

Mathematics Content & Curriculum

The SIOP program is content and curriculum independent. Its aim is to simultaneously teach English language and content wherein there may be multiple interdisciplinary content goals, for instance, a thematic lesson may teach objectives from mathematics, language arts, music, science, and art. The techniques presented in SIOP are very adaptable to accommodate content from all grade levels and many curriculum styles.

Language Practices

The SIOP program maintains that language objectives of a lesson should be stated clearly, the same as with the content objectives, and these should be given both orally and in writing. It also stresses that in addition to vocabulary, grammar is an important component of language development. Since the SIOP program was developed specifically with ELL in mind, it addresses this section of the TSUS MELL CPF better than probably any of the other programs.

Family & Community Involvement

Certainly SIOP supports connections to each student's family-life through lessons that embed contextual experiences and skills, however, there does not seem to be much information about explicit interaction between the family and the student's learning. Neither does the program specifically advise teachers to engage in frequent communication about a student's progress. The collaborative approach of SIOP encourages pairing weaker students with stronger ones in terms of both language and content, but more exact information about pairing techniques are not explicitly mentioned.

Assessment of Student Learning

SIOP authors support teacher assessment strategies that offer multiple pathways for students to demonstrate their understanding of the content. The authors' claim that a variety of assessments allow teachers to create a more accurate appraisal of content knowledge and skill level. The appraisal is then used for instructional planning.

TEXTEAMS

Textteams, developed by the Dana Center in the mid-90s is a comprehensive system of professional development based on the mathematics and science Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). Professional Development is provided through a trained network of leaders who then provide training to pre-K to 12th grade teachers from that area on a more local level that is customized to meet the needs of a district or school.

Because the Textteam institutes were developed and designed using the Texas mathematics curricular framework, the alignment and assessment to the state curriculum and testing are in place. The length of the institutes that extend for 3-5 days can provide time for in-depth discussion of content and pedagogy matters. This also encourages collaboration and active participation among teachers at the institutes.

Learning Atmosphere & Physical Environment

Professional development experiences, much like the school mathematics and science curriculum itself, focus on a few activities in great depth. The professional development also provides opportunities for teachers to connect and apply what they have learned to their day-to-day teaching. The main focus is on addressing the content knowledge of teachers.

Instructional Practices

Textteams is designed to model pedagogy that deliberately engenders collaboration and active participation. Hands-on approach with “get-up-and move” activities is also modeled as a way to foster critical thinking through hands-on experiences. Questioning strategies are featured with variety of questions developed within each learning experience to elicit deep levels of mathematical or scientific understanding and proficiency for teachers.

Mathematics Content & Curriculum

The TEKS and TAKS objectives are the main objectives of the Textteams institutes and hence the curriculum and content are organized around the five main TEKS content strands: number and operation, patterns and algebraic thinking, geometry and spatial sense, measurement, and probability and statistics. Teachers engage in exploring and examining mathematical concepts in order to deepen their content understanding. The use of multiple representations, including verbal, concrete, pictorial, tabular, symbolic, and graphical, is encouraged.

Language Practices

There is not a mandate to provide materials for any specific group of students, therefore, the materials were not written in Spanish. Providers could present in Spanish, but there was no recommendation for this by Textteams. Multiple representations, concrete and visual models, and appropriate technology, are ways that various learning styles are accommodated.

Family & Community Involvement

Textteams does not address this aspect specifically in its professional development institutes.

Assessment of Student Learning

The main objective of the Textteams professional development is strengthening the teacher's content knowledge to more effectively teach the TEKS objectives to their students with results from the TAKS tests and the End-of-the-Year tests as the main assessment tools. The Algebra Institute, for example, examines assessments for alignment with TEKS and TAKS, focusing on methods for evaluating student work, developing strategies for classroom implementation, and making decisions based on student work. Strategies for fitting the Algebra II assessments into a district's yearly plan are also discussed. Some of the Textteams institutes' multiple tools for assessment are: "describing evidence of a student's understanding of content that was to be learned, and building questions and tasks to elicit evidence of understanding that can be recognized by both teachers and students."

Reference List of the PDPs

- Anstrom, K. and National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education Washington DC. (1999). Preparing Secondary Education Teachers to Work with English Language Learners: Mathematics. NCBE Resource Collection Series, No. 14. District of Columbia, for full text: <http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/resource/ells/>. 26.
- Ascher, M. and U. D'Ambrosio (1994). "Ethnomathematics: A Dialogue." For the Learning of Mathematics 14(2): 36-43.
- Batchelder, M. and Austin Independent School District TX. Office of Program Evaluation. (2001). Austin Collaborative for Mathematics Education 1999-2000 Evaluation. Texas, Austin Independent School District, Department of Accountability, Office of Program Evaluation, 1111 W. Sixth Street, Austin, TX 78703.: 92.
- Batchelder, M. L. and Austin Independent School District TX. Office of Program Evaluation. (1998). Austin Collaborative for Mathematics Education. 1997-1998 Annual Report. Publication Number 97.18. Texas, Austin I.S.D., Office of Program Evaluation, 1111 West Sixth Street, Austin, TX 78703-5399; Tel: 512-414-1724.: 88.
- Bell, G. L. Elementary Science Teaching Enhancement through a Professional Development Schools Model. In: Proceedings of the Annual International Conference of the Association for the Education of Teachers in Science, Charlotte, NC, January 10-13, 2002, For full text: <http://aets.chem.pitt.edu>.
- Buchanan, K., M. Helman, et al. (1997). Reforming Mathematics Instruction for ESL Literacy Students. ERIC Digest. District of Columbia, ERIC/CLL, 1118 22nd Street N.W., Washington, DC 20037.: 4.
- Cain, J. S. (2002). "An Evaluation of the Connected Mathematics Project." Journal of Educational Research 95(4): 224-33.
- Capraro, R. M., M. M. Capraro, et al. (2001). Digital Video: Watch Me Do What I Say! Consortium of State Organizations for Texas Teacher Education, Corpus Christi TX.
- Carpenter, T. P., E. Fennema, et al. (2000). Cognitively Guided Instruction: A Research-Based Teacher Professional Development Program for Elementary School Mathematics. Research Report. Wisconsin, NCISLA, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin, School of Education, 1025 W. Johnson Street, Madison, WI 53706. Tel: 608-263-3605; e-mail: ncisla@education.wisc.edu. For full text: <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/ncisla>.: 12.
- Cavalluzzo, L. C. and CNA Corporation. (2004). Is national board certification an effective signal of teacher quality? Alexandria, Va., CNA Corp.

- Chamot, A. U., P. B. El-Dinary, et al. (2000). *Children's Learning Strategies in Language Immersion Classrooms*. District of Columbia: 33.
- Chamot, A. U. and et al. (1994). "Comments on Janie Rees-Miller's "A Critical Appraisal of Learning Training: Theoretical Bases and Teaching Implications." Two Readers React. [and] The Author Responds." TESOL Quarterly 28(4): 771-81.
- Chamot, A. U., et al., et al. (1996). *Learning Strategies in Elementary Language Immersion Programs*. Final Report. Reporting Period: FY 1993-1996. District of Columbia: 204.
- Chamot, A. U. and J. M. O'Malley (1994). The Calla Handbook. Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach. New York, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, World Language Division, 10 Bank Street, White Plains, NY 10606-1951.
- Collier, V. P. (1987). "Age and Rate of Acquisition of Second Language for Academic Purposes." TESOL Quarterly 21(4): 617-41.
- Collier, V. P. (1989). "How Long? A Synthesis of Research on Academic Achievement in a Second Language." TESOL Quarterly 23(3): 509-31.
- Collier, V. P. (1992). "A Synthesis of Studies Examining Long-Term Language Minority Student Data on Academic Achievement." Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education 16(1-2): 187-212.
- Collier, V. P. and National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education Wheaton MD. (1987). *The Effect of Age on Acquisition of a Second Language for School*. Maryland: 8.
- Copley, J. V. and Y. Padron (1998). Preparing Teachers of Young Learners: Professional Development of Early Childhood Teachers in Mathematics and Science. Forum on Early Childhood Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education, Washington DC.
- Cuevas, G. E. and M. E. Driscoll (1993). Reaching All Students with Mathematics. Virginia, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc., 1906 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091-1593
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc., Reston, VA.
- D'Ambrosio, U. (2001). "What Is Ethnomathematics, and How Can It Help Children in Schools?" Teaching Children Mathematics 7(6): 308-10.
- Dalton, S., J. Sison, et al. (1995). *Enacting instructional conversation with Spanish-speaking students in middle school mathematics*. Santa Cruz, Calif. Washington, DC, National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning;
- U.S. Dept. of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement Educational Resources Information Center.
- Echevarria, J., M. Vogt, et al. (2004). Making content comprehensible for English learners: the SIOP model. Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

- Ernest, H. M., R. M. Gonzalez, et al. (1997). *Dos Idiomas, Un Mundo*. Dual Language Project. Title VII Biennial Evaluation Report, 1995-97. Texas: 33.
- Fennema, E., J. Sowder, et al. (1999). *Creating Classrooms That Promote Understanding*. Wisconsin, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 10 Industrial Avenue, Mahwah, NJ 07430.: 16.
- Georgiady, N. P., L. G. Romano, et al. (1992). Focus on successful characteristics of a middle school. East Lansing, Mich., Michigan Association of Middle School Educators.
- Hamilton, L. S., D. F. McCaffrey, et al. (2003). "Studying Large-Scale Reforms of Instructional Practice: An Example from Mathematics and Science." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 25(1): 1-29.
- Hansen, M. L., D. S. Lien, et al. (2004). *Relative Pay and Teacher Retention: An Empirical Analysis in a Large Urban District*. Alexandria, Va., CNA Corp.
- Little, P., S. DuPree, et al. (2002). *Documenting Progress and Demonstrating Results: Evaluating Local Out-of-School Time Programs*. District of Columbia, Finance Project, 1401 New York Avenue, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20005. Tel: 202-587-1000; Fax: 202-628-4205; Web site: <http://www.financeproject.org>. For full text: <http://www.financeproject.org/ost/localevaluation.pdf>.: 48.
- Michel, C. S. (2003). Characteristics of middle school English language learner students related to reading achievement on a high stakes assessment: x, 91 leaves.
- National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education Washington DC. (1997). *High Stakes Assessment: A Research Agenda for English Language Learners*. Symposium Summary. NCBE Report. District of Columbia: 28.
- New York City Board of Education Brooklyn. Div. of Assessment and Accountability. (2000). *ELL Subcommittee Research Studies Progress Report*. New York, New York City Board of Education, Division of Assessment and Accountability, 110 Livingston Street, Room 728, Brooklyn, NY 11201. For full text: <http://www.nycenet.edu>.: 272.
- Reys, R., B. Reys, et al. (2003). "Assessing the Impact of Standards-Based Middle Grades Mathematics Curriculum Materials on Student Achievement." Journal for Research in Mathematics Education 34(1): 74-95.
- Rueda, R. and L. D. Monzo (2002). "Apprenticeship for Teaching: Professional Development Issues Surrounding the Collaborative Relationship between Teachers and Paraeducators." Teaching and Teacher Education 18(5): 503-21.
- Schwartz, W. and ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education New York NY. (1991). *Teaching Limited English Proficient Students To Understand and Use Mathematics*. ERIC/CUE Digest No. 70. New York, ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Box 40, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027 (free). 4.

- Short, D. and J. Echevarria (2004). "Teacher Skills to Support English Language Learners." Educational Leadership 62(4): 8-13.
- Short, D., S. Fitzsimmons, et al. (2004). SIOP model digest series: resource for professional developers training others in the SIOP model. Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Short, D. J., J. Echevarria, et al. (1999). The sheltered instruction observation protocol: a tool for teacher-research collaboration and professional development. Santa Cruz, Calif., Center for Research on Education Diversity & Excellence.
- Texas Education Agency Austin. Div. of Research and Evaluation. (2002). Program Participation and Academic Progress of Second Language Learners: Texas Middle School Update. Policy Research Report. Texas, Texas Education Agency, Publications Distribution, 1701 North Congress Ave., Austin, TX 78701-1494 (Publication no. GE02 600 01: 34.
- Thomas, W. P. and V. P. Collier (1998). "Two Languages Are Better Than One." Educational Leadership 55(4): 23-26.
- Thomas, W. P. and V. P. Collier (1999). "Accelerated Schooling for English Language Learners." Educational Leadership 56(7): 46-49.
- Thomas, W. P., V. P. Collier, et al. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. Washington, DC, Center for Research on Education Diversity & Excellence.
- Thomas, W. P., V. P. Collier, et al. (1997). School effectiveness for language minority students. Washington, DC, National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Valenzuela, A. (2005). Leaving children behind: how "Texas-style" accountability fails Latino youth. Albany, State University of New York Press.

Appendix A –

MELL Classroom Practices Framework

Developed by

**Texas State University – San Marcos
Joyce Fischer, Ph.D.
Christopher Johnson, M.S.
Leslie Huling, Ed.D.**

For The

Math for English Language Learners (MELL) Initiative

**A Texas State University System (TSUS) and
Texas Education Agency (TEA)
Collaborative**

Participating TSUS Institutions Include:

**Angelo State University
Lamar University
Sam Houston State University
Sul Ross State University
Texas State University**

June, 2005: 1st edition

January 2007: 2nd edition

MELL Classroom Practices Framework

Introduction:

The MELL Classroom Practices Framework (CPF) is a synthesis document compiled by the Texas State University System (TSUS) Math for English Language Learners (MELL) Initiative and funded by a grant from the Texas Education Agency (TEA). In the summer of 2004, TEA, in response to the lingering achievement gap in mathematics between Limited English Proficient (LEP) students and other students, worked with TSUS and its five partner institutions to establish the MELL Initiative. The primary purpose of the MELL Initiative is to develop resources for professional development targeted at improving mathematics instruction for English Language Learners, especially those at the secondary level. MELL and TEA staff identified the need for a concise document that could not only capture the essence of the research but could also provide a roadmap for use in future resources. The MELL Classroom Practices Framework was developed in response to this need.

The MELL CPF was generated collaboratively by MELL and TEA staff and was guided by the question of “What do the findings of our research investigations suggest in regard to classroom practices that contribute to successful math instruction for English Language Learners.” This framework represents the collective thinking of the MELL partners about what the research investigations revealed and it is our intention that all of the MELL professional development products support teachers in implementing these classroom practices. Over time, as additional insights are gleaned from ongoing work, it is likely that this evolving framework will be revised.

Much, perhaps most, of this framework is comprised of elements of effective instruction that is appropriate for all students, and clearly all students would be well-served by these suggested practices regardless of their language proficiency. It appears, however, from our investigations, that the success of ELL students is more highly dependent on receiving instruction geared to their specific needs. In other words, while many students who are not experiencing a language barrier might be able to experience success with less than optimal instructional practices, few ELL students can thrive in such an environment. For this reason, creating a rich classroom experience for ELL students is not simply desirable, but rather is necessary if they are to have a chance to succeed. The MELL Classroom Practices Framework is targeted at achieving this goal.

1 Learning Atmosphere & Physical Environment

- 1.1 A caring classroom atmosphere of mutual respect and support is facilitated by the teacher who:
 - 1.1.1 Knows each child as an individual,
 - 1.1.2 Embraces languages, customs, and cultures of ELL students,
 - 1.1.3 Provides culturally rich learning materials,
 - 1.1.4 Encourages self-expression and provides positive recognition,
 - 1.1.5 Builds student confidence and esteem,
 - 1.1.6 Fosters an emotionally safe environment that allows students to feel secure and to take risks.
- 1.2 The classroom is visually rich to support student learning.
 - 1.2.1 Incorporates displays of student produced work, whenever possible,
 - 1.2.2 Is colorful and thought stimulating,
 - 1.2.3 Contains pertinent, real-world information and applications,
 - 1.2.4 Reinforces math-specific vocabulary and concepts,
 - 1.2.5 Provides color-coded learning supports when appropriate.
- 1.3 Room arrangement facilitates student interaction and group work.

2 Instructional Practices

- 2.1 Instructional practices foster cooperation and collaboration.
- 2.2 Concepts are presented accurately, logically, and in engaging ways.
- 2.3 Multiple representations incorporate mathematics learning levels: concrete, semi-concrete, and abstract.
- 2.4 The teacher employs student-centered instructional practices.
 - 2.4.1 Approaches content from a concept-oriented constructivist method,
 - 2.4.2 Surrounds students with different modalities (e.g., aural, visual, kinesthetic),
 - 2.4.3 Connects new concepts to prior learning,

- 2.4.4 Encourages students to refine and reflect about their own work and verbalize concept understanding “in their own words”,
 - 2.4.5 Chooses homework to optimize individual content development,
 - 2.4.6 Provides extra help and resources on an individual basis.
- 2.5 Students are frequently partnered with peer learners to enhance learning opportunities.
- 2.5.1 To develop math content,
 - 2.5.2 To aid English language development,
 - 2.5.3 To insure sustained active participation in the class,
 - 2.5.4 To welcome new students into an established learning community.
- 2.6 Instructional activities are varied and support diverse learning styles and multiple intelligences, including for instance:
- 2.6.1 Frequent use of models,
 - 2.6.2 Music as a motivator and anchor,
 - 2.6.3 Mind maps, poster-walks, and word walls
 - 2.6.4 Key vocabulary and cognates presented in different forms,
 - 2.6.5 Vivid adjectives.

3 Mathematics Content & Curriculum

- 3.1 Glossary of mathematical terms is always available for reference.
- 3.2 Content is aligned to appropriate grade-level, mathematics TEKS and professional standards.
- 3.3 Content is based on diagnosed student needs.
- 3.4 Content is systematically designed to incorporate sound learning principles.
 - 3.4.1 To incorporate increased complexity,
 - 3.4.2 To present a cohesive big-picture through chunking,
 - 3.4.3 To connect concepts through bridging and scaffolding,
 - 3.4.4 To emphasize multidisciplinary understandings,

3.4.5 To reflect on inherent patterns by comparing and contrasting concepts.

3.5 Curriculum is challenging, relevant, age-appropriate, and well-paced

3.5.1 To include contextually-based problems,

3.5.2 To incorporate student realities,

3.5.3 To involve interactive problem solving.

4 Language Practices

4.1 Language support is offered without supplanting English instruction.

4.2 Support is aligned with student’s diagnosed language needs.

4.3 Language used is appropriate to age and grade level and presented in a socially meaningful context.

4.4 Mathematics-specific vocabulary is explicitly and implicitly taught and reinforced through repetition.

4.5 Teachers are knowledgeable about the second language acquisition theories and best practices embodied in Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part II, Chapter 128.

4.6 Ideally, dual language instructional support should be offered.

4.7 When dual language teachers are not available, sheltered instruction should be utilized to provide strong language support by addressing content through ESL.

5 Family & Community Involvement

5.1 Schools connect to student’s family-life by embedding contextual experiences and skills in teaching and curriculum.

5.2 Projects are relevant and promote family interaction.

5.3 Opportunities are available for English-speaking higher grade-level students to mentor ELL lower grade-level students either in an in-school or after-school program, as appropriate.

5.4 Teacher engages in frequent communication with families

5.4.1 About activities and events in which parents can participate,

5.4.2 About student progress.

- 5.5 Teacher utilizes services provided by a community liaison and is knowledgeable about community resources.
- 5.6 Parents are informed about the benefits of using their most cognitively advanced language at home.

6 Assessment of Student Learning

- 6.1 Classroom assessment is designed to foster student success.
- 6.2 Assessment methods allow students frequent opportunities to demonstrate mastery in a variety of ways.
- 6.3 Various assessment techniques are used to measure student understandings.
- 6.4 Grades are oriented to promote and emphasize valid step-by-step logical reasoning processes.
- 6.5 Assessment data and results shape instructional planning.
- 6.6 Flexible time allotments are given to demonstrate concept mastery.

REFERENCE LIST FOR THE CPF

- Achilles, C. (1999). *Let's put kids first, finally: Getting class size right*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Anstrom, K., & National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education Washington DC. (1999). *Preparing secondary education teachers to work with english language learners: Mathematics*. District of Columbia: Ncbe resource collection series, no. 14.
- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Barki, H. & Pinsonneault, A. (2001). Small group brainstorming and idea quality. *Small Group Research, 32* (2), 158-205.

- Batchelder, M. L., & Austin Independent School District TX. Office of Program Evaluation. (1998). Austin collaborative for mathematics education. 1997-1998 annual report. Publication number 97.18. Texas: Austin I.S.D., Office of Program Evaluation, 1111 West Sixth Street, Austin, TX 78703-5399.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Snow, C. (2004). Introduction: The potential of peer talk. *Discourse Studies, 6* (3), 291-306.
- Brown, V., Tumeo, M., Larey, T., & Paulus, P. (1998). Modeling cognitive interactions during group brainstorming. *Small Group Research, 29* (4), 495-526.
- Byrnes, H. (2000). Languages across the curriculum—intradepartmental curriculum construction. In M.-R. Kecht & K. von Hammerstein (Eds.), *Languages across the curriculum: Interdisciplinary structures and internationalized education* (pp. 151-175). Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University
- Camacho, M., & Paulus, P. (1995). The role of social anxiousness in group brainstorming. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68* (6), 1071-1080.
- Carlo, M., August, D., & Snow, C. (2005). Sustained vocabulary-learning strategies for English language learners. In E. Hiebert & M. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice* (pp. 137-153). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Carpenter, T. (1989). Teaching as problem solving. In R. Charles & E. Silver (Eds.), *The teaching and assessing of mathematical problem solving* (pp. 187-202). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Carroll, S. (1992). On cognates. *Second Language Research, 8* (2), 93-119.

- Chirumbolo, A., Mannetti, L., Piero, A., Areni, A., & Kruglanski, A. (2005). Motivated closed-mindedness and creativity in small groups. *Small Group Research, 36* (1), 59-82.
- Collier, V. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. *TESOL Quarterly, 21* (4), 617-641.
- Collier, V. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 23* (3), 509-531.
- Collier, V. (1992a). The Canadian bilingual immersion debate: A synthesis of research findings. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 14* (1), 87-97.
- Collier, V. (1992b). A synthesis of studies examining long-term language minority student data on academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal, 16* (1-2), 187-212.
- Collier, V. (1995a). *Acquiring a second language for school*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.
- Collier, V. (1995b). *Promoting academic success for ESL students: Understanding second language acquisition for school*. Woodside, NY: New Jersey Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages-Bilingual Educators.
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (1989). How quickly can immigrants become proficient in school English. *Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 5* (1), 26-38.
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (1999a, August/September). Making U.S. schools effective for English language learners, Part 1. *TESOL Matters, 9* (4), 1, 6. Retrieved December 31, 2006, from http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_document.asp?CID=196&DID=812
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (1999b, October/November). Making U.S. schools effective for English language learners, Part 2. *TESOL Matters, 9* (5), 1, 6. Retrieved December 31, 2006, from http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_document.asp?CID=196&DID=817

- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (1999c, December/January). Making U.S. schools effective for English language learners, Part 3. *TESOL Matters*, 9 (6), 1, 10. Retrieved December 31, 2006, from http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_document.asp?CID=196&DID=826
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (2002). Reforming education policies for English learners means better schools for all. *The State Education Standard*, 3 (1), 30-36.
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and practice*, 2 (1), 1-20.
- Copley, J. V., & Padron, Y. (1998, February 6-8). Preparing teachers of young learners: Professional development of early childhood teachers in mathematics and science. Paper presented at the Forum on Early Childhood Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education, Washington DC.
- Coskun, H. (2005). Cognitive stimulation with convergent and divergent thinking exercises in brainwriting. *Small Group Research*, 36 (4), 466-498.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, 49 (2), 222-251.
- Cummins, J. (1983). *Heritage language education: A literature review*. Toronto: Ministry of Education.
- Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56 (1), 18-36.
- Cummins, J. (1991). Language development and academic learning. In L. Malavé & G. Duquette (Eds.), *Language, culture and cognition* (pp. 161-174). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Los Angeles, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (1983). Analysis-by-rhetoric: Reading the text or the reader's own projections? A reply to Edelsky et al. *Applied Linguistics*, 4 (1), 23-41.
- Curtain, H., & Pesola, C. (1994). *Languages and children: Making the match* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman
- Daniell, B. (1999). Narratives of literacy: Connecting composition to culture. *College Composition and Communication*, 50 (3), 393-410.
- Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2006). School reform and standards-based education: A model for English-language learners. *Journal of Educational Research*, 99 (4), 195-210.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson, Allyn & Bacon.
- Educational Resources Information Center (U.S.). (1997). High stakes assessment
a research agenda for english language learners: Symposium summary [microform]. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education: U.S. Dept. of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement Educational Resources Information Center.
- Egelson, P., Harman, P., & Achilles, C. (1996). Does class size make a difference? Greensboro, NC: South Eastern Regional Vision for Education.

- Evan, R., & Lappin, G. (1994) Constructing meaningful understanding of mathematics content. In D. Aichele & A. Coxford (Eds.), *Professional development for teachers of mathematics* (pp. 128-143). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Folger, J. (1989). Project STAR and class size policy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 67 (1), 1-16.
- Gallegos, R. (1979). Cashing in on cognates. *Pointer*, 23 (3), 10-15.
- Garrison, D. (1990). Inductive strategies for teaching Spanish-English cognates. *Hispania*, 73 (2), 508-512.
- Goodfellow, J., & Sumsion, J. (2000). Transformative Pathways: field based teacher educators' perceptions. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 26 (3), 245-257.
- Gordon, S., (2006). Placement Tests: The Shaky Bridge Connecting School and College Mathematics. *Mathematics Teacher*, 100 (3), 174-178.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2006). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve the writing of adolescents in middle and high schools: A report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Green, R. (2005). *Expectations: How teacher expectations can increase student achievement and assist in closing the achievement gap*. Columbus, OH: SRA/McGraw-Hill.
- Greene, J. (1997). A meta-analysis of the Rossell & Baker review of bilingual education research. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21 (2-3), 103-122.
- Haastруп, K. (1991). *Lexical inferencing procedures or talking about words*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Halpern, D. (1998). Teaching critical thinking for transfer across domains: Dispositions, skills, structure training, and metacognitive monitoring. *American Psychologist*, 53 (4), 449-455.

- Hammrich, P., & Ragins, A. (2002, June). *Science and communication curriculum reform project: A content-based literacy program*. Paper presented at the Head Start National Research Conference, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED467559)
- Hartwell, P. (1987). Creating a literate environment in freshman English: Why and how. *Rhetoric Review*, 6 (1), 4-20.
- Hernandez, J. (1991). Assisted performance in reading comprehension strategies in non-English proficient students. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 8 (1), 91-112.
- Hillocks, G. (1995). *Teaching writing as reflective practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Holmes, J. (1986). Snarks, quarks, and cognates: An elusive fundamental particle in reading comprehension. *ESpecialist*, 15 (1), 13-40.
- Horst, M., Cobb, T., & Meara, P. (1998). Beyond a clockwork orange: Acquiring second language vocabulary through reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 11 (2), 207-223.
- Klingner, J., & Vaughn, S. (1996). Reciprocal teaching of reading comprehension strategies for students with learning disabilities who use English as a second language. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96 (3), 275-293.
- Krashen, S., & McField, G. (2005, November/December). What works? Reviewing the latest evidence on bilingual education. *Language Learner*, 7-10, 34.
- Kroll, J., & Dussias, P. (2004). The comprehension of words and sentences in two languages. In T. Ghatia & W. Ritchie (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 169-200). Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Laufer, B. (1988). The concept of 'synforms' (similar lexical forms) in L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Language and Education*, 2 (1), 113-132.

- Lesaux, N, Koda, K., Siegel, L., & Shanahan, T. (2006). Development of literacy. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth* (pp. 75-122). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lowry, P., Roberts, T., Romano, N., Cheney, P., & Hightower, R. (2006). Modeling cognitive interactions during group brainstorming. *Small Group Research, 37* (6), 631-661.
- Martinez, M. (1994). Spanish-English cognates in the subtechnical vocabulary found in engineering magazine texts. *English for Specific Purposes, 13* (1), 81-91.
- Martins, L., Gilson, L., & Maynard, M. (2004). Virtual teams: What do we know and where do we go from here? *Journal of Management, 30* (6), 805-835.
- McQuillan, J. (2005, November/December). An urban myth: The "poor quality" of bilingual education research. *Language Learner, 13-14*, 30.
- Met, M. (1999). *Content-based instruction: Defining items, making decisions* (NFLC Reports). Washington, DC: The National Foreign Language Center.
- Nagy, W. (1992). *Cross-language transfer of lexical knowledge: Bilingual students' use of cognates* (Technical Report No. 558). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED350869)
- Nagy, W., Breninger, V., & Abbott, R. (2006). Contributions of morphology beyond phonology to literacy outcomes of upper elementary and middle-school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98* (1), 134-147.
- Nagy, W., Herman, P., & Anderson, P. (1985). Learning words from context. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20* (2), 233-253.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2000). *Principles and standards for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.

- National Research Council. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning. Committee on Learning Research and Educational Practice. Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- National Research Council. (2003). *Assessment in support of instruction and learning: Bridging the gap between large-scale and classroom assessment* (Workshop Report). Committee on Assessment in Support of Instruction and Learning. Board on Testing and Assessment, Committee on Science Education K-12, Mathematical Sciences Education Board. Center for Education. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Netten, J., & Germain, C., (2000). Transdisciplinary approach and intensity in second language learning/teaching. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics/La Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée*, 3, (1-2), 107-122.
- Papai, N. (2000). Literacy development through content-based instruction: A case study. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 16 (2), 81-95.
- Paribakht, T., & Wesche, M. (1997). Vocabulary enhancement activities and reading for meaning in second language vocabulary acquisition. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy* (pp. 174-200). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paulus, P., & Dzindolet, M. (1995). Social influence processes in group brainstorming. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64 (4), 575-586.
- Pedder, D. (2006). Are small classes better? Understanding relationships between class size, classroom procedures and pupils' learning. *Oxford Review of Education*, 32 (2), 213-234.

- Rains, S. (2005). Leveling the organizational playing field—Virtually. *Communication Research, 32* (2), 193-234.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rowe, M. (1987). Wait time: Slowing down may be a way of speeding up. *American Educator, 11* (1), 38-43).
- Rueda, R., & Monzo, L. D. (2002). Apprenticeship for teaching: Professional development issues surrounding the collaborative relationship between teachers and paraeducators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*(5), 503-521.
- Russell, C., & Baker, K. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English, 30* (1), 7-73.
- Shillaw, J. (1995). Using a word list as a focus for vocabulary learning. *The Language Teacher (JALT), 19* (2), 58-59.
- Short, D., & Boyson, B. (2004). *Creating access: Language and academic programs for secondary school newcomers*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Shuy, R. (1976). *Problems in assessing language ability in bilingual education programs*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Shuy, R. (1981). Conditions affecting language learning and maintenance among Hispanics in the United States. *NABE Journal, 6* (1), 1-17.
- Sternberg, R. (1987). Most vocabulary is learnt from context. In M. McKeown & M. Curtis (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 89-105). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Stoller, R. (2002, March). *Content-based instruction: A shell for language teaching or a framework for strategic language and content learning?* Keynote address presented at the annual meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Salt Lake City, UT. Retrieved December 31, 2006, from <http://www.carla.umn.edu/cobaltt/modules/strategies/Stoller2002/READING1/stoller2002.htm>
- Stahl, R. (1994). *Using "think-time" and "wait-time" skillfully in the classroom.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED370885)
- Thomas, W. (1992). An analysis of the research methodology of the Ramirez study. *Bilingual Research journal*, 16 (1-2), 213-245.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997a). *School effectiveness for language minority students.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997b). Two languages are better than one. *Educational Leadership*, 55 (4), 23-26.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1999). Accelerated schooling for English language learners. *Educational Leadership*, 56 (7), 46-49.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement.* Santa Cruz, CA; Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2003). The multiple benefits of dual language. *Educational Leadership*, 61 (2), 61-64.
- Tinajero, J. (2005, November/December). Bilingual education in Texas: Lighting the path, leading the way. *Language Learner*, 17-18, 20.
- Tobin, K. (1987). The role of wait time in higher cognitive learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 57 (1), 69-95.

- Torff, B. (2005). Developmental changes in teachers' beliefs about critical-thinking activities. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97* (1), 13-22.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2000). Before it's too late: A report to the nation from the National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st century. (Publication Identification Number EE 0449P). Maryland: U.S. Department of Education, P.O. Box 1398, Jessup, MD 20794-1398.
- Valenzuela, A. (2005). Leaving children behind: How "texas-style" accountability fails latino youth. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Zohar, A. (2006). The nature and development of teachers' metastrategic knowledge in the context of teaching higher order thinking *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 15* (3), 331-377.
- Zohar, A., & Dori, Y. (2003). Higher order thinking skills and low-achieving students: Are they mutually exclusive? *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12* (2), 145-181.
- Zohar, A., & Schwartz, N. (2005). Assessing teachers' pedagogical knowledge in the context of teaching higher order thinking. *International Journal of Science Education, 27* (13), 1595-1620.
- Zhu, W. (1995). Effects of training for peer response of students' comments and interaction. *Written Communication, 12* (4), 492-528.

