learning goal, learners often make? (You will implement strategies to address these misconceptions in the Deepening the Meaning section of this plan.)</p>
<p>Strategies for supporting ALL learners</p> <p><u>T-TESS 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 2.4, 2.5, 3.3</u></p>	<p>What strategies are you proactively planning to allow ALL learners to be successful toward meeting the learning goal(s)/objective(s)?</p> <p>List specific strategies that will be used to scaffold, accommodate, and/or modify the lesson for each the following student populations, as applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emergent Bilingual/English Learner Students by proficiency level: These strategies must also be referenced in the body of the lesson plan. - Students with Disabilities (Reference the IEP or 504): - - Students who are performing below grade level: - - Students with specific behavioral needs or supports: - - Students who are performing above grade level: -
<p>Assessment:</p> <p><u>T-TESS 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.5</u></p>	<p>Describe your assessment strategies and how they will ensure that ALL learners have met the lesson goal(s)/objective(s) -- (pre, formative, and post). Include all assessments within the instructional procedure below.</p> <p>Pre-assessment: How will you determine what the students know about the learning objective before you design the lesson? What data will you collect prior to the lesson? Describe accommodations in the pre-assessment by English language proficiency level. (eg. Beginning ELs will draw what they know about the water cycle.)</p> <p>Formative assessment: Describe the strategies you will use to ensure students are making progress throughout the lesson. How will you adjust your instruction based on these results? How are you using this data to inform your instruction? How will you assess students during your instruction? Describe accommodations in the formative assessment by</p>

	<p>English language proficiency level. (eg. Intermediate ELs will be given sentence stems).</p> <p>Summative/Post-assessment: How will you measure and know students have grasped the to be remembered content at the end of this lesson? How will you assess students after your instruction? Describe accommodations in the post-assessment by English language proficiency level. (eg. Intermediate and advanced ELs will be given a multiple choice quiz with 3 instead of 4 options.)</p>
<p>Resources and Materials:</p> <p>T-TESS 1.1, 1.4, 3.1</p>	<p>Please ensure all resources and materials are grade level appropriate and align to the objectives. Include specific links and 1-2 sentences describing each of your resources. Include resources and materials that are appropriate for English language proficiency levels (eg. Word bank, differentiated reading passage) If videos or songs are used, explain how these are appropriate for ELs.</p>

Lesson Plan		
	<p>For each section of the lesson:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focus on time-stamps and break down each section into smaller chunks! For each chunk, ask yourself: what will this task, text, question, or activity cause students to think about? - How am I engaging ALL students in the most important thinking? Include the specific effortful thinking prompts and protocols you'll use in each section. - Review through an equity lens: how do you affirm, support, and challenge ALL learners throughout the lesson? - Be sure to use discipline-specific instructional procedures in this section. (Five E's Inquiry Model, Discovery Learning, etc...) 	<p>Time Stamps (Min)</p>
<p>Retrieval Practice (Also known as: Warm-up; Focus; Launch; Engage; or Connecting the Dots)</p>	<p>In this section, you will consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How are you prompting learners to call up relevant prior knowledge and what strategies will you use to have learners connect to new ideas? ● How are you building background for ELs (Link to experience, link to prior learning and pre-teaching vocabulary)? What strategies will you use? (eg. Team TPR, Abracadabra words) ● What modes of language are ELs using: listening, speaking, reading, and writing? ● What learning strategies will you teach or prompt ELs to use? (eg. Add needed Tier 2 vocabulary to the personal dictionaries) ● What strategies will you use to ensure that ELs will understand your speech? ● What specific visuals, diagrams, sentence stems will you use for ELs? ● Describe the pre-assessment strategies you will use including accommodations for ELs? 	

<p>Lesson Content: (<u>Deepening the Meaning and Learning</u>)</p>	<p><i>In this section, you will include the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>What strategies will you use to provide comprehensible input for ELs? (eg. No More than Three, Oral language strategies.)</i> ● <i>What modes of language are ELs using: listening, speaking, reading, and writing?</i> ● <i>Explicit steps to describe the instructional procedures for this lesson. Include what will be used with ELs at each point of the lesson.</i> ● <i>Highlight key points you will make about the to be remembered content.</i> ● <i>What learning strategies will you teach or prompt ELs to use? (eg. Read aloud, think and summarize, QAR Concept ladder)</i> ● <i>Questions and tasks that prompt learners to analyze, justify, and provide detailed explanations of key content (How and/or why questions). Include any needed sentence stems.</i> ● <i>Effortful thinking opportunities for ALL learners (turn and talk, stop and jot, etc.)? Include any needed sentence stems.</i> ● <i>What grouping strategies are used for ELs?</i> ● <i>What strategies are used to promote interaction? (eg. Buzzing, Pairs Squared)</i> ● <i>Examples and nonexamples, attention to meaning, effortful thinking you'll use to frame the new concept..</i> ● <i>Strategies to address common misconceptions related to the content.</i> ● <i>Describe the formative assessment strategies you will use including accommodations for ELs.</i> <p><i>Note: Be very detailed so a substitute could use this section to teach this lesson.</i></p>	
<p>Practicing with Purpose (Also known as: Independent practice: “You do”, Explore, Explain. Elaborate)</p>	<p><i>What strategies will you use to have learners practice the knowledge and skills for this content?</i></p> <p><i>What modes of language are ELs using: listening, speaking, reading, and writing?</i></p> <p><i>What accommodations will be provided to ELs?</i></p>	
<p>Closing (Also known as: Debrief, Synthesize, Summarize, Exit Ticket)</p>	<p><i>What opportunities will you provide to ensure that ALL learners are synthesizing and summarizing the new learning with key concept(s) of the learning goal(s)/objective(s)?</i></p> <p><i>How will you review key concepts and vocabulary for ELs?</i></p>	

Summative Assessment (<i>when applicable</i>) <i>Evaluate</i>	How will you formally assess students after your instruction? (Project-based, authentic/performance-based assessment, etc.) Include specific accommodations for ELs by proficiency level.	
---	--	--

Appendix B

Books

Ferlazzo, L. & Sypniewski, K.H. (2025). *The ELL teacher's toolbox 2.0*. Jossey-Bass.

Wu, H.P., Garza, E. & Guerra, M.J. (2020). *Second language education for teacher candidates & professionals*. Kendall Hunt.

Ferlazzo, L. & Sypniewski, K.H. (2022). *The ESL/ELL Teacher's Survival Guide: Ready-to-Use Strategies, Tools, and Activities for Teaching All Levels*, 2nd Ed. Jossey-Bass.

Websites

This website is free and features a lot of strategies which are appropriate or adaptable for ELs. It also includes short videos that demonstrate the strategies. <https://www.theteachertoolkit.com/index.php/tool/all-tools>

The Texas Education Agency has a portal for supporting emergent bilingual students in Texas: <https://www.txel.org/>

Larry Ferlazzo's website has a lot of free info to explore and could be used in a class.

<https://larryferlazzo.edublogs.org/category/esl-web/>

Colorin colorado has a plethora of information on working with emergent bilinguals and their families. This webpage contains links to EL strategies and best practices: <https://www.colorincolorado.org/ell-strategies-best-practices>