



education review // reseñas educativas

editors: gene v glass gustavo e. fischman melissa cast-brede

a multi-lingual journal of book reviews

July 10, 2012

ISSN 1094-5296

Education Review/Reseñas Educativas is a project of the National Education Policy Center <http://nepc.colorado.edu>

Follow Education Review on Facebook



Nutta, Joyce W.; Mokhtari, Kouider & Strebel, Carine. (Eds.)
(2012) *Preparing Every Teacher to Reach English Learners: A Practical Guide for Teacher Educators*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Pp. 311 ISBN 978-1612501284

Reviewed by Navin Kumar Singh
Northern Arizona University

In this book, the editors, Nutta, Mokhtari, and Strebel together with other contributors put forward a model for infusing English learner (EL) instruction into teacher education and preparation programs across disciplines and subject areas. They contend that in the past two decades, a number of global forces have transformed core practices of teacher educators in that there is a dramatic shift in school demographics in the U.S. Consequently, linguistically and culturally diverse English language learners constitute a major portion of student populations in schools almost every state in the United States. Thus, they argue that all teachers can and should be prepared to teach English learners (ELs) effectively in the mainstream classroom.

Citation: Singh, Navin Kumar. (2012 July 10) Review of *Preparing Every Teacher to Reach English Learners* by Nutta, Joyce W.; Mokhtari, Kouider & Strebel, Carine. (Eds.) *Education Review*, 15. Retrieved [Date] from <http://www.edrev.info/reviews/rev1176.pdf>

This review was accepted by the previous Editor for English, Gene V Glass.

The first three chapters of the book lay the foundation for the One Plus Model. They review some of the prevailing approaches of delivering content through infusion and offer an operational definition of EL infusion guided by principles of interdisciplinarity, instructional design, and effective instruction and assessment of ELs, which guided the development and implementation of the One Plus model (pp. 11-12). They also trace the evolution of EL infusion, beginning with a response to a Florida Consent Decree that highlighted the need for the preparation of teachers to teach ELs. They describe the development of the early iterations of the Florida English speakers of other languages (ESOL) infusion model, which was originally designed for language arts teachers only and leads to the attainment of the full ESOL endorsement. They also explain how they adapted the Florida ESOL infusion model and built in resources, procedures, and policies to develop the One Plus model.

They provide a detailed description of the One Plus model, which addresses a diverse but array of teaching specializations and credentials. We focus on the two institution-granted credentials at the center of the One Plus model, namely, EL-qualified for teaching academic subject areas in mainstream classrooms and EL-qualified for teaching language arts in mainstream classrooms. Finally, for institutions considering adoption of the One Plus model, they offer a framework for designing, implementing, and evaluating such programs. They also address issues pertaining to the process of embedding EL content across the curriculum, faculty development, and resources. They present a step-by-step process for infusing EL content across courses and programs, and provide tools and strategies for engaging in the faculty infusion process. They also provide guidance in planning and delivering faculty development in EL content and share a set of resources that teacher educators can use to support the development and implementation of the model in their own contexts.

Part I: EL Infusion from Theory to Practice: The One Plus Model

EL infusion is a means of preparing generalist teachers to support the academic success and language development of ELs. Institutions' responses to addressing this goal may

meet different criteria for infusion in different ways. However, the extent to which these three qualities of EL infusion—interconnectedness, cohesion, and interdisciplinarity—are met depends on the intent and implementation at each institution (p. 21). The contributors argue that during the first decade of the twenty-first century, various approaches to preparing teachers of English language learners have been implemented, supported largely by federal grants. They further argue that while educator preparation professionals are often guided by similar standards with respect to expected teacher knowledge, skills, and dispositions for teaching ELs, but they have also used array of instructional approaches, and strategies that vary widely in terms of target audiences, theoretical and research grounding, content focus, and instructional delivery venues. These approaches tend to fall into four broad categories: (a) Use of particular instructional procedures or strategies, such as instructional scaffolding, that help make instruction and assessment comprehensible to ELs in classroom; (b) Use of specific lesson frameworks during specific blocks of instruction, such as sheltered instruction; (c) Use of linguistically and culturally relevant conceptual frameworks to inform and guide EL instruction; and (d) Use of comprehensive and systemic models designed to prepare teachers and other school personnel to effectively address the language, literacy, and content needs of ELs in all classrooms (p. 22).

The contributors also argue that the OELA recently provided financial support to teacher preparation institutions that incorporate EL competencies into general teacher preparation programs through its National Professional Development Grants initiative, in response to the challenges faced by teachers who work with ELs in mainstream classrooms and the need to prepare all educators to teach these students, (p. 23). For them while EL infusion is relatively new approach for preparing teachers to address the needs of ELs in all classrooms, it is being used in a small but growing number of institutions in the United States and Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education; Boston College; University at Albany; and Miami University (pp. 23-24)

They contend that although the One Plus model is intended to prepare mainstream teachers for instructing and

assessing ELs, its stackable nature permits the possibility of building up to the ESL endorsement or certification. This can be accomplished by adding more EL-specific courses as well as more in-depth and specialized clinical experiences with ELs and more rigorous and comprehensive assessments of the ESL endorsement standards (p. 51). Earnest Boyer of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching described a “sea change” in the trend toward interdisciplinary and integrative scholarly activity: “Today, interdisciplinary and integrative studies, long on the edges of academic life, are moving toward center, responding both to new intellectual questions and pressing human problems” (p. 57).

The contributors further argue that in line with the spirit of Boyer’s groundbreaking work, William Newell noted that interdisciplinary involves curriculum and instruction that “critically draw upon two or more disciplines and...lead to an integration of disciplinary insights” are typically organized around a theme, problem, or issue (p. 57, p. 113). They argue that EL-infusion model is smaller in scale than the most notable interdisciplinary efforts across the general education curriculum. Nonetheless, the construct of interdisciplinary provides a solid grounding on which to build EL-infused teacher preparation programs (p. 58). For this they refer to the joint publication of the TESOL and NCATE of 2003. In 2003, the professional organization Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Language (TESOL) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) issued standards for pre K-12 ESL teacher Education.

The contributors contend that in the absence of national standards for teachers of ELs, teacher preparation programs can consider various sources to guide EL infusion. For this they suggest that institutions consider the recommendations of National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) Roundtable Report as the basis of their broad goals, what we term EL curricular competencies that organize the elements of the EL-infused curriculum (p. 59). The NCELA recommendations are divided into five general areas, each of which includes a number of specific criteria for the mainstream teacher of ELs: (a) language acquisition and

communicative competence; (b) curriculum and instruction; (c) assessment and accommodations; (d) culture and education; and (e) school and home communities (p. 59). NCELA guidelines apply to teachers of all subjects and grade levels with one or more ELs in their mainstream classes (p. 61).

Nevertheless, the contributors also assert that programs that operate in states that mandate EL teacher preparation can use state standards as their EL competencies or can choose to augment the state standards by adding other emphases. For example, the Florida Department of Education requires that teacher preparation institutions offering initial certification degrees in early childhood, elementary, English language arts, exceptional include a full endorsement in ESL (p. 61).

Part II: Application of the One Plus Model Across Selected Disciplines

This part sheds light on testing of infusion models in two states, assessment and evaluation of these models, and reactions of participants and faculty. This part of the book elucidates how faculty from four teacher preparation institutions in two states-Florida and Ohio have successfully embedded EL content into their courses in order to prepare their candidates to reach all ELs in mainstream classrooms and in non-instructional settings and to effectively support English language learners. In this part of the book, the contributors, Florin Mihai and Eleni Pappamihel, Jennie Dutcher, Martha Castaneda, and Amy Fisher Young discuss about the various EL-infusion models and provide examples of content in EL-specific courses and/or field experiences. They describe the addition of two EL-specific courses, and offer suggestions for incorporating content from the courses, across the teacher preparation curricula. Mihai and Pappamihel (2012) argue that although there are various models for organizing and presenting the content of courses, teacher educators should have the flexibility to plan, deliver, and evaluate the course curriculum and instructional delivery depending on their needs and constraints. They further contend that as teacher educators, we also know that teachers are better positioned to adjust instruction to accommodate student needs when they have an awareness of these students' language backgrounds and abilities, and

an understanding of the language demands involved in classroom tasks (p. 260).

Mihai and Pappamihel (2012) further argue that it is true that teacher preparation programs include courses that address some the instruction and assessment of ELs. Nevertheless, given the complexity of the processes of learning English while acquiring academic content, EL-specific courses direct pre-service teachers' attention to issues that are specific only to ELs (Mihai & Pappamihel, 2012, p. 270). For them, while teacher preparation programs in general do not prepare teachers to be certified ESL teachers, they are expected to prepare them to work with ELs in mainstream classrooms. Therefore, EL-specific courses should be integrated with the rest of the teacher education curriculum in a seamless way, so that teacher candidates see these courses as an integral part of their preparation (Mihai & Pappamihel, 2012, p. 270). In this part, the contributors also address candidate assessment and evaluation of EL-infused programs and present a culturally responsive framework for evaluating EL-infused programs and assessing teacher candidates' perception to teach ELs in mainstream classrooms. Dutcher, Castaneda, and Fisher (2012) assert that program evaluation must be seen as a process that informs the development, implementation, results of the EL infusion project. Evaluation is not a coercive or adversarial process; on the contrary, it is an opportunity for change and improvement, in our case by faculty, administrators, and teacher candidates (p. 272). They argue that over the past decade, a clear consensus has emerged that cultural responsiveness should be an integral part of program design, implementation, and evaluation. Dutcher, Castaneda, and Fisher (2012) further argue that culturally responsive evaluation which also known as responsive, collaborative, or participatory evaluation—is a response and challenge to the traditional reductionist and dichotomous evaluation methods that rely heavily on quantitative data and detach the evaluator, researcher, participants, and community.

For Dutcher, Castaneda, and Fisher (2012), traditional models of evaluation work under the notion that assessment is objective and culture free, and may not honor the cultural context and role the affected community plays in the conception, process, and evaluation of the

project. In contrast to traditional evaluation models, “a culturally responsive evaluation is descriptive, inductive, participatory, and multidimensional” (p. 275). To substantiate their arguments, Dutcher, Castaneda, and Fisher (2012) refer to Frierson et al. and Dobson who describe culturally responsive evaluation as “an examination of impacts through lenses in which the culture of participants is considered an important factor.” While for Dobson, “an examination that states resists the dominant, mainstream thinking that pervades the tradition of scholarship that sees difference as deficit or diversity as deviant” (p. 275)

In regards to implications of the proposed EL-infusion and similar other models in practice, they contend that research has shown that while approaches can vary widely with respect to educator preparation, effective preparation programs share three common ingredients that have been associated with improving teacher candidate preparation to teach all students, including EL students: (a) use of assessment data to inform program design and instruction, (b) institutional investment in mentoring as form of effective professional development, and (c) engaging faculty and staff in collaboration and teamwork (p. 278). In this book, the editors seem to intend to accomplish two main objectives: First, present what they term “a realistic EL infusion model,” the One Plus model that teacher educators can use as a guide for preparing all teachers to address the needs of ELs in the mainstream classrooms. Second, throughout the book, they provide a set of insights and examples of how EL competencies can be infused across the teacher preparation curricula. They advocate for the use of EL-infusion for preparing all teachers to teach English language learners, “Two forms of potential intrinsic benefits of the process and product of infusion include what Ernest Boyer terms the scholarship of integration and the scholarship of teaching” (cited in Nutta, Mokhtari, & Strebel, 2012, p. 113). In the end, this book is useful as it provides a practical and viable model for infusing English learner (EL) instruction into teacher education and preparation programs. The contributors argue that most pre-service teacher candidates are unprepared to work with English learners. Hence, they point out step-by-step process involved in EL-infusion approach, assessing needs, getting faculty support, and developing capacity, and sharing strategies. They also

provide some guidelines through which EL content can be incorporated across disciplines and subject areas, human development, learning disabilities, math, science, social science, physical education, and classroom management.

Note: All citations in this review are from Nutta, J. W., Mokhtari, K., & Strebel, C. (Eds.). (2012).

About the Reviewer

Navin Kumar Singh earned his doctorate in Curriculum and Instruction with specialization in Applied Linguistics from Northern Arizona University (NAU). He completed his Bachelors of Arts in English language and literature, one year diploma in English Education and have his Master's in Education with specialization in Applied Linguistics from Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal. His research interests include globalization, bilingual and multicultural education, higher education, multi-ethnic diversity, social justice and equity, human rights, child rights, indigenous peoples and communities, and contemporary other educational issues. He has his professional affiliations with Nepal English Language Teachers Association, Linguistic Society of Nepal, TESOL, and AERA.

Copyright is retained by the first or sole author, who grants right of first publication to the *Education Review*.

Education Review/Reseñas Educativas is a project of the National Education Policy Center <http://nepc.colorado.edu>



Editors

David J. Blacker

blacker@edrev.info

Gustavo Fischman

fischman@edrev.info

Melissa Cast-Brede

cast-brede@edrev.info

Gene V Glass

glass@edrev.info
