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ABSTRACT

EXPLORING THE ROLE OF MENTOR TEACHING, THROUGH A CO-TEACHING MODEL, IN SECONDARY TEACHERS’ BELIEFS, PRACTICES, AND SELF-EFFICACY TOWARD ENGLISH LEARNERS: A MULTIPLE-CASE STUDY

by Terry E. Flora

This dissertation presents the findings of an exploratory, multiple-case study in which eight public secondary school teachers engaged in a professional development (PD) program centered on improving teacher instruction for English learners (ELs). The participants worked as co-teachers with teacher credential candidates, serving as both mentors and collaborators in professional development. The PD program focused on improving participants’ instructional practices with ELs as a way to support the high numbers of ELs enrolled in California public schools. The PD included cycles of inquiry, collaborative dialogue within a professional learning community, working with a university consultant, ongoing reflection, and collaborating with a teacher candidate as a way to improve their own teaching practices. This study explores changes in mentor teachers’ beliefs, practices and self-efficacy toward working with ELs over the course of a seven-month professional development project. This research was viewed through the framework of Mezirow’s Transformative Learning Theory. Findings suggest that all participants entered the PD experience with positive beliefs toward the academic capabilities of ELs and the desire to improve their own instructional practices. Data from this research reflects the need for PD programs to include differentiated, or individualized, activities that help to reach the professional growth needs of participants who are in various stages of transformative learning.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Public school teachers are faced with the daily task of instructing every student that walks through their classroom doors. All students enter their classrooms with a wide range of academic needs, and it is the job of public school teachers to meet the needs of all students. These needs are especially prevalent for students who are English learners (ELs). Teachers arrive to their classrooms with a variety of skillsets. These skillsets may not always match to the academic needs of their students. To better reach the needs of the students, it may be necessary for teachers to engage in some type of professional development (PD). Research has shown some elements of PD to be more helpful than others. The researcher of this exploratory, multiple-case study takes an in-depth look at a semester-long PD program that is centered on mentor teaching and co-teaching as a form of PD for secondary public school teachers. The researcher views this study through the lens of EL support, and designed the study to add to the existing research on effective PD. Additionally, the researcher explores the ways in which mentor teaching serves as a context for promoting the beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy associated with student learning outcomes in ELs and native English-speakers. More specifically, the researcher investigates the experiences of eight mentor teachers as they participated in a PD experience that contains elements of co-teaching that follows the work of Dieker and Murawski (2003). These co-teaching elements include: a) co-planning lessons, b) co-instructing lessons, and c) co-assessing student work. During this study, the mentor teachers were co-teaching with a teacher candidate as part of the clinical model.
component of the single-subject teaching credential program at a local university. The researcher explores the ways that mentoring, through a co-teaching experience, influences the mentors’ beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy when working with ELs. Jack Mezirow’s *Transformative Learning Theory* is utilized as the framework for exploring the effect that PD experiences had on the participants (Mezirow, 1991; Mezirow, 1997). Mezirow’s theory offers relevant insight on the research participants’ points of view, habits of mind, and a set of previous assumptions that Mezirow calls “frames of reference.” This theory is explained in more depth in Chapter 2 and is used to categorize some of the research findings in Chapter 4 and to frame the discussion in Chapter 5. More specifically, this theory frames the discussion of the relationship between the PD experience, and the mentor teachers’ beliefs, practices and self-efficacy toward their work with ELs.

The researcher specifically designed this study to investigate the PD participants who were working within a public secondary school containing high numbers of ELs. During the PD experience, the mentor teachers continued to work at the school in which they were already serving. The mentor teachers who participated in this study were volunteers from a larger group of mentor teachers who volunteered to take part in the PD program. Data analyzed in Chapter 4 were obtained through the collection of individual surveys, one-on-one interviews, and a focus group discussion comprising of all eight participants. The data obtained through the course of this study were used to address the research question components for this study.
**Research Question**

What is the relationship between mentoring, in a professional development program focused on co-teaching, and the mentors’ professional growth in the following areas?

a) Beliefs about the academic capabilities of English learners.
b) Practices toward English learners.
c) Self-efficacy in their work toward English learners.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of conducting this multiple-case study is to explore the PD experiences of the eight participating mentor teachers as a way to learn more about how to best support their professional growth toward teaching linguistically diverse students.

Changing teachers’ instructional practices and increasing self-efficacy are not easy to achieve. Research has shown that teachers with low levels of self-efficacy toward teaching ELs tend to feel unprepared in teaching ELs and may be hesitant to change their classroom practices (Guskey, 2002). Whitworth and Chiu (2015) found that teachers maintained low feelings of self-efficacy when they previously participated in a PD program, but failed to experience positive results in their own instruction or the achievement levels of their students. These findings demonstrate the difficulty in changing teacher practices and the importance of increasing levels of teacher self-efficacy.

The findings from this study can be used for the following outcomes: a) To bring light to people involved in mentoring programs in order to find what is working in mentoring programs; b) To help disseminate the information on what is working in mentoring programs so that other educators involved in mentoring programs can use
these strategies for future PD programs; c) To provide feedback to educators designing mentoring programs for more impactful teacher PD experiences; and d) To help teachers understand the importance of PD as a way to enhance instruction practices, promote positive beliefs, and increase self-efficacy toward working with ELs.

Scope of the Study

The scope of this study occurred within the sponsoring university’s semester-long co-teaching PD program called, *The Academic Language Project (The AL Project)*. This PD program, grant-funded through the U.S. Department of Education, worked in partnership with the sponsoring university to provide participants with a co-teaching experience that focused on multiple areas. The first area, “co-planning,” occurred when both the mentor and the teacher candidate collaborated on the planning of each class lesson. The second area, “co-teaching,” occurred during the co-instruction of each classroom lesson. The third area, “co-assessment,” occurred as the mentor and teacher candidate analyzed their students’ quizzes and/or exams. The final area was the participants’ engagement with multiple, student-outcomes focused, cycles of inquiry. Cycles of inquiry afforded the participants the opportunity to take an in-depth look at students’ work, to see what practices worked best on students and which students were academically struggling.

The data collected in this study were used to examine the various co-teaching and PD experiences of the eight participating mentor teachers during their participation in The AL Project. Additional areas that were examined during this study include the role that the relationship between the mentor teacher and the teacher candidate played in the overall PD experience, and the participant impact of engaging in ongoing professional
learning community (PLC) meetings. There were other mentors in The AL Project who participated in the full PD experience but did not wish to participate in this study. All project participants attended four PLC meetings throughout the fall, 2016 semester. The PLC meetings included all co-teaching partners and university professors leading The AL Project. Chapter 3 includes specific details on data collection and the participants.

**Beliefs, Practices, and Self-Efficacy**

In the scope of this research, the terms “beliefs,” “practices,” and “self-efficacy” pertain to participating teachers’ perception of how well they can promote ELs’ academic skills.

**Beliefs.** In this study, the term “beliefs” refers to Richardson’s (1996) definition of a teacher’s overall outlook or general disposition toward a particular group of students. For this study, “beliefs” is used in relation to the participating teachers’ dispositions toward teaching ELs in their mainstream classroom. According to research from Youngs and Youngs (2001), positive teacher dispositions toward ELs can have a positive impact on overall student learning. The same could be said for the negative impact that occurs when a teacher holds negative dispositions toward ELs. Additionally, research findings from Reeves (2006) indicate that teachers may carry a negative disposition toward teaching ELs because of the increased workload in providing appropriate academic supports. Examples of “beliefs” in this study include whether or not ELs should be provided with language support, rigorous curriculum, and an academic schedule consisting of mainstream, English-only classes. Additionally, “beliefs” refers to the
teachers’ overall outlook that ELs can academically achieve at high levels given the appropriate academic supports.

**Practices.** The term “practices” refers to a variety of inquiry and evidence-based pedagogy that will lead to increased learning for students. According to the research of Timperley, Wilson, Barrar & Fung (2008), these practices include the analysis of student achievement, engagement in content-specific PD, teachers’ abilities to assess student skills, collaborative learning opportunities with colleagues, working with external content experts, multiple opportunities to model teaching practices, and opportunities to engage as an instructional coach. According to Timperley, Wilson, Barrar & Fung (2008), these practices must be integrated through sustained PD to support both the learning and instructional practices of teachers.

**Self-efficacy.** The term “self-efficacy” refers to the strength of people’s convictions in their own effectiveness toward a given situation (Bandura, 1977). Factors that influence self-efficacy include past accomplishments, experiences of others, verbal persuasion from others, and emotions aroused from a given situation (Bandura, 1977). For this study, self-efficacy refers to the belief held by the teacher that he or she can positively impact student learning.

**Problem of the Study: Achievement Gap**

The “Standardized Testing and Reporting System,” known as *STAR*, was developed by California state legislators as a result of the federal accountability measures imposed by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2002. The purpose of creating STAR was to measure student progress in mathematics and English language arts (ELA). The results for the
yearly STAR test were used to calculate each school’s performance, known as the Annual Performance Index (API). The API scoring system used ELA and mathematics STAR test scores to generate a school’s API score. The API scoring system could range from as low as 200, to as high as 1000, and were used to report the students’ performance to both state and federal accountability mandates (www.cde.ca.gov).

Student performance data from 2013, the most recent API data, were obtained from the California Department of Education website on November 21, 2016. These data reflect a large achievement gap between California’s ELs and their English-proficient counterparts. In 2013, the average overall combined API score for all California students in all grades was 790. California’s Asian student population averaged a score of 906, White students averaged 852, Hispanic/Latina/o students averaged 743, ELs averaged 717, African-American students averaged 707, and students with disabilities averaged 616 (dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest).

These data points, collected from grades two through six, seven through eight, and nine through 11, suggest that White and Asian students significantly outperformed all of their peers, including ELs. The same data, when broken down by grade level, reflect large-scale academic challenges of California’s ELs attending school at the secondary grade levels. While all subgroups showed a decline in API scores through elementary, middle, and high school, no group showed a larger score decline than ELs.

For example, a snapshot of all Asian students attending California’s public schools shows scores of 906 (grades two through six), 927 (grades seven through eight), and 876 (grades nine through 11). These data represent a 30-point drop between Asian students
attending elementary school in 2013 and Asian students attending high school in 2013. Additionally, White students scored 874 (grades two through six), 855 (grades seven through eight), and 819 (grades nine through 11), which is a 55-point drop. In contrast, ELs scored 758 (grades two through six), 700 (grades seven through eight), and 651 (grades nine through 11). These data represent a 107-point drop between ELs attending elementary school in 2013 and ELs attending high school in 2013, a significant difference when compared to other subgroups. This is the second largest discrepancy in API scores out of all subgroups in California’s public schools, with students with disabilities showing a 137-API point drop. Additionally, test scores from African-American students showed a 73-API point drop, and Hispanic/Latina/o students showed a 57-API point drop (dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest).

The API scores mentioned above demonstrate that the academic achievement gap vastly widens for ELs as they move up from elementary to middle and later to high school. This is the reason why it is essential that teachers in the upper grades receive effective PD so that they can in turn increase the academic performance of ELs. Equally important to this discussion is the size of the EL population enrolled in California public schools. In 2013, there were over 1.46 million ELs accounted for in the API data. This is a large portion of all students enrolled in California’s public schools when compared to the approximately 407,000 Asian students, roughly 1.2 million White students, approximately 2.44 million Hispanic/Latina/o students, roughly 507,000 students with disabilities, and approximately 298,000 African-American students. These 2013 API data not only suggest a widening achievement gap for ELs, but also a widening
achievement gap for one of the largest student subgroups in the California public school system (dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest).

**Background of the Problem**

**Immigration patterns.** Changes in globalization and immigration patterns have led to sustained increases in the K-12 enrollment of ELs throughout the United States (Fix & Passel, 2003; Huntington, 2004). These changes have impacted California schools more than most other states (Fix & Passel, 2003; Gándara & Rumberger, 2009). Statistics from the California Department of Education database support Fix & Passel, 2003; Gándara & Rumberger, 2009 findings that show sustained enrollment trends for ELs in California public schools. In 1997, California had over 1.38 million ELs enrolled in grades K-12. These numbers spiked in 2004 when California served nearly 1.6 million ELs in grades K-12. Data from 2015 show that EL enrollment held steady at 1.39 million students. These data show consistent increased EL enrollment trends dating back to the late 1990s. Since 2002, California’s overall student enrollment has stayed relatively steady at roughly 6.2 million students, making EL enrollment, which has fluctuated between 1.3 and 1.5 million students, a large percentage of California’s 6.2 million K-12 student population (dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest).

Providing academic and linguistic support for ELs has become an important responsibility for California teachers due to the changing levels of language diversity within California’s public schools (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009). As recorded in the data last reported by the California Department of Education database, there are over 60 languages spoken in homes in California, with Spanish being the most commonly spoken
second language. For example, 1.1 million students speak Spanish at home, making Spanish speakers the largest group of second-language learners in California. This is a large percentage of the EL population, given that there are approximately 30,000 Vietnamese-speaking ELs in California schools, the second most commonly spoken language (dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest).

**Teachers’ experiences with a diverse student population.** Long-serving secondary education teachers are likely to have encountered increases in student language diversity during their career. In contrast, newer teachers may have entered the profession with high levels of language diversity already existent in California classrooms. The ongoing increases in language diversity within California public schools have left many teachers struggling to meet the academic needs of ELs in their classroom (Ballantyne, Sanderman, and Levy, 2008). Research has shown that teachers who struggle, because they are unprepared to help students meet their academic needs, often feel frustrated, disillusioned, and can leave the profession (Ballantyne, et al., 2008). The academic delivery and support for ELs has increasingly fallen on the shoulders of California teachers, many who are ill equipped to meet these challenges. This trend highlights the importance of engaging California teachers in a well-structured PD so that they become knowledgeable toward academically supporting ELs. In doing this, they can increase the opportunities for ELs in school.

Due to the increasing number of California’s ELs who are being placed in mainstream classrooms, it is imperative that teachers be well versed in strategies that promote second-language acquisition (Dresser, 2013; Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-
Jolly, & Callahan, 2003; Hakuta, 1974; Krashen, 1981). Teachers not familiar with best practices on second-language acquisition tend to focus on teaching students lower-level skills such as spelling and form, rather than higher-level skills such as synthesizing and analyzing (Hakuta, 1974). This leaves many ELs unprepared to meet the academic challenges they will face in the upper grades (Cummins, 1980; Dresser, 2013). One of the challenges students face is reading comprehension, because as students get older, the language in the textbooks becomes more complex. ELs often lack the necessary vocabulary and reading comprehension strategies to work in academic settings, creating the need for increased academic support at the secondary school level (Bunch, Abram, Lotan, & Valdés, 2001). This is why it is essential that teachers teach students not only how to convey ideas but also how to understand messages in their second language (Cummins, 1980; Krashen, 1981).

The increasing numbers of ELs, and the large numbers of unprepared teachers, have left California public schools with a shortage of teachers who are able to face the challenges of academically and linguistically supporting California’s EL students (Dabach, 2015; Gándara, et al., 2003).

The fact that there is a shortage of teachers who are trained to teach in a linguistically diverse classroom creates a challenge for educators in charge of universities’ teaching credential programs. Thus, university educators must discover ways to adequately prepare new teachers to meet the academic needs of ELs while also offering PD support programs for veteran teachers struggling to teach ELs. Professional development programs can range in duration and content focus (Guskey & Yoon, 2009). According
to the work of Guskey and Yoon (2009), some of the more effective qualities of PD programs include: a) opportunities for teacher collaboration, b) opportunities to work with an outside expert, c) a sustained PD experience over a long period of time, and d) content-specific collaboration. According to the work of Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, and Yoon (2001), other elements of effective PD include: a) collaboration, b) opportunities for reflection, and c) group dialogue. Elements of effective PD are discussed in more detail in Chapter 2.

Even though the amount of PD programs offered to teachers has increased in recent years, there are large numbers of teachers who do not participate in these opportunities (Rumberger & Gándara, 2004). To further complicate matters, despite best efforts, many teachers who do participate in various PD programs do not end up integrating the new instructional strategies into their daily classroom practices (Smith & Gillespie, 2007; Whitworth & Chiu, 2015). It is important that PD programs be refined to contain more research-based practices. Doing so increases the likelihood that the practices teachers learn in PD programs find their way to the intended students (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Whitworth & Chiu, 2015).

One component of effective PD that has shown to create professional growth is through the process of teachers mentoring other teachers. The professional growth of both participants is likely to occur because of the sustained opportunities to engage in elements of PD that research has shown to be effective (Garet, et al., 2001; Guskey & Yoon, 2009; Huling & Resta, 2001). Professional growth is also likely to occur when the mentor and mentee receive ongoing support from an expert (Guskey & Yoon, 2009;
Huling & Resta, 2001). In addition, research has shown that professional growth is likely to occur when the PD program focuses on the instructional needs of the participant. These needs can include participants’ instruction of academic language, as well as the various academic needs of a specific group of students, such as ELs (Bunch et al. 2001; Harper, & de Jong, 2009).

**Legislation: Impact on ELs**

**United States judicial branch.** Minimum expectations for supporting ELs in American public schools have been influenced by several pieces of legislation, and rulings from both the federal circuit courts and the U.S. Supreme Court. Prior to the mid-1900s, American public schools operated under the parameters set forth by the Supreme Court case, Plessy v. Ferguson (1896). The ruling upheld state rights for legal segregation of public facilities based on race. The Supreme Court ruled that states that practiced racial segregation in public facilities, including public schools, were not in violation of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution, which granted all citizens equal protection of all laws, as long as they provided equal facilities to both groups (Kauper, 1954). The Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) ruling set the precedent for the legalization of racial segregation in U.S. public schools. It was not until the mid-1900s that new court cases emerged challenging the Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) segregation ruling.

**Westminster v. Mendez (1946)** was a class action lawsuit filed on behalf of nearly five thousand Mexican students attending school in Orange County, California. The U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the rights of Mexican students were being
violated if they were being segregated in California public schools (Valencia, 2005). Even though the U.S. Supreme Court did not rule on this case, Westminster v. Mendez (1946) laid the groundwork for the Supreme Court case, Brown v. The Board of Education (1954).

In 1951, a small group of parents filed a class action lawsuit against the Board of Education in Topeka, Kansas. The plaintiffs in this case filed the lawsuit on behalf of their students with the intent of making the Topeka School Board reverse its policies on racial segregation in their schools. The U.S. Supreme Court eventually took the Brown v. Board of Education case in 1954, after long legal battles in the lower courts (Bell, 1980). The Supreme Court ruled unanimously in favor of the plaintiffs, and outlawed racial segregation in American public schools (Bell, 1980). States throughout the country stopped the practices of racial segregation in U.S. public schools and over a short span of time integrated students throughout the U.S. public school system. The integration created a variety of other issues including increased racism, and issues surrounding language support for non-native English speakers (Gándara, Moran, and Garcia, 2004).

In the early 1970s, there were roughly 2,800 Chinese-American students attending schools in San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). These students were receiving insufficient support, and therefore could not understand what they were learning. To ensure students’ academic achievement, a group of Chinese-American parents filed a class action lawsuit against the president of SFUSD. The goal of the class action lawsuit was to improve the quality of support ELs were receiving in San Francisco’s public schools (Gándara, Moran, and Garcia, 2004). The lower courts
defeated the plaintiffs under the notion that all students were being treated equally under the 14th Amendment. The U.S. Supreme Court selected to take on the case, and Lau v. Nichols (1974) was ruled unanimously in favor of the plaintiffs. The Supreme Court Justices argued that U.S. public schools accepting federal monies needed to provide equal opportunities and access to all students (Berenyi, 2008). The result of this ruling was the increase in funding for The Bilingual Education Act (1968), and the passing of The Equal Educational Opportunities Act (1974). The Equal Opportunities Act (1974) mandated that public schools take appropriate actions to overcome educational barriers for students and faculty (Berenyi, 2008). Lau v. Nichols (1974) was influential in preventing the denial of a proper education to ELs in U.S. public schools. The case was also instrumental in establishing support mandates, such as increased funding, for schools where ELs made up at least 5% of their school’s student population (Calderon, Slavin, & Sánchez, 2011).

These cases paved the way for increases in both state and federal accountability measures for ELs in U.S. public schools (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009), while also changing the trajectory in the way ELs are served in U.S. public schools. These cases expanded the national education dialogue to include supporting ELs, which influenced legislative and executive action throughout the second half of the 1900s and into the early 2000s.

**United States executive and legislative branches.** In 1965, as part of the “War on Poverty,” President Lyndon Johnson pushed for the passing of influential legislation in support of low socio-economic students and the public school system (Thomas & Brady,
2005). President Johnson associated poverty with inequitable education, and under his vision for a “Great Society,” pushed for the passing of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965). The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) paved the way for school districts across the country to receive varying degrees of federal funding depending on the socioeconomic levels of their students. For example, in 1965, ESEA provided nearly $1 billion in direct funding to American public schools containing high numbers of students living in poverty (Thomas & Brady, 2005), making the ESEA the primary funding source for addressing inequity in public schools.

In the following few years, ESEA was modified to create additional accountability and funding mandates that supported specific subgroups, including ELs. For example, Title VII of the ESEA became The Bilingual Education Act (1968). This law highlighted the needs of ELs and provided opportunities for increased levels of support for bilingual students (Curiel, Rosenthal, & Richek, 1986). As a result of the passing of The Bilingual Education Act (1968), bilingual programs throughout American public schools increased (Curiel, et al., 1986).

During the early 1980s, President Ronald Reagan pushed for increased state powers, and the federal government’s role in education began to subside. The publishing of the 1983 landmark report titled, “A Nation at Risk,” highlighted areas of concern within the U.S. education system. This report outlined the need for increased academic standards (Goldberg & Harvey, 1983), and created increased momentum for the federal government to increase its influence in public schools (Hunt, 2008).
During the early 1990s, President George H.W. Bush pushed for national academic standards and increased national standardized testing (Thomas & Brady, 2005). Even though his efforts did not result in federal legislation, President Clinton continued these efforts and was successful in passing the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (1994). This legislation increased the attention on academic achievement levels, academic rigor through the use of content standards, and increased use of standardized testing to monitor the academic progress of students (Thomas & Brady, 2005).

**No Child Left Behind (2002): Increased school accountability.** The federal government began the push for increased student accountability during the late 1990s. This push was occurring at the same time that California passed Proposition 227, severely limiting support for bilingual programs, and almost eliminating bilingual programs altogether. During the early 2000s, President George W. Bush was influential in creating legislation that increased academic performance accountability for all students attending public school in the United States. In 2002, Congress passed the *No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)*. NCLB expanded the federal government’s role in America’s public schools and created the largest amount of federal oversight in public education since the 1960s (McGuinn, 2005). According to McGuinn (2005), states who accepted federal funds were mandated to comply with the following statutes: a) the implementation of academic standards that guide course curriculum, b) the adoption of a testing system that aligns with the state’s academic standards, c) ensuring that all public school teachers possessed a bachelor’s degree, state teaching credential, and demonstrated competence within the
content area they are instructing, and d) the implementation of statewide standardized testing to generate student performance data.

NCLB created a nation-wide system of increased accountability, standards-based curriculum, and high-stakes testing (McGuinn, 2016). According to McGuinn (2016), NCLB increased state responsibilities in the following areas of accountability: a) the establishment of a system of accountability that determines student proficiency levels, b) the identification of methods in discovering schools that contained large numbers of students who were not “proficient,” and c) the institution of specific measures toward a school/district that failed to make “adequate yearly progress” (AYP), which was moving toward the target goals of the state.

The mandates from NCLB that were placed on states receiving federal education funding created increased student accountability measures throughout the nation’s school system. The increased accountability measures strained school resources and had an inequitable impact on schools serving high levels of ELs (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009).

Every Student Succeeds Act (2015): Changes in school accountability. During the mid 2000s, President Obama faced heavy political gridlock and struggled to move forward with a federal education policy (McGuinn, 2016). Much of the Obama administration’s early education reforms took the shape of federal grants such as 2009’s Race to the Top (Weiss, 2016). Race to the Top awarded federal monies to districts that showed large increases in student improvement, but it was criticized by some educators for inequitably awarding monies to schools that had the existing needed resources, such as technology, which is viewed as a tool for academic growth (Weiss, 2016).
By 2014, it was clear that the states were not achieving the levels required by NCLB that called for 100% student proficiency in ELA and mathematics. It was also clear that President Obama’s Race to the Top initiative was not achieving the desired impact of large-scale public school improvements. As a result, Congress and President Obama began working together on new federal education legislation.

In 2015, Congress passed *The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)*. According to McGuinn (2016), ESSA reduced the number of state accountability pressures created by NCLB, and instituted the adoption of the *Common Core State Standards (CCSS)*. The CCSS shifted the focus of instruction away from existing state content standards, and toward the creation of skills such as critical thinking, creativity, communication, and collaboration. ESSA also created changes in state accountability systems by focusing state assessments on measuring progress with academic skills, instead of measuring content knowledge. Finally, ESSA reduced the role of the federal government in the education system and gave more control to state and local education agencies.

The shift toward more state and local control has created new types of accountability measures for the state of California. According to Klein (2015), these accountability measures include increasing the language proficiency levels for ELs, and increasing academic growth among all subgroups of students. These subgroups include African-American and Latina/o students, students from low socioeconomic backgrounds, and ELs. These areas of growth are measured yearly by computer adaptive tests that have recently taken the place of the STAR tests that were used during the NCLB era.
The nation’s ever-changing student accountability measures have created an education climate where public educators needed to find new ways to academically support ELs. The increased enrollment of ELs in California’s public schools, coupled with the current climate of student accountability, have left teachers with no option but to acquire the necessary skills to ensure that students become linguistically and academically proficient.

California Legislation: Impact on ELs

In 1998, California voters passed Proposition 227. This proposition severely restricted the use of bilingual programs in California public schools. According to Matas & Rodríguez (2014), Proposition 227 impacted ELs attending California’s public schools in the following ways. First, the law began the dismantling of most of the state’s bilingual programs. Second, schools were required to place ELs in “Structured English Immersion” classes (SEI) for a period of time. These were English-only classes that only contained ELs. The instruction of English grammar was the focal point of SEI lessons, and the SEI classes tended to lack academic rigor. Third, Proposition 227 led to increased mainstreaming of ELs into classes with their English-proficient counterparts. The increased practice of mainstreaming often took ELs away from the most highly qualified bilingual teachers and into classes with little to no language support (Mora, 2002). Finally, Proposition 227 created education inequities statewide. These inequities occurred as some communities had the resources to advocate for maintaining their existing bilingual programs, while communities without the appropriate resources often experienced the dismantling of their school’s bilingual program.
The impact of Proposition 227 created a ripple effect of education inequities for ELs throughout California’s public schools. Since 1998, large numbers of parents and educators worked to reverse the impact of Proposition 227 by creating statewide momentum for a law that would overturn the state law. The sustained momentum led to the creation of Proposition 58 that was put on the state ballot during the 2016 election. Proposition 58 was designed to overturn the education restrictions of Proposition 227, and was designed to allow public schools to decide how to teach ELs in their district (Citrin and DeCamillo, 2016).

California voters approved Proposition 58 during the 2016 election by a 73% voter approval rate (L.A. Times, 2017). California school districts now have the option to do away with English-only programs that were a direct result of Proposition 227. In addition, Proposition 58 has created the opportunity for immigrant students to retain their home languages while also learning English (S.F. Public Press, 2017).

**Challenges California Educators Face As They Support ELs**

**Teacher credentialing.** The residual effects of NCLB and the current measures from ESSA, such as increases in accountability measures, have created additional challenges for California lawmakers in ensuring that all students receive a quality education. California lawmakers have been working to meet these challenges through the state’s rigorous teacher certification process. In fact, California educators have greater credentialing requirements and certification requirements than most other states (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009). These requirements were put in place to ensure that all students are meeting their academic goals. To meet these goals, students need to be placed in
classrooms taught by highly qualified teachers (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009). California teachers need a bachelor’s degree, a teaching credential, and must complete a series of courses in second-language acquisition. Aside from these certifications, bilingual teachers must pass the proper state exams to add the bilingual authorization (California Education Code; EC Section 44001, EC Section 44830(a), EC Section 44831, EC Section 44253.1). Even though the bilingual authorization is only for bilingual teachers, English-only teachers need to take a series of courses in second-language acquisition.

**Bilingual programs.** The passing of Proposition 58 during the 2016 election has created school staffing challenges throughout California as that state looks to increase their bilingual education efforts. Authorized bilingual teacher shortages around the state are one of the remaining negative impacts of Proposition 227. For example, the number of authorized bilingual teachers dropped 46% between 2010 and 2015, and the number of emergency bilingual permits increased by 19% (www.ctc.ca.gov). These data show that there is a need to quickly increase the number of authorized bilingual teachers, so that we can rebuild bilingual programs throughout California’s public schools.

California will likely experience bilingual teacher shortages due to the fact that it takes teacher candidates several years to meet the state requirements. One way that California is addressing this shortage is through the recruitment of authorized bilingual teachers from other states (Bakersfield.com, 2017).

**Bilingual student recognition.** Despite past setbacks and current challenges to bilingual education programs, California educators have found alternative means of recognizing the academic achievements of bilingual students. One way of doing so is
through the promotion of the *Seal of Biliteracy* offered by many public schools. The Seal of Biliteracy is a national program that not only honors students who are biliterate, but also encourages students to become biliterate (Edwards, Ander, & Herda, 2015). In 2011, California educators showed support for ELs by becoming the first state in the nation to adopt this recognition for bilingual students (O’Rourke, Zhou, & Rottman, 2016). This has been a significant step in the process of academically supporting ELs attending California public schools.

**Summary.** Even though legislation has changed to support second-language instruction, California teachers remain in need of PD and other forms of support. Those teachers who feel unprepared to meet the needs of ELs may experience prolonged levels of low self-efficacy, which could lead to increases in teacher turnover and low student success (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010; Johnson, Berg, & Donaldson, 2005). As they work to improve instruction, teachers need to remain optimistic about their individual potential in creating a positive impact on their students’ academic success (Nieto, 2015). In doing this, it is imperative that teachers receive the necessary tools they need to be effective educators in their work with ELs. For this reason, it is necessary to put in place well-structured PD programs that can increase teacher knowledge, which can result in student success.

Teachers from a variety of experience levels can benefit from specific PD experiences, especially those in programs serving the linguistic and academic demands of their diverse students (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009). Guskey (2002) argues that PD programs can offer the teacher the support needed in order for teachers to make changes
to their practices. For example, through PD, teachers can learn how to make modifications to a lesson, how to effectively collaborate, techniques for direct instruction, and effective assessment practices are all important ways to better support the academic efforts of their students (Guskey, 2002; Guskey & Yoon, 2009). With these ideas in mind, it is essential to provide ongoing PD to California’s educators, which can increase EL support and prevent teacher turnover.

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of this study is to bring light to the many challenges that teachers face in order to meet the academic and linguistic needs of ELs. While well-intentioned, current legislation has created a push for standardized testing, which makes teaching even more difficult (McGuinn, 2016; Weiss, 2016). Teachers work hard to help their students meet the state and federal requirements. However, many of them understand that most tests only assess lower-level skills. As a result, teachers find themselves struggling to find time to teach higher-skills content and academic language, which are essential for students to master in order to succeed in high school (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008; Bunch, et al., 2001). Teachers, therefore, need to receive ongoing PD support so that they learn not only how to assist students to increase their test scores, but also how to provide high levels of content-language learning. The intent for conducting this study was to uncover factors that afford or constrain the impact of PD on participating teachers. In addition, the researcher hopes that findings from this multiple-case study will add to the existing body of research on effective PD, mentoring, and co-teaching as ways to improve teacher self-efficacy toward academically supporting their EL students.
Background and Role of the Researcher

The researcher’s experiences in teaching ELs, as an administrator, and as a child who experienced language loss are some of the events that propelled the idea for this study. Many generations ago, the researcher’s family spoke English and Spanish. Throughout the years and many generations receiving English-only instruction, the Spanish language disappeared and his family became monolingual. After growing up without the full knowledge of a second language. The researcher would like to see all California students afforded with the opportunity to become bilingual and biliterate. Strides can be made toward achieving this goal through increased teacher participation in PD programs centered on English learners, and increases in academic success for ELs.

Frames of Reference

This section describes various personal and professional experiences that have influenced the assumptions of the researcher going into this study, also known as frames of reference (Mezirow, 1997). The following paragraphs discuss the researcher’s beliefs on the following topics: a) potential benefits of participating in PD focused on supporting ELs, b) potential long-term negative impact on ELs when teachers do not provide proper academic support, and c) the academic implications that are at stake for individual students who do not receive such support.

The researcher’s beliefs on the academic abilities of ELs have been shaped by his time as a classroom teacher. The researcher received an assignment to teach ELs in a “SDAIE” class during his fifth year of teaching. SDIAE, or “Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English,” is an instructional process that includes teaching
content and English language development simultaneously to ELs, often in a mainstream class setting (Cline & Necochea, 2003). As the school year began, the researcher worked quickly to build relationships with his students, while also building a positive classroom culture. After a few weeks of teaching, he realized that his lessons were not providing the linguistic support nor the academic rigor needed to help his students achieve at high levels. The researcher sought advice from colleagues and searched for outside PD with the goal of increasing support and rigor for the ELs in his class. He eventually pursued the services of an instructional coach and worked with the coach throughout four class sessions. During these sessions, they planned and practiced multiple teaching strategies. Some of these strategies were borrowed from Dove & Honigsfeld’s (2010) work, which they describe as elements of co-teaching. These strategies included “one person teaches, the other one observes,” “one person teaches, the other one assists,” and “co-instruction” of an entire lesson. A reflective dialogue between the coach and the researcher followed each session, and it was through these reflections that the researcher was able to see the impact of the new instructional practices he was using. For example, the researcher found an increase in student engagement. With further analysis of his students, it became evident that aside from an increase in engagement, there was an increase in student achievement. In the end, the researcher became confident that the changes in behavior and practices would lead to positive academic achievements for his students.

The researcher’s second frame of reference for this research comes from three years of serving as a high school administrator. Working as an assistant principal gave the researcher the experience to work as both a disciplinarian for students and as an
instructional evaluator for teachers. In this role, he saw first-hand how the academic limitations of ELs could lead to personal conflict with their teachers. The researcher noticed that often times these student-teacher conflicts resulted in an increased number of discipline referrals sent by the teacher toward a particular student. Many of the students who were sent to him for discipline-related issues were ELs, and most of the referrals written for these students were for acts of “disruption” or “defiance.”

Through dialogue with the referred students, the researcher found that many of the problems the students were experiencing stemmed from their frustration caused from their inability to master subject matter-related material. Conversing with the referring teachers, the researcher often heard statements such as, “They don’t care about my class,” and “They are just being lazy.” These experiences gave the researcher first-hand experience with classrooms where students are failing because teachers do not have the necessary preparation to effectively support their students. The researcher believes that teachers should improve their understanding of the struggles ELs encounter when learning a second language, learn research and theory-based practices, and increase their sense of self-efficacy as a key to not only decreasing the number of discipline referrals for ELs, but also decreasing teacher frustrations, which more likely will result in student success.

The researcher’s third frame of reference comes from an influential conversation that he had in the fall of 2015 with an 11th grade EL who was born in the African country of Eritrea. This particular student moved to the United States during the spring 2015 semester. One day, during the lunch period, the researcher saw the student sitting on a
bench looking uncharacteristically sad. The researcher asked the student what was the matter and the student proceeded to share the cause of his frustrations. The student explained that he was used to taking advanced courses in his home country and was placed in a pre-college program. When the student arrived in the United States, he had to take lower-level English courses. The student felt that taking the lower-level courses would negatively impact his ability to attend college in the United States. After the researcher listened to the student’s concerns, he responded by saying, “I’m sorry you are going through this. It must be hard attending classes that are being taught in your second language.” The student looked up at the researcher, cracked a half-smile, and said, “Mr. Flora . . . English is my fifth language.” This conversation reminded the researcher of the assets that many ELs bring to public school classrooms. It was also made clear that this student’s language skills were not assessed properly as a result of not being academically challenged. This conversation motivated the researcher to learn ways to help teachers to provide increased academic support for their EL students.

**Positionality**

The researcher served as the project manager of The AL Project throughout the research study process. The researcher’s primary duties as project manager were to organize the PD training days at the participating university. Additionally, the researcher facilitated communication between the university professors and the PD participants, and made sure that the participants were provided with all PD materials. The researcher’s position as project manager did not give him any authority over the participants whom he researched. He did not have any contact with the administrators of the participating
teachers, nor was he able to impact their status as mentors in the university’s credential program. The participants for this research were volunteers and could cease their participation at any time.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

The Increased Need for Teacher Professional Development

As previously stated in Chapter 1, multiple factors have contributed to the need for teacher professional development (PD). For example, growing numbers of English learners (ELs) in the California public school system have increased the demand for educators to provide academic supports for ELs (Flynn, 2005; Gándara, et al., 2003). Additionally, state and federal accountability measures have developed the need for California educators to focus on improving instruction for ELs (Batt, 2008). Furthermore, reductions in bilingual programs have left mainstream teachers struggling and unprepared to meet the needs of their diverse students (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009). These changes and challenges have left educators with the responsibility of giving all teachers the ability to participate in well-structured PD programs so that they can receive the training they need to ensure that all children, including ELs, meet their linguistic and academic needs (Fix & Passell, 2003).

The conditions highlighted in Chapter 1 have increased professional demands on California’s public school teachers. According to Batt (2008), without increased support, teachers have to solve many of these problems while working in isolation. These professional demands can be made worse for teachers who are new to the profession. According to the research of Reeves (2006), teachers who lack experience in teaching all students may experience reservations in teaching classes containing ELs. These ideas are just some that have left educational leaders in a position to revise PD programs (Flynn,
Depending on the type of PD program, struggling teachers may experience an opportunity to professionally grow in a variety of areas. For example, some researchers believe that a well-structured PD program can help teachers to provide increased academic supports for their EL students (Batt, 2008; Guskey & Yoon, 2009). Some of these elements include opportunities for teachers to try new instructional practices while receiving ongoing support from an outside expert (Guskey & Yoon, 2009). These elements are explored later in this chapter.

**Potential Benefits of Professional Development Participation**

Through PD, teachers can learn to honor ELs’ existing language skills while helping them to develop academic language across the curriculum (Flynn, 2005). Mainstream teachers learn to maintain high expectations for their EL students and utilize effective practices to ensure that the students achieve high academic learning (Reich, Sevim, & Turner, 2015; Walqui, 2006). For example, a teacher may want to promote collaboration by creating heterogeneous grouping so that ELs receive support from their peers. A teacher may learn how to use sentence frames, or graphic organizers to help students stay engaged and to promote comprehension and learning. Additionally, teachers could learn strategies on how to best get to know their students. Helping teachers to meet the academic needs of their EL students may require that teachers learn more about each student’s English language abilities and their students’ individual learning needs. Doing so can help the teacher to make the appropriate changes to his or her instructional practices (Castañeda, Rodríguez-González, & Shultz, 2011).
One way to increase student success is ensuring that all teachers teaching ELs have experience and are well versed in second-language acquisition practices. The increased accountability measures and the Common Core State Standards have made teaching even more difficult than before. Increased mainstreaming practices in most classrooms have been the main reasons for this shift in responsibility compared to previous years, when ELs were isolated in their own classes without their English-speaking peers (Bunch, 2013). These are some of the changes that have increased the need for PD among experienced teachers.

**Professional Development Opportunities**

Since the early 2000s, California’s educational leaders have created more PD opportunities for teachers teaching ELs (Ballantyne, et al., 2008). As a result, California legislators have approved funding for a PD institute through the University of California system. However, by 2002, only seven percent of PD programs had a focus on ELs, and of these programs, only eight percent of California teachers participated (Rumberger & Gándara, 2004). This raised concerns over the reasons for the low levels of participation. Subsequently, researchers studied the most effective types of PD experiences in order to create PD opportunities that more teachers would want to engage with. The following sections describe key pieces of research as they relate to effective PD programs.

**Elements of Effective Professional Development**

In recent years, researchers have assessed a plethora of PD programs in hopes of determining specific PD activities that bring about the maximum amount of impact for the participants (Guskey & Yoon, 2009). The goal for any PD program is to allow its
participants to engage in professional growth experiences. The research of Guskey (2002) explores the ways in which specific PD activities help to promote professional growth. For example, Guskey found that professional growth transpires when participants have the opportunity to implement what they learn, and then observe specific changes in student behavior. This gives the participants the opportunity to see the cause-and-effect relationship between new instructional practices and student achievement. Additionally, a positive impact from a PD experience is likely to occur when teacher participants see that their own behavioral changes are working to improve student outcomes. This process can occur through various reflection activities. This type of PD process can lead to greater chances of professional growth for the PD participants.

Guskey (2002) concludes that these types of PD activities have shown to have a positive impact on teachers’ instruction, while increasing levels of student achievement, compared to PD programs that do not contain these types of activities.

**Components of effective PD.** Additional authors from other bodies of research on PD programs have sought to discover connections linking PD and increases in student achievement. In a 2009 meta-analysis on effective PD, Guskey and Yoon analyzed over 1,300 studies. The following paragraph describes their findings in relation to the components of PD that they determined to be the most effective in changing teacher practices.

The first factor is the consistent guidance from, and collaboration with, an outside expert throughout the PD experience. The presence of an outside expert has shown to help teachers to be more active in the PD experience, compared to participating in a PD
led by a colleague at the participant’s school site. Second, there must also be an appropriate amount of time dedicated to the PD session. This time needs to be structured, purposefully directed, and goal-oriented. Third, there must be timely and consistent follow-up from an outside expert to ensure that the PD participant understood the learning goals from the PD session. The expert follow-up is meant to assist teachers who are in the process of attempting to make the desired professional growth, but may need additional support to make specific changes to their practice. Consistent follow-up has been found to be a vital component to the success of the participating teacher’s professional growth. Without timely and consistent support, the teacher is at-risk of reverting back to older instructional habits. Fourth, an effective PD program should contain subject matter that relates to the content area of the participant or the instructional practices of the teacher. For example, science teachers would benefit more from a program that contains content regarding teaching science, rather than a program that focuses on teaching English. If the PD is not relevant to the teacher’s needs, then it will be unlikely that her or she will invest time and effort by participating in the PD experience.

Other bodies of research have shown that effective PD programs must contain elements of what Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, and Yoon (2001) calls “active learning.” Examples of active learning include both observing another teacher engaging in direct instruction, as well as being observed during a direct instruction. Active learning also includes lesson planning and reviewing student work with a colleague, and opportunities for self-reflection (Garet, et al., 2001). Active learning can also include
multiple PD participants engaging one another within a group discussion. This activity has been shown to build a sense of community, while increasing collective levels of peer support among other program participants (Guskey, 2003).

The research of Guskey (2002) has shown that PD participants need appropriate amounts of time to work with new instructional materials in order to learn how to use and implement these tools effectively into their practice. Having the appropriate amount of time to work with new materials is a key component for experiencing sustained professional growth (Guskey, 2002). In addition, effective PD programs must allow time so that participants can reflect on their practice and on student learning (Garet, et al., 2001).

Additional research from Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, and Birman (2002) has shown that lasting professional growth rarely occurs in just one PD session. It can often take many months for teachers to experience a positive impact from a PD program that results in lasting professional growth (Desimone, et al., 2002). For these reasons, educational leaders running PD programs need to provide ongoing learning support for the PD participants that last beyond the scope of the PD program.

Potential benefits of effective PD. Well-designed professional programs for teachers can also impact students’ performance. Research from Guskey (2003) and Guskey & Yoon (2009) have shown that a lasting impact on student achievement can occur as a direct result of the teachers’ professional growth. For example, students may experience improvements in reading and/or writing if their teacher incorporates various reading and writing strategies that he or she learned from his or her PD program. Student
success can be even more dramatic in situations such as ELs receiving academic support from teachers who completed a PD program that assisted them in working with ELs.

Collaborative conversations among PD participants are helpful for professional growth, because participants tend to change their beliefs and/or instructional practices through the process of reflective dialogue with colleagues (Garet, et al., 2001). For example, collaborative conversations can help the participants in working through various questions and/or concerns that may have been keeping them from implementing a new instructional practice. In doing this, they can work through concerns about implementing new practices learned during a PD program (Guskey, 2003). These practices can include increased use of technology in the classroom, collaborative seating arrangements for student group work, and EL support strategies for their EL students. These conversations can be the implementation of new strategies to increase student learning, and even the increased use of student performance data for lesson planning. Since professional growth has been shown to occur during collaborative conversations, continuous engagement in these types of conversations throughout a PD program can serve as a way to create a long-lasting impact on teachers learning through a PD program.

**Summary of effective PD elements.** A synthesis of the research done by Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon (2001), Guskey and Yoon (2009), and Darling-Hammond & Richardson (2009) have provided information that helps for the emergence of important themes regarding effective PD programs. First, the experience must be content-related. Second, the PD needs to be sustained over a long period of time. Third, the PD should be designed around active learning components. Finally, the participants
should never be left in isolation to implement the PD material. For example, they should always have appropriate supports from school leaders, a colleague, and/or an outside expert throughout the professional growth process. These supports help to prevent a teacher from reverting to old instructional habits when implementing a new instructional strategy that is not immediately successful in creating increased academic success for his or her students.

Even though teacher participation with PD containing these elements have been shown to increase participant learning, despite best efforts, teachers who participate in PD containing these elements do not always experience the desired outcomes. Therefore, it is necessary to delve further into what elements of a PD program makes it ineffective and how programs containing these elements impact participating teachers.

**Co-Teaching as Professional Development**

Research from Gatley & Gatley Jr. (2001), and Dieker & Murawski (2003), discuss the elements of the co-teaching model. According to Dieker & Murawski (2003), the co-teaching PD “model pairs two teachers for an extended period of time.” During the co-teaching process, both teachers act as equal classroom teachers, as opposed to a model in which one person is the teacher and the other is the assistant teacher. In other words, rather than having a lead teacher and assistant teacher, the co-teaching experience emphasizes equality between both participants throughout the experience. The two participants not only act as teaching partners, but they also engage in various collaborative elements of active learning (Garet, et al., 2001). These elements include the co-planning of lessons, the co-instruction of lessons, the co-reflection of the day’s
teaching, and the co-assessment of student work (Gatley & Gatley Jr., 2001; Dieker & Murawski, 2003). The ongoing collaboration often results in both teachers making pedagogical decisions, which can help the two participants to learn from each other (Gatley Jr., 2001). According to Dove & Honigsfeld (2010), the co-teaching model is a collaborative learning process that helps teachers to find new ways to academically support students.

The co-teaching model emphasizes the sharing of curriculum, lesson development ideas, the sharing of academic supports for all students, and collaboration on ways to support various specific subgroups of students (Dieker & Murawski, 2003). Research from Dove and Honigsfeld (2010) examines strategies that can be used to help teachers to improve their levels of academic support for ELs while participating within a co-teaching model. One of these strategies involves one teacher taking the instructional lead while the other teacher provides individual student support. This method allows a teacher to lead the whole class through a lesson, while the other teacher helps to provide specific and timely academic support for students who may not be following with the rest of the class. Another strategy involves one teacher teaching curriculum content, and the other teacher blending linguistic content into the lesson. This method helps teachers to better support more students through both content and language-learning objectives by focusing on specific instructional tasks throughout a particular lesson. Furthermore, another strategy involves one teacher leading a specific section of a lesson, while the other teacher observes a subgroup of students. This method helps both teachers to determine
the areas of needed academic support when one teacher has the opportunity to provide immediate and concentrated academic support for specific students.

The co-teaching experience may also include a student-outcomes based cycle of inquiry. Research from Dieker & Murawski (2003) examines ways that engaging in a student-outcomes based cycle of inquiry can help co-teachers to better analyze the direct impact of particular academic supports. According to their research, the analysis can occur through a variety of processes. First, a cycle of inquiry can include academic support planning for particular students. The academic support planning can be in a variety of forms, stemming from evidence of student need such as analysis of student work. Evidence can also come in the form of observation data of students during a lesson. This method of data collection is made easier when the co-teachers practice a “one-teach, one-observe” model of instruction. Finally, the academic support planning can come from various lesson reflections. The co-teaching model allows for many opportunities for lesson reflection, given the amount of time that that co-teachers spend together. The opportunities to analyze the academic supports toward a particular focus group of students, afforded through co-teaching, can serve as an important element of professional growth for participating teachers (Dieker & Murawski, 2003). These opportunities are essential in creating a co-teaching environment that helps to academically support various subgroups of students. With the correct collaborative elements in place, co-teaching has been shown to be an effective experience in providing continued PD for both new and experienced teachers (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009).
Mentoring as Professional Development

Mentorship. According to the research of Chao, Waltz and Gardner (1992), mentorship is defined as “an intense work relationship between senior (mentor) and junior (protégé) organizational members.” Additionally, mentorships arise out of a mentor’s desire “to help the protégé”, and the protégé’s willingness “to be open to advice and assistance from the mentor” (p. 624).

Mentoring can be both formal and informal. For example, an employer could officially provide a new employee with a mentor as part of the training process, or a more experienced employee may volunteer to offer ongoing guidance to a newer employee in an informal manner. Two common forms of mentoring are career and psychological mentoring (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992). Career mentoring focuses on activities for career advancement such as networking assistance and advanced training for a specific skillset, while psychological mentoring focuses on counseling and/or job competence. Examples of career mentoring include on-the-job training provided by an experienced employee toward a new employee. Both forms of mentoring involve multiple opportunities for interactive dialogue and interactive learning (Chao, et al., 1992).

Mentor teaching. Mentoring within the field of education often combines elements of both career and psychological mentoring. In their 2001 research, Huling and Resa discuss ways in which a mentorship experience can help to have a positive impact for both the mentor and “mentee.” In their research, the authors assert that mentor teachers experience benefits toward their general beliefs for the teaching profession and benefits from learning new teaching practices. For example, Huling and Resa found that serving
as a mentor teacher can lead to improved competency as a classroom teacher. They report that a key benefit of serving as a mentor is the opportunity to learn new ideas about curriculum and/or teaching from the person they are mentoring. This is often possible because new teachers are typically working in conjunction with a university teaching credential program and are being trained in the newest methods of pedagogy. Additionally, serving as a mentor increases opportunities for reflective practices between the mentor and the mentee (Huling & Resa, 2001). Finally, the same authors also report that mentor teachers often experience a sense of professional renewal and/or a feeling of being professionally re-energized from the mentoring experience.

One of the reasons for the reported positive impact is the consistent opportunity for collaboration between the two participating teachers. When two teachers work closely together over an extended period of time, there are multiple opportunities for collaborative dialogue regarding a variety of issues. This includes collaboration on lesson planning, student instructional supports, and/or student assessment. Furthermore, the research of Huling and Resa (2001) reports increased opportunities for mentor teachers to participate in university research projects, or teacher research when serving as a mentor for a new teacher. These opportunities can afford mentor teachers with the opportunity to critically examine their own practice within the context of the teaching profession.

**Gap in Mentoring Literature**

The research on mentorship from Chao, Waltz and Gardner (1992) provides data on the topic of mentorship in general terms, including types of mentorship. Additionally, the
authors discuss the benefits from mentorship for the protégé. The research from Huling and Resa (2001) addresses the topic of mentorship, and not only applies the topic to the teaching profession specifically, but also frames the impact of mentorship from the perspective of the mentor teacher. The authors draw positive conclusions from the impact of serving as a mentor. Some of these impacts include improvements in the mentors’ own competency in teaching, renewed attitudes toward the profession, and opportunities to work with teacher research. The authors also discuss the impact that mentoring has on mentor teachers’ general beliefs and practices within the teaching profession. The authors do not discuss the positive impact of mentoring in regard to working with specific student subgroups such as ELs, nor do they cover the topic of self-efficacy specifically.

The mentoring data from this dissertation adds to the existing research on mentoring in a few ways. First, this research contributes to the broader body of research on mentoring by adding multiple perspectives of a mentoring experience. Second, this research specifically adds to mentoring research as it pertains to teacher development by exploring ways in which the PD experience influenced the mentor teachers’ beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy. Finally, this research views mentorship through the lens of improving EL instruction by participating as a mentor.

**Coaching as Professional Development**

Research into instructional coaching also sheds light on the positive effects of mentoring on both the mentor and mentee (Knight, 2007). The following sections
expand on elements of instructional coaching and ways in which instructional coaching can positively impact both participants.

**Elements of instructional coaching.** There are multiple types of instructional coaching models within the field of education. Research from Knight (2007) refers to these coaching models as “executive,” “co-active,” “cognitive,” “literacy/reading,” and “instructional coaching.” All of these coaching models approach a PD experience with a slightly different perspective. For example, a person working with a co-active coach could get feedback and advice on aspects of both their personal lives and professional duties. For teachers, this can come in the form of a more experienced teacher working with a new teacher on ways to manage a healthy balance between work life and personal life. This method tends to be a more holistic coaching experience than other types of coaching. Another example of coaching could include instructional coaching. This type of coaching is strictly limited to the professional practice of the person being coached, and incorporates research-based strategies within their instructional practices (Knight, 2007).

**Benefits of instructional coaching.** Knight (2007) highlights the following elements of instructional coaching, along with the coaching benefits. First, coaching classroom behavior management helps to create a safe learning environment for all students. Second, coaching content helps to ensure that the teachers are adhering to the state standards within their lesson plans. Third, coaching direct instruction helps to ensure that the teachers are using researched-based instructional strategies that allow for high levels of student engagement. Finally, coaching formative assessment helps to ensure that
teachers check for student understanding throughout their lessons. When done effectively, a teacher can use the information learned from the formative assessment to increase student achievement by making various pedagogical adjustments.

Multiple bodies of research on instructional coaching show a positive impact on both the person receiving the coaching and the coach as a result of the coaching experience (Knight, 2007; Showers, 1985; Walpole, McKenna, Uribe-Zarain, & Lamitina, 2010). The instructional coaching process is intended to create increased learning for both people involved (Walpole, et al., 2010). This process can benefit the coach because it affords him or her the opportunity to justify his or her own practices. Additionally, the coaching process creates opportunities for both parties to experience professional growth because of the ongoing collaboration and/or reflective dialogue that is inherent to the coaching process. Finally, most coaching experiences involve cycles of observations and the process of giving feedback, which serves to benefit both participants for the same reasons (Garet, et al., 2001). These examples are just some of the key components of professional growth that can occur when using instructional coaching as a means of PD.

Knight (2007) discusses reasons for participating in an instructional coaching process. A main reason to engage teachers with instructional coaching as PD is to change a teacher’s instructional behaviors and/or habits inside the classroom. For example, experienced teachers may be using familiar practices out of habit, even if these practices are not yielding positive academic results for their students. Furthermore, an instructional coach can demonstrate how to implement research-based strategies for the person they are coaching. This process has shown to be an important component for the
creation of new habits for the person participating with an instructional coach (Showers & Joyce, 1996).

Additional benefits of instructional coaching are also described further within the research of Walpole, McKenna, Uribe-Zarain, and Lamitina (2010). The research shows that working with an instructional coach can benefit the participant in a number of ways. First, the process improves the participating teacher’s content knowledge in many ways. This can be caused by increased exposure to course content, ongoing collaboration with a coach, and/or consistent engagement with reflective dialogue. Second, instructional coaching can create new instructional practice habits for both the coach and the person being coached. This can be attributed to ongoing support from the coach while the participant attempts various types of instructional change. Additionally, coaching can lead to the creation of new understandings on how to academically support students. This tends to occur from class observations and reflective dialogue between the coach and the person being coached.

Research from Showers (1985) highlights the development of a shared language when educators engage with a coaching process. When educators develop a shared language, they have been known to create common understandings and build new knowledge through the process of instructional coaching (Showers, 1985). Additionally, teachers can undergo fundamental changes through the process of co-teaching. Depending on the types of changes that the teacher implements, they could have a positive impact on various levels of student achievement.
Building trust with an instructional coach. According to Showers and Joyce (1996), there are two elements that need to be in place in order for a coaching experience to yield positive results for the participants. The elements of successful instructional coaching are related to the five social-emotional competencies that are described in the research of Dresser (2013). In this research, the author writes about the five social-emotional learning competencies, with one being “relationship skills.” This element involves the forming of positive relationships, and the practices of cooperative learning, conflict management, and providing assistance for one another. An important element of instructional coaching that relies on social-emotional learning is the building of a trusting relationship between the coaching pair, and the treatment of one another as equal members of the coaching team.

One of the outcomes of working with an instructional coach is the opportunity to view instruction through another person’s point of view. Doing so can create new opportunities for transformative learning. The following sections describe transformative learning in more detail, and also highlight the ways in which it serves as the framework for this study.

Transformative Learning

According to Merriam, Caffarella, and Baumgartner (2007), “transformative learning occurs when there is a transformation in one of our beliefs or attitudes, or a transformation of our entire perspective” (p. 133). Multiple scholars, including Jack Mezirow, Robert Boyd, Laurent Daloz, and Pablo Freire, have done work in the area of transformative learning. All of these scholars have varied approaches to a transformative
learning framework, but Jack Mezirow’s Transformative Learning Theory is the framework that is used for this research. The elements of Mezirow’s theory are outlined in the following sections and serve as the framework for this study, particularly toward the beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy of teachers working with ELs.

**Mezirow’s transformative learning theory.** Mezirow’s theory asserts that transformative learning is a process in which a person experiences changes to his or her own frame(s) of reference. According to Mezirow (1997), a “frame of reference” is the starting point for which a person views a problem or situation. Additionally, Mezirow asserts that a frame of reference is often a product of one’s own cultural assimilation.

People’s opinions, points of view, associations, feelings, and responses are often influenced by their own frame of reference (Mezirow, 1997). For example, if a teacher holds a deficit frame of reference toward his or her EL students, then the teacher may have a hard time making changes to his or her instructional practices to include language supports. Furthermore, if a teacher holds an asset frame of reference toward his or her EL students, then the teacher may be more open to changing his or her instructional practices to incorporate language supports.

Changing one’s own frame of reference can also create changes in one’s values, feelings, and responses within a specific context. Part of the change process involves changes to one’s own “habits of mind.” Mezirow (1997) describes “habits of mind” as “broad, abstract, orienting, habitual ways of thinking, feeling, and acting influenced by assumptions” (p. 5). For example, teachers make countless decisions throughout the day that relate to both instructional practice and the way in which they interact with their
students. Those who may be operating under a deficit frame of reference toward ELs may approach their instructional practices in a way that offers little language support, and design their lesson that only benefit English-proficient students. For example, these teachers may choose English-only students as group leaders over ELs students, or may make more personal connections with English-only students compared to their EL students. In contrast, teachers with an asset frame of reference toward ELs may exhibit the opposite and/or more balanced behaviors toward all students. An example of this could include choosing both English-only students and ELs to be group leaders, or providing language supports for all students within a given lesson.

**Changing a frame of reference through transformative learning.** Mezirow’s theory contends that a person (learner) can change his or her frame of reference, point of view, and/or habits of mind, either suddenly or incrementally, through some type of transformative experience (Mezirow, 1997). “Learners” may endure a sudden change in a frame of reference due to a life-altering event such as a death of a loved one, while incremental changes occur with less dramatic experiences. Mezirow’s theory contends that opportunities for reflection can create the spark for transformative learning as the learner reexamines his or her frame of reference toward a particular subject (Merriam, et al., 2007). Furthermore, engaging in ongoing reflection with another person through reflective discourse can create opportunities for the learner to gain new understandings on a particular topic. These insights are more difficult to achieve when reflection occurs in isolation.
Mezirow’s theory describes a three-step process for engaging in transformative learning (Merriam, et al., 2007; Mezirow, 1997). The first step is becoming aware of the need to change by engaging in critical reflection. Engaging in critical reflection assists learners in recognizing his or her assumptions and/or values toward a particular topic. The second step is seeking out other people with similar frames of reference. Seeking out others helps to create a learning environment in which like-minded learners can engage in reflective discourse with the intent of learning from one another. The final step involves the process of learning what actions to implement in order to match a learner’s new frame of reference. Learners may need help in acquiring additional knowledge or in attaining additional skills in order to implement new actions that fit the new frame of reference. For example, a teacher may gain a new frame of reference from a PD experience but may not be able to immediately make changes to all of his or her lessons to fit a new frame of reference, due to the magnitude of a year’s worth of curriculum. The teacher may need additional support to gradually implement modifications, such as, in this example, language supports for ELs.

Beliefs

Asset vs. deficit beliefs. Research within the field of education has described the term “beliefs” as an outlook toward specific interventions that should be applied when working with a particular group of students (Richardson, 1996). Beliefs can stem from either an asset perspective, in which all students are believed to have the ability to academically succeed, or a deficit belief system, in which various obstacles are believed to impede the academic success of specific groups of students. Multiple bodies of
research indicate that teachers who practice deficit beliefs toward ELs can create low teacher expectations toward ELs, and create a negative school experience for ELs (Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996; Thompson, 1992). Additionally, a teacher’s belief system toward the academic abilities of ELs can originate from various trainings, years of teaching experience, and/or limited exposure, toward working with ELs. According to Petit (2011), a teacher with deficit beliefs can have a negative impact on ELs’ overall educational experience. Additionally, the research of Freeman & Freeman (1994) noted similar ideas regarding impact of asset and deficit beliefs toward ELs. For example, teachers who believe that ELs bring existing knowledge, culture and/or life experiences to the classroom are said to have asset beliefs toward ELs. Furthermore, teachers who do not believe that ELs bring knowledge, culture and/or life experiences to a classroom are said to hold deficit beliefs toward ELs. Additionally, Freeman & Freeman (1994) conveyed that teachers who view ELs from an asset perspective are more likely to have higher expectations for ELs compared to teachers holding a deficit belief system.

According to Friere (2000), teachers run the risk of oppressing their students’ educational experience by holding deficit beliefs toward specific subgroups of students. An example of educational oppression can be seen when teachers practice “knowledge banking.” Freire describes knowledge banking as the practice of feeding knowledge to passive students through the process of lecturing and disproportionate use of audio and/or visual materials. In contrast, the “problem posing” style of education allows for a more collaborative learning process for all students (Merriam, et al., 2007). When students are viewed as a problem instead of as an asset, they become passive learners or silenced. The
“banking model” of education may seem to appear effective because students are quieter, and the classroom seems to be under control. However, a quiet and controlled class does not necessarily mean that all students are learning. Friere (2000) conveyed that students tend to achieve their educational goals when they have opportunities to collaborate and use their voice. Even though teachers have the power to intervene within the classroom to counteract damaging practices, some may lack the appropriate skills and/or pedagogical knowledge to do so. These reasons help to illustrate the necessity for teachers to engage in PD that can transform beliefs that may be a deficit way of thinking into a belief system that is an asset way of thinking.

**Beliefs and Practices**

Research from Pajares (1992) indicates a strong connection between teacher beliefs toward student achievement with general levels of academic expectations for their students. The same research also conveys a link between student expectations and the classroom practices used toward students during classroom instruction. These links make instructional practices toward ELs vulnerable to a teacher’s beliefs, and can be damaging to students if a teacher has deficit beliefs toward ELs. The belief-to-practice link has increased the need for teachers to participate in PD programs containing elements that research has shown to be effective. Depending on the type of PD, an effective PD experience can impact a teacher’s beliefs toward ELs in a positive manner (Petit, 2011). Researching the elements of effective PD that lead to a positive impact of teacher beliefs toward ELs could afford ELs an educational experience that that is both supportive and challenging.
Inquiry Practices

According to Butler (2012), “Emerging professional development models engage teachers in inquiry as a means of promoting shifts in practice and teacher development” (p. 1207). Additionally, Butler refers to a variety of PD activities that promotes both increased teacher development and shifts to participants’ instructional practices. Butler calls this practice “collaborative inquiry.” These activities include engaging in student outcomes based cycles of inquiry, collaboration with colleagues in order to support teacher inquiry, and opportunities for teachers to reflect on their own instructional practices.

Cycles of inquiry. Butler (2012) asserts that teacher learning increases through engagement with various cycles of inquiry. More specifically, the cycle of inquiry process helps to stimulate changes in instructional practices and also promotes teacher development. According to Butler, a cycle of inquiry allows for sustained teacher inquiry and reflection in a number of ways. First, teachers define a problem and/or specify student expectations for a particular lesson. Second, the teacher sets goals and/or selects instructional strategies to achieve the desired outcome. Third, the teacher self-monitors lesson outcomes and/or student learning outcomes. Finally, the teacher revisits the original problem and revises goals for future student outcomes and/or future lesson strategies.

Reflection and collaboration. In his work on transformative learning, Mezirow discusses three types of reflection: content, process, and premise (Mezirow, 1991). He asserts that content reflection identifies a problem, process reflection evaluates the
effectiveness of the problem-solving strategy, and premise reflection explores the assumptions behind the chosen problem-solving solutions.

Hatton and Smith (1995) convey that the most effective reflections come from reflections on one’s own experiences, as opposed to reflections from research analysis. Their research also expressed that teachers do not spend enough time reflecting on their own practice. Additionally, Kreber (2012) articulates that teachers must engage in ongoing reflection opportunities if they are looking to improve their instructional practices toward academically serving ELs. This can be done through reflective dialogue with a like-minded colleague and/or self-reflections on one’s own assumptions, which are some of the elements of transformative learning (Mezirow, 1997). Furthermore, opportunities for reflective dialogue increase through the process of ongoing collaboration with a colleague, or within a professional learning community (Olivares, 2014).

Ongoing teacher collaboration and teacher reflection on their instructional practices toward ELs can create learning opportunities that can develop new ways of thinking while also challenging previously held assumptions toward ELs (Mezirow, 1991; Halton & Smith, 1995; Mezirow, 1997; Olivares, 2014). Engagement with these types of learning opportunities can create the conditions for a transformative learning experience for teachers looking to improve teaching practices toward ELs.

**Summary.** According to Butler (2012), ongoing engagement with inquiry practices such as cycles of inquiry, collaborating with colleagues, and engaging in ongoing reflection can help to create a shift in teachers’ instructional practices. Butler conveys
that inquiry practices work best when done among “a group of volunteers” (p. 1208). Additionally, Butler asserts that the volunteers should be like-minded and open to collaboration in order to improve teachers’ instructional practices toward ELs.

**Instructional Practices**

**Academic language.** One way in which teachers can be more effective is by utilizing academic language through the curriculum. This means that all teachers, regardless of the content they teach, need to teach language and literacy. For example, the math teacher needs to teach synonyms (e.g., “more,” “in addition”). This way ELs are learning English in every class. As previously stated, teachers need to be aware of their students’ English proficiency levels in order to design instruction that is not too challenging or too easy. For example, Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) theory addresses this issue. According to Vygotsky (1987), ZPD refers to “potential learning” in relation to “actual learning,” as well as the skills that students need to achieve “actual learning” (p. 1). Specifically, ZPD relates to the need for teachers to create scaffolds within their lessons that can build the skills needed for their students to meet specific learning objectives. For increased EL learning, these skills can include specific language supports. As Krashen (1981) argues, it is essential that students receive learning support from their teachers, while also feeling secure within their learning environment. Additionally, students must learn language in formal and informal settings, and language supports are one way in which ELs can improve their English within a formal learning environment. To better assist students to achieve increased levels of
learning, teachers need basic knowledge of language acquisition strategies so that they can address instructional errors within their own curriculum.

**Changing instructional practices.** Changing old practices to meet the academic needs of ELs can be challenging for teachers, and it may take multiple steps for growth to occur. Teachers must first trust that ELs bring an array of strengths to the classroom, thus changing the deficit way of thinking (Petit, 2011). To begin the instructional change process, teachers must first determine their students’ learning needs and then implement the necessary research-based strategies to help support the EL learning process (Kreber, 2012). Furthermore, engaging with inquiry practices through sustained and collaborative professional development can have an influence on teachers’ instructional practices (Butler, 2012).

**Self-Efficacy**

Research from Bandura (1977) conveys that self-efficacy is the belief that specific behaviors will eventually lead to specific outcomes. According to Bandura, “Efficacy expectations determine how much effort people will expend and how long they will persist in the face of obstacles and aversive experiences” (p. 194). People who have strong self-efficacy often are persistent in their behaviors with the belief that their efforts will result in a positive outcome.

**Factors influencing self-efficacy.** Bandura (1977) lists multiple factors that help to increase a person’s overall sense of self-efficacy. The first factor relates to a person’s recollections in regard to a previous behavior leading to a specific outcome. For example, if a teacher tried an instructional practice that failed to support student learning,
then they will likely have low self-efficacy toward using the same instructional practice in the future. The second factor relates to obtaining self-efficacy through observing the outcomes of someone else’s behavior. For example, a teacher may experience low self-efficacy toward an instructional practice by observing a colleague who is struggling to teach his or her students while using a particular strategy. This could include the observation of a colleague who is attempting to implement more group work but loses control of his or her classroom during the group activity. The third factor is self-efficacy through “verbal persuasion.” This includes being encouraged by someone else to continue with a practice, and also includes a lack of encouragement from someone. Finally, Bandura (1977) discusses “emotional arousal” as a factor that influences one’s self-efficacy. Emotional arousal can include fear of change or anxiety toward a specific behavioral outcome. For example, if a teacher fears losing control of his or her classroom, then he or she may experience low self-efficacy toward implementing group work during instruction.

Impact of self-efficacy. Ross (1992) discusses the impacts that self-efficacy levels can have on teachers’ daily classroom behaviors and the multitude of daily snap decisions they make while delivering a lesson. Additionally, various teaching experiences may cause a teacher’s levels of self-efficacy in their instruction to fluctuate throughout their career. For example, a teacher may feel high self-efficacy toward teaching ELs if he or she teaches ELs for multiple years, but may shift to low self-efficacy if he or she hasn’t taught ELs for a while. Fluctuating levels of self-efficacy can have an impact on teacher participation in PD programs. Ross (1992) conveys the idea that teachers with relatively
high levels of self-efficacy tend to self-select as participants in PD programs due to the expectation that the PD will create positive results on their instructional practices. In contrast, a teacher with low levels of self-efficacy may not feel the need to participate in a PD program out of concerns that the time spent in a PD program will not create a positive impact on his or her instructional practices. For example, a teacher with high levels of self-efficacy may pursue an opportunity to participate with an instructional coach, because he or she believes that the experience will lead to increased student achievement.

Research results from Howe and Barry (2016) reflect the idea that teachers with high levels of self-efficacy tend to benefit from collaboration and prolonged PD experiences. Data from Howe and Barry’s 2016 study show the impacts that a year-long reading and literacy PD program had on teachers’ teaching skills when they worked with an instructional coach for three hours a week. The authors of the research concluded that levels of self-efficacy toward reading and literacy increased when teachers had opportunities for collaboration, appropriate time for reflection, adequate instructional resources, and consistent access to their instructional coach (Howe & Barry, 2016).

Additionally, Krout, Chandler, and Hertenstein (2016) link PD participation to increases in self-efficacy. For example, the authors indicate a positive correlation between PD that focuses on increasing teacher content knowledge to higher levels of self-efficacy for the participating teacher (Krout, et al., 2016).
**Gap in Self-Efficacy Literature**

There are multiple bodies of research on self-efficacy, PD participation, and EL instruction (Bandura, 1977; Garet, et al., 2001; Guskey & Yoon, 2009; Howe & Barry, 2016; Krout, et al., 2016; Ross, 1992). A gap in the literature can be found when combining the themes of these studies. This gap is in relation to the way that teachers can use PD to increase self-efficacy toward their EL students. Furthermore, it is important to research the experiences of participants within a PD program that incorporates all of the elements of PD that research has shown to be effective. These elements include opportunities for collaboration, coaching, and co-teaching (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010; Garet, et al., 2001; Guskey & Yoon, 2009). Since research has shown that self-efficacy increases gradually with prolonged exposure and support in a new environment (Bandura, 1977), it is important to research a PD program that takes place during an extended period of time.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter highlighted relevant literature that encompasses important themes that this research is focused on. The themes from this chapter included elements of PD that research has shown to be both effective and ineffective, co-teaching, mentoring, and instructional coaching. Additionally, this chapter centered on Mezirow’s Transformative Learning Theory, which serves as the framework for this research.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Purpose of Research

This multiple-case study explores the ways in which mentor teaching serves as a context for promoting mentors’ beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy associated with student learning outcomes in English learners (ELs) and native English-speakers. As detailed in the first two chapters, there is a growing body of research supporting the improvement of teacher practices through the use of sustained, content-specific professional development (PD) (Guskey, 2002; Guskey and Yoon, 2009). The data from this research helps to shed light on the precise PD activities that afforded the participants the opportunity to transform their beliefs, practices, and/or self-efficacy toward ELs.

The PD activities of The AL Project were analyzed through the collection of survey data, one-on-one interview response data, and focus group response data. These data explored the mentors’ collective and individual experiences with the collective activities of the PD program that included serving as a mentor to a teacher candidate, co-planning, co-instruction, co-assessing, engaging in a student-outcomes focused cycle of inquiry, and participating in an ongoing professional learning community with other mentors and teacher candidates. These PD activities were designed to support the academic language development of all students, and ELs in particular. The data analysis in Chapter 4 helps to explore the influence that the various activities of PD had on the mentor teachers’ beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy toward working with ELs.
Research Design

This qualitative multiple-case study was developed following the principles of grounded theory, a research approach that emphasizes the ongoing adaptations of research methods in response to incoming data (Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, Hanson, Clark, Plano, & Morales, 2007). More specifically, this study follows the principles of constructivist grounded theory, which emphasizes the views, beliefs, values, feelings, and assumptions of the research participants toward the research topic (Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, et al., 2007). Constructivist grounded theory also emphasizes the researcher’s role in gathering, coding, interpreting, and drawing conclusions from data sets based on their own personal values. Within the case studies, multiple data collection methods were employed to generate multiple sources of qualitative data pertaining to the participants’ beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy toward working with ELs. Researchers have argued for the use of multiple data gathering methods for the process of data validation (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Jick, 1979). The data for this study were obtained through multiple methods, including individual surveys, one-on-one interviews, and a focus group interview with all of the participants. The collective trends discovered in the survey were used in the development of the one-on-one interview questions. The collective trends uncovered through the data analysis of the one-on-one interviews were used in the development of the focus group questions. The collective and individual data extrapolated from the one-on-one interviews allowed for the discovery of the multiple ways in which the mentor teachers learned through the multiple PD experiences within The AL Project.
Timeline for Research

This qualitative multiple-case study took place from the time the surveys were taken in October 2016, through the time of the focus group interview in January 2017. During this time period, the researcher studied the PD experiences of the eight self-selected mentor teachers as they attended ongoing PD at the sponsoring university, while co-teaching everyday with a teacher candidate at their school site. Throughout the process, the participants engaged in co-planning, co-teaching, co-assessment, and ongoing reflective dialogue regarding ways the co-teaching pair academically supports all students, and ELs in particular. Throughout the multiple case studies, the researcher was able to gather data that helped to explore ways in which participation as a mentor teacher in The AL Project influenced the participants’ beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy toward working with ELs.

Setting and Participating School Districts

The sponsoring institution of The AL Project is a large public university serving a metropolitan area on the West Coast of the United States. The university’s College of Education offers multiple undergraduate and graduate degrees, as well as multiple credential programs. The credential programs offer multiple-subject, single-subject, counseling, and administrative credentials to professionals seeking a career in public education. The AL Project is affiliated with the single-subject credentialing program within the College of Education’s Teacher Education Department. The co-teaching components and the emphasis on EL pedagogy allows the teacher candidates to participate in The AL Project as a way of earning their single-subject teaching credential.
in one year, compared to a typical year-and-a-half program. The AL Project personnel recruit the mentors from local public schools.

As previously stated in Chapter 1, The AL Project is a PD program that pairs a mentor teacher from a local public secondary school with a teacher candidate earning his or her single-subject teaching credential at the participating university. The partners engaged in daily co-teaching for a semester while engaging with the activities of The AL Project, which included attending ongoing PD sessions at the sponsoring university.

Even though there are many activities within The AL Project that could be studied, this particular research focused only on the experiences of the participating mentor teachers. Throughout the scope of this study, the mentor teachers spent a total of five days at the sponsoring university engaging in all-day PD sessions with their student teachers and university faculty. These PD days specifically focused on the fundamentals of being a mentor for a teacher candidate, methods for incorporating the various elements of co-teaching into their classroom, and ways to address the academic language development needs of ELs in the mentor’s content subject area. Additionally, the mentors and teacher candidates participated in two cycles of inquiry during the fall semester. The mentors and candidates planned and discussed these cycles in the professional learning communities (PLCs) within subject-area groups. The subject-area groups consisted of both the mentors and teacher candidates. There were four groups that consisted of English, math, science and social science. Content-area specialists from the participating university facilitated the groups.
The districts that have partnered with The AL Project are located in close proximity to the sponsoring university, with most of the participating school districts located within a 10-mile radius. Some of the participating school districts are unified districts serving K-12 students, while other participating school districts are high school districts serving students in grades nine through 12. All of the schools reside in the same county.

**Research Participants**

The participants who volunteered to be a part of this research range in age, teaching experience, and instructional content. The schools where the participants taught during the duration of the study range in student enrollment numbers, as well as the percentage of enrolled ELs. These schools stem from multiple school districts, with both varying levels of services for academically supporting ELs and varying PD opportunities offered to teachers. All of the schools come from the same county and are located in the San Francisco Bay Area. According to totals found on the California Department of Education website, the county in which these schools reside serves large numbers of enrolled students, as well as high numbers of enrolled ELs. During the 2015-2016 school year, the county served roughly 275,000 students, which included approximately 64,000 EL students. In addition, this enrollment total also included roughly 54,000 for ELs who have been redesignated as English proficient (RFEP). These numbers indicate that in 2015-2016, over 43% of all public school students enrolled in this particular county were currently, or had once been, an EL.

The following section introduces the research participants (whose names and schools have been changed to preserve their anonymity). Each introduction begins with a quote
that the participant said during his or her one-on-one interview. The quote is meant to capture the essence of the participants’ beliefs on either teaching all students or teaching ELs. Each section also includes the participants’ demographic information, and information on their past teaching experiences. Descriptions of the participants’ schools of employment are also included in the profiles to give context on the number of ELs the participants are academically serving. Finally, each section shares the participants’ general feeling regarding how well they believe their teaching credential program prepared them to work with ELs.

Teacher #1: Ms. Portillo

You always have to have the same expectations for every single student. (Portillo, 2016)

Ms. Portillo is a math teacher at Corazon High School, an alternative public high school located in the San Francisco Bay Area, which serves students from all schools within the Arnold Union High School District. Students who are in need of credit recovery are referred to Corazon High School (CHS) from his or her home school. There are a number of reasons why a student would leave his or her home school to attend CHS for credit recovery. Some of these reasons could include past issues with habitual truancy, missing school due to health reasons, past experience with incarceration, and/or a transfer after finishing a term for disciplinary expulsion. According to data from the 2015-2016 school year, there were 153 students enrolled at CHS. Out of the 153 students, 41 students were ELs, and 59 students had once been ELs and have been redesignated as “Fluent English Proficient” (RFEP). These numbers indicate that during
the 2015-2016 school year, over 65% of all students at CHS were currently, or had once been, ELs.

According to demographics data obtained through the survey, Ms. Portillo is in her 40s and identifies her ethnicity as Hispanic/Latina. She also identifies herself as a former EL. She holds a bachelor’s degree, a single-subject teaching credential, a multi-subject teaching credential, a master’s degree, and is currently working on a second master’s degree. She has been teaching for over 16 years and has experience working in both elementary and high school levels. During her time working toward her multi-subject and single-subject teaching credentials, Ms. Portillo took five or more courses that contained a focus on EL instruction. According to her survey response, she felt that her credential programs prepared her “somewhat well” for working with ELs, but indicated, “most preparation happens with practice.” This year was Ms. Portillo’s first year serving as a mentor with The AL Project.

Teacher #2: Ms. Tuscano

You get around people in your department who are like, ‘Oh, they can’t do this because they’re English language learners and this is their limit.’ And it’s like, no that’s not their limit. (Tuscano, 2017)

Ms. Tuscano is a science teacher at Padilla High School, which is a comprehensive public high school that is open to serve all students in the school’s attendance area. Padilla High School is located in the San Francisco Bay Area. According to data from the California Department of Education website, Padilla High School (PHS) served 1,449 students in the 2015-2016 school year. PHS served the highest number of ELs compared to the other seven schools mentioned in this study. During the 2015-2016 school year,
PHS served 400 ELs and 651 RFEP students. These numbers indicate that during the 2015-2016 school year, over 75% of all students at PHS were currently, or had once been, ELs.

According to demographics data obtained through the survey, Ms. Tuscano is in her 30s and identifies her ethnicity as Asian/Pacific Islander. She holds a bachelor’s degree, a single-subject teaching credential, and a master’s degree. She has been teaching between 10-15 years, and only has experience teaching at the high school level. During her time working toward her single-subject teaching credential, Ms. Tuscano took three to four courses that contained a focus on EL instruction. According to her survey response, she felt that her credential program prepared her “pretty well” for working with ELs, but indicated that she has benefitted from additional EL training through her district of employment. This year was Ms. Tuscano’s third year serving as a mentor with The AL Project.

**Teacher #3: Ms. Johnson**

My goal isn’t that every student will get an ‘A.’ My goal is that every student will improve. (Johnson, 2016)

Ms. Johnson is an English teacher at Goodger High School, which is a comprehensive public high school located in the San Francisco Bay Area. According to data from the California Department of Education website, Goodger High School (GHS) served 2,458 students in the 2015-2016 school year. GHS serves a high number of ELs. During the 2015-2016 school year, GHS served 285 ELs and 1,002 RFEP students. These numbers indicate that during the 2015-2016 school year, roughly 53% of all students at GHS were currently, or had once been, ELs.
According to demographics data obtained through the survey, Ms. Johnson is in her 40s and has been teaching for over 16 years at the high school level. Ms. Johnson holds a bachelor’s degree and a single-subject teaching credential. She declined to state her ethnicity for this study. During her time working toward her single-subject teaching credential, Ms. Johnson took one to two courses that contained a focus on EL instruction, and she indicated that her credential program did not prepare her very well for working with ELs. This was Ms. Johnson’s fourth year serving as a mentor with The AL Project.

**Teacher #4: Ms. Barbera**

> We need to give the kids our best and not have any kids fall in the cracks. We want to meet everybody. Not one person’s going to fall behind.  

(Barbera, 2016)

Ms. Barbera is an English teacher at Carlson High School, which is a comprehensive high school located in the San Francisco Bay Area. According to data from the California Department of Education website, during the 2015-2016 school year, Carlson High School (CHS) served 1,137 students, of which 246 were ELs and 513 were RFEP students. These numbers indicate that during the 2015-2016 school year, over 66% of all students at CHS were currently, or had once been, ELs.

According to demographics data obtained through the survey, Ms. Barbera is in her 30s and identifies her ethnicity as White/Anglo. She holds a bachelor’s degree, a single-subject teaching credential, and a master’s degree. She has been teaching between 10-15 years, and only has experience teaching at the high school level. During her time working toward her single-subject teaching credential, Ms. Barbera took three to four courses that contained a focus on EL instruction. According to her survey response, Ms.
Barbera felt that her credential program prepared her “pretty well” for working with ELs. This was Ms. Barbera’s first year serving as a mentor with The AL Project.

**Teacher #5: Ms. Margaret**

I’ve always felt like that, just because you speak another language, you’re not stupid. You don’t need remediation. You just need it delivered in a different way. (Margaret, 2016)

Ms. Margaret is a science teacher at Leadbetter High School, a comprehensive public high school located in the San Francisco Bay Area. According to data from the California Department of Education website, Leadbetter High School (LHS) served 1,574 students in the 2015-2016 school year. During the 2015-2016 school year, LHS served 84 ELs and 319 RFEP students. These numbers indicate that during the 2015-2016 school year, roughly 26% of all LHS students were currently, or had once been, ELs.

According to demographics data obtained through the survey, Ms. Margaret is in her 50s and identifies her ethnicity as White/Anglo. She holds a bachelor’s degree, a master’s degree, a single-subject teaching credential, and a multiple-subject teaching credential. She has been teaching for over 16 years and has experience teaching at the elementary, secondary, and college levels. During her time working toward her teaching credentials, Ms. Margaret took one to two courses that contained a focus on EL instruction, and according to her survey response, she felt that her credential program prepared her “somewhat well” for working with ELs. This was Ms. Margaret’s first year serving as a mentor with The AL Project.
**Teacher #6: Ms. Douglas**

I believe that what we need to do to support English learners is good teaching. It’s what we need to do to support everybody. I think if you’re doing a good job teaching your EL students, everybody benefits. (Douglas, 2017)

Ms. Douglas is a math teacher at Elise Middle School, which is a comprehensive public middle school located in the San Francisco Bay Area. According to data from the California Department of Education website, Elise Middle School (EMS) served 1,197 students in the 2015-2016 school year. During the 2015-2016 school year, EMS served 177 ELs and 292 RFEP students. These numbers indicate that during the 2015-2016 school year, 39% of all students at EMS were currently, or had once been, ELs.

According to demographics data obtained through the survey, Ms. Douglas is in her 40s and identifies her ethnicity as White/Anglo. She holds a bachelor’s degree and a multiple-subject teaching credential. She has been teaching for over 16 years, and all of her years of teaching have been at the middle school level. During her time working toward her teaching credential, Ms. Douglas took one to two courses that contained a focus on EL instruction. According to her survey response, she felt that her credential program prepared her “pretty well” for working with ELs. This was Ms. Douglas’ second year serving as a mentor with The AL Project.

**Teacher #7: Mr. Lorenzo**

It’s not about me. It’s got to be about the kids, and there needs to be a willingness to do what we say that we’re going to do. (Lorenzo, 2017)

Mr. Lorenzo is an English teacher at Noelle High School, which is a comprehensive public high school located in the San Francisco Bay Area. According to data from the
According to demographics data obtained through the survey, Mr. Lorenzo is in his 40s and identifies his ethnicity as Hispanic/Latino. He holds a bachelor’s degree, a master’s degree, a single-subject teaching credential, and an administrative credential. He has been teaching for over 16 years, and all of his years of teaching have been at the high school level. During his time working toward his teaching credential, Mr. Lorenzo took one to two courses that contained a focus on EL instruction. According to his survey response, he felt that his credential program prepared him “somewhat well” for working with ELs. This was Mr. Lorenzo’s fourth year serving as a mentor with The AL Project.

**Teacher #8: Ms. Barnes**

I feel like, as a teacher in California, it’s bizarre that I haven’t had that experience (teaching ELs). I realize that, and so I feel like it’s my responsibility to get up to speed. (Barnes, 2016)

Ms. Barnes is an English teacher at Haylee High School, which is a comprehensive public high school located in the San Francisco Bay Area. According to data obtained from the California Department of Education website, Haylee High School (HHS) served 1,514 students in the 2015-2016 school year. During the 2015-2016 school year, HHS served 90 ELs and 214 RFEP students. These numbers indicate that during the 2015-2016 school year, 20% of all students at HHS were currently, or had once been, ELs.
According to demographics data obtained through the survey, Ms. Barnes is in her 40s and identifies her ethnicity as White/Anglo. She holds a bachelor’s degree and a single-subject teaching credential. She has been teaching for over 16 years and has experience teaching at both the middle and high school levels. During her time working toward her teaching credential, Ms. Barnes took one to two courses that contained a focus on EL instruction. According to her survey response, she felt that her credential program did not prepare her well for working with ELs. This was Ms. Barnes’ first year serving as a mentor with The AL Project.

**Data Collection**

According to Thurmond (2001), collective analysis of multiple forms of research data can help a researcher to gain an enriched perspective and discover more accurate research findings, compared to analysis of only one data source. The data from this research were triangulated by collective trends and individual experiences in the three research areas of beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy. According to the research of Rubin and Rubin (2011), the qualitative methods used in this research incorporated active listening and helped to gain insight on the experiences of each participant, all beneficial elements for addressing each components of the research question.

Multiple bodies of research suggest that data triangulation enhances the research findings and increases the validity of the data, thereby minimizing potential flaws for each type of data collection method (Hussein, 2015; Thurmond, 2001). For this research, the data were triangulated to discover insights on the participants’ experiences throughout multiple points of the PD process. The data collection methods and the triangulated
analysis of the data allowed for the opportunity to gain detailed insights on the mentors’ PD experiences within The AL Project.

**Survey Data**

According to Jick (1979), incorporating a survey in a research model acts as a quantitative measure that helps in the collective data validation process. The survey used in this study captured the participants’ initial thoughts regarding the impact of the various activities within the PD experience of The AL Project. The survey was designed based on the work of Reeves (2006), which addresses teacher attitudes and beliefs toward ELs, and Siwatu (2007), which addresses self-efficacy. The surveys were sent to mentors within The AL Project who volunteered to participate in the study. The survey, administered online, contained 50 response items. Most survey items required a multiple-choice response formatted to a Likert scale. The scale had four selection choices that ranged from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree.” Each item gave the participants the opportunity to expand on his or her selection with a short answer response. The survey also asked for information on participant demographics, teaching experiences, and the levels of preparation they received in their respective credential programs toward EL instruction. The survey gave each participant the opportunity to respond to the benefits and challenges of mainstreaming ELs into English-only classes.

Survey items were created to gauge the research participants’ collective beliefs and self-efficacy toward ELs near the beginning of the PD experience. The survey responses were analyzed through the use of frequency tables based on the themes of the research
question. Exploratory questions for the one-on-one interviews were created based on the collective survey data trends.

**One-on-One Interviews**

Rubin and Rubin (2011) recommend conducting one-on-one interviews for an increased focus and more depth toward various participant experiences. Additionally, DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree (2006) argue that a semi-structured interview model allows for enough participant response flexibility that opportunities are afforded to the participants to delve deeper in their feelings or on a particular experience. For this research, one-on-one semi-structured interviews served to generate answers beyond the participants’ daily experiences within the activities of The AL Project, and allowed for the exploration of the most impactful PD experiences.

The interviews followed a set of predetermined, open-ended questions that were designed to build on the themes discovered within the survey responses. Each interview question included a series of follow-up questions that allowed for a particular topic to be explored from multiple angles. The interviews were conducted midway through the PD experience, and allowed each participant to share their insights on their PD experiences while still engaged in that experience. Interviews were scheduled in advance and occurred at the school site of each participant. Most interviews occurred in the teacher’s classroom, and one interview occurred in the school’s counseling office. The times of the interviews varied, and they occurred either before school, during the teacher’s prep period, or after school.
The purpose for the one-on-one interviews was to allow the participants the opportunity to openly discuss their experiences with the PD activities. Through the one-on-one interviews, the participants had the opportunity to explore, in detail, their own experiences within The AL Project, and the relationship between the PD experience and their beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy toward ELs. The participants’ perspectives helped to shine a light on the precise areas of the PD experiences that impacted their professional growth, especially in working with ELs. It was through the interview process that qualitative data was obtained on the transformative learning, or lack thereof, of each participant who served as a mentor through the co-teaching process.

The one-on-one interviews afforded the opportunity for the participants to expand on the indicated beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy from the survey items. Additionally, the interviews served as an opportunity to listen to the participants discuss the relationship between the PD experience and their beliefs about ELs. Examples of this included participant claims that the PD program solidified existing positive beliefs toward ELs. The interviews also created the forum for the participants to share their thoughts on the role that each activity of the PD program played in their instructional practices and self-efficacy toward ELs. Examples of this include the participants’ feelings toward the co-teaching model, engaging in cycles of inquiry, opportunities for ongoing reflection, and abilities to academically support ELs.

**Focus Group Interview**

Research from Morgan (1997) suggests that a focus group can be a useful method of obtaining self-reported data from the research participants due to the dialogue that
develops between the participants. Additionally, the group dialogue allows for rich data opportunities from the group discourse as opposed to the limited dialogue that can occur during a one-on-one interview, as individuals build on and react to one another’s ideas. For example, one participant could make a claim that sparks the memory or interest of another participant, which could veer the conversation in a unique direction. The disadvantage to using a focus group for qualitative data collection is the limitations it puts on the researcher’s ability to probe individual responses. A focus group was used for this study as a way to gather response data at the end of the PD experience and to give participants the opportunity to elaborate on themes identified in the survey and one-on-one interview data.

The focus group interview occurred during the final day of the PD program and lasted roughly 90 minutes. On this day, all mentors participating in The AL Project met at the participating university for the final day of PD. During the lunch hour, the eight participants moved to a private classroom to engage in the focus group interview. The participants sat in a circle, while the interviewer served as the main session moderator, aided by a university professor who took notes and provided verbal response summaries to the group at the end of each section.

During the focus group interview, the participants had the opportunity to offer insight on their experiences with activities of The AL Project. It was through the focus group interview process that qualitative data was obtained on the PD activities that were the most meaningful to the participants. The focus group interview offered the group the opportunity to expand on some of the trends discovered from the collective one-on-one
interview data. Additionally, the focus group served as an opportunity to listen to the group, as they discussed the relationship between their work within program and their work with ELs.

**Coding of Data**

Each one-on-one interview and the focus group interview were digitally recorded and transcribed for the purposes of coding. To ensure transcription accuracy, each transcription was read while listening to the original audio file. Any transcription mistakes were corrected, and all identifying information related to the participants, the teacher candidates, and/or their school of employment was removed from the transcriptions.

**Survey.** All survey responses were placed into a frequency table for data analysis. The data were Likert scale selections, sorted by research question component. The frequency table displayed collective group trends regarding the participants’ initial thoughts on beliefs and self-efficacy toward ELs, as well as thoughts on the initial impact of the practices used in The AL Project PD program. The survey items that were categorized as “beliefs” were adopted based on the survey items from the work of Reeves (2006), which discussed teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming ELs. The Likert items were categorized as levels of agreement in order to measure the participants’ levels of positive and/or negative beliefs toward the academic abilities of ELs. The survey items that were categorized as “practices” were based on the research of Timperley, Wilson, Barrar, and Fung (2008), which discussed various activities within PD. The Likert items were categorized as levels of agreement in order to measure the participants’ opinions
regarding their feelings toward the various activities of their PD experience. The survey items that were categorized as “self-efficacy” were adopted based on the survey items of Siwatu (2007). This study contained data on teacher self-efficacy in culturally responsive teaching. The Likert items were categorized as levels of agreement in order to measure the participants’ feelings of self-efficacy toward working with ELs.

**One-on-one interviews.** The interview data were sorted into multiple categories through the process of coding (Cresswell, 2013). The qualitative data software, *MaxQDA12*, was utilized to code all of the interview data. All transcription data were analyzed with multiple rounds of coding. During the first round of coding, each statement was binned into one of the following categories: “beliefs,” “practices,” “self-efficacy,” or “null.” Items that were coded as “null” were parts of the interview data that contained conversation not relevant to the research questions. Sub-codes such as “casual dialogue during question transitions,” “question/response clarification,” and “short/vague response to a direct/leading question” are examples of what were coded as “null.” The remaining data fell into one of the remaining bin categories.

In the second round of coding, the binned items were placed into a code family. The various code families contain additional sub-codes that helped to address multiple angles of a particular topic. Examples of code families included “beliefs toward all students” and “beliefs toward ELs.” A statement regarding increased beliefs toward academic rigor for ELs would be coded as “rigor” and placed in the code family, “beliefs toward ELs.” Additionally, a statement regarding a teacher’s beliefs toward high expectations for all students would be coded as “high expectations” and placed in the code family, “beliefs
toward all students.” The end of the coding process resulted in the creation of large quantities of sub-codes. All sub-codes were counted collectively, and a frequency table was created to determine which topics the group collectively discussed the most, and which topics the individual participants discussed the most. The creation of the frequency table helped in the creation of the focus group questions as a way to drill deeper into topics that were mentioned the most by the participants.

Focus group interview. Similar to the manner in which the interview data was analyzed, the software, MaxQDA12, was used in coding the focus group data. The focus group transcription was loaded into the software program, and each statement was initially binned with the same codes that were used in the interviews. Additionally, the same sub-coding process that was used for the data from the one-on-one interviews was also used for the focus group data. Rather than looking for frequency of responses, each utterance was analyzed in search for evidence of either a positive or negative impact on the participant, and/or evidence of transformative learning as a result of the PD experience. The focus group data is used in the analysis of the individual participants in Chapter 4.

Inter-Rater Reliability

Outside assistance was solicited in order to determine the inter-rater reliability of the coding scheme used in the data analysis. The researcher received coding assistance from an elementary school teacher who has both a master’s degree and experience with qualitative data analysis. The reader was given a copy of the code matrix that was created for this research project (Appendix E), along with 25% of the interview data.
Using the coding matrix as a reference, the reader coded each utterance with a code from the matrix. The two raters met on multiple occasions to review reliability on the coded utterances. When the two raters disagreed about the number of codable utterances in the transcript, the disagreement was resolved through discussion before a finally agreed-upon code was assigned to the utterance.

Cohen’s kappa. The inter-rater reliability was calculated by exact agreement and by using Cohen’s Kappa. Making a direct comparison of the codes assigned to each codable utterance helped to establish a 92% exact agreement between the two raters. Each code was then assigned a number and placed in a data spreadsheet in order to produce a calculation for Cohen’s Kappa. Inter-rater reliability, tallied using 25% of the interview data, was .895 (Cohen’s k).

Ethical Considerations

The researcher worked as the project manager for The AL Project during the duration of the study. The researcher was an observer and facilitator during the PD sessions, so there were no ethnical considerations to maneuver while working with the participants. Additionally, this was the last year of The AL Project, so the participating teachers were not motivated by the desire to be signed on for another year with the PD program. The researcher’s duties as project manager included the organization and facilitation of the professional learning community days at the participating university. During the PD breakout sessions, the researcher was involved in facilitating discussions on academic language use for the social science group. The researcher also served as a university supervisor for three teacher candidates, none of which were involved with this study, nor
were they partnered with any of the research participants. The researcher’s role as project manager did not bear any authority over the participants for this study.

It is important to disclose that all mentor teachers in The AL Project received a $1,000 stipend from the U.S. Department of Education to compensate them for the activities of the project, but they did not receive any additional incentives to participate in this study. Since there were no participant incentives for participating in this study, the participants likely provided data that was valid and free of outside influence.

**Process of Informed Consent**

Permission for conducting this research was approved by the Institutional Review Board as part of a larger data collection process within an existing context of The AL Project. All participants for this study were given research consent forms at the beginning of the PD program. The form outlined the methods of data collection (Appendix D). Each participant in this study signed a consent form at his or her own discretion and were free to withdraw from the project as a whole or this study at any time without repercussions.
CHAPTER 4

Research Findings

Survey Data Analysis-Whole Group

As previously discussed in Chapter 3, the survey was used to collect information regarding the participants’ general beliefs and self-efficacy about academically supporting ELs. It was also designed to collect information about participants’ perceptions of the relationship between the professional development (PD) activities, and their beliefs, practices and self-efficacy toward ELs over the course of the PD program.

The following sections present the whole group trends as they pertain to the survey findings. The section includes: a) response frequency tables for the topics of “beliefs” (Tables 1 and 2), “practices” (Table 3), and “self-efficacy” (Table 4); b) a summary of the collective survey response trends; and c) relevant quotes that were written by various participants when given the option to explain their survey selection. These quotes were selected to add context to some of the patterns being discussed. The participants did not include written explanations for all response items, so the quotes that were included in this section were selected from a limited response pool. They were chosen to give additional context to some response patterns.

Whole-Group Patterns: Beliefs

Cumulative results. The cumulative results of the survey, shown in Table 1 and Table 2, indicate that at the time of the survey, all participants held generally positive beliefs about academically supporting ELs. None of the participants strongly disagreed with positive statements about supporting ELs, and participants disagreed with positive
statements in only three instances. Some of the survey items yielded stronger levels of positive beliefs than other items, and some survey data yielded differing opinions. These ideas are discussed in greater detail in the following sections.

Table 1 Frequency of Survey Responses: Positive Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Theme</th>
<th>&quot;Agree&quot;= Positive/ Negative Outlook Toward ELs</th>
<th>Participant Responses: Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Participant Responses: Agree</th>
<th>Participant Responses: Disagree</th>
<th>Participant Responses: Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers are capable of adapting their instruction to meet the needs of ELs.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teachers have the capability to create academic success for all students when their class contains ELs.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Using elements of students' cultural backgrounds within a lesson can lead to increased student learning.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ELs are likely to experience academic success if teachers use their ELs' prior knowledge to help them make sense of new information.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Increased student/teacher connections will lead to increased academic achievement for all students.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teachers can create a collaborative classroom environment by helping ELs to develop positive relationships with their classmates.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Facilitating classroom collaboration between ELs and their English-proficient peers can lead to increased student learning for all students.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ELs can better understand the curriculum when teachers model classroom tasks for their students.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Helping all students to feel like important members of a classroom can lead to increased student learning for all students.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Designing instruction that matches the developmental needs of ELs can lead to increased student learning for all students.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>The inclusion of ELs in subject-area classes creates a positive educational atmosphere for all students.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Frequency Table of Survey Responses: Negative Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Theme</th>
<th>&quot;Agree&quot;= Positive/ Negative Outlook Toward ELs</th>
<th>Participant Responses: Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Participant Responses: Agree</th>
<th>Participant Responses: Disagree</th>
<th>Participant Responses: Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Subject-area teachers do not have enough time to address the academic needs of ELs.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>It is good practice to simplify coursework for ELs.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>It is good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ELs.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Teachers should modify assignments for ELs enrolled in subject-area classes.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Teachers should allow ELs more time to complete their coursework than their English-proficient peers.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Teachers should give ELs less coursework than their English-proficient peers.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>The inclusion of ELs in my class increases my workload.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General trends.** As evident from the group selection trends, the participant group indicated holding positive beliefs toward ELs at the time of the survey. Eleven of the survey items indicated positive beliefs toward ELs if the participant selected either “strongly agree” or “agree.” The designation of a teacher holding “positive” beliefs toward ELs by indicating item agreement is based on the work of Reeves (2006) pertaining to teacher attitudes toward teaching ELs in mainstream classes. Out of these 11 items, 38% or more of the participants indicated, “strongly agree” for all 11 items. Additionally, at least 88% or more of the participants indicated a level of agreement on all 11 items.

Seven of the survey items indicated positive beliefs toward ELs if the participant selected “strongly disagree” or “disagree.” The designation of a teacher holding
“positive” beliefs toward ELs by indicating item disagreement is also based on the work of Reeves (2006). Even though Reeves discusses the importance of lesson modification for ELs, the researcher acknowledges a degree of ambiguity within bodies of research on how to provide these modifications. The participant responses to lesson modifications for ELs reflect mixed reactions toward Reeve’s assertions. For example, there were mixed responses on two of the five items that assessed beliefs about whether to modify lessons or learning goals for ELs. Additionally, 75% showed some level of disagreement toward three out of the seven items pertaining to supporting ELs. The mixed response can be seen in Item 25, which showed that 50% of the participants believed in modifying assignments for ELs, and 50% did not.

The survey items analyzed in the following sections were chosen to elaborate on the trends mentioned above. The specific items were chosen based on either strong participant trends, or they were items that contained written explanations that serve to add context for the selection trends.

Adapting instruction and creating academic success for ELs. Responses from Item 1 indicated that all of the participants believe that teachers have the capability to adapt instruction to meet the academic needs of ELs (38% strongly agreed with this claim). Ms. Douglas writes that in order for teachers to adapt their instruction to meet the academic needs of ELs, “It takes training and willingness” on the part of the teacher. Additionally, 88% of the participants held strong beliefs that teachers are capable of creating academic success for ELs (Item 6). However, Ms. Tuscano disagreed with this prompt, citing concerns with teachers’ ability to create academic success for students.
with low levels of English proficiency. Additionally, 50% of participants strongly agreed that tapping into the students’ cultural backgrounds in the classroom environment would help lead ELs to find academic success. Mr. Lorenzo was one of the teachers who had strong positive beliefs about using students’ cultural backgrounds to find academic success. He writes, “Validating students' backgrounds leads to greater willingness to engage in a meaningful way.”

**Student connections and collaboration.** All participants agreed that learning for ELs increases when teachers help to increase their level of teacher-to-student connections in the classroom. According to the data in Item 11, 63% of the participants strongly agreed with the benefits of increasing teacher-student connections. Mr. Lorenzo was one of the participants who indicated strong support, and writes, “Learning is an active, not a passive, endeavor.” Additionally, teachers were asked about the benefits of increasing levels of student-to-student interactions between ELs and their English-proficient peers during class instruction (Item 14). All participants held positive beliefs in this item, with 63% of the participants indicating strong positive beliefs toward the benefits of ELs collaborating with their English-proficient peers. Ms. Margaret was one of these participants, but cautions, “This can backfire, with more proficient English speakers over-helping.”

**Adequate amount of time to address needs of ELs.** According to the data in Item 20, 50% of the participants indicated that teachers have enough time to address the academic needs of ELs, while the other 50% indicated that teachers do not have enough time to do so. Ms. Barnes was one of the teachers who indicated a lack of time, citing
“current class sizes” and lack of “appropriate support” as the main barriers for creating academic success for ELs. Mr. Lorenzo was one of the participants who indicated that teachers do have enough time, stating that reason “is an excuse”, and that “nothing is more important.”

**Modifying lessons for ELs.** Items 23-27 addressed participant beliefs regarding ways to academically support ELs through lesson modifications. The participants indicated a variation of beliefs in these items, and most of the participants did not hold strong convictions. For example, 63% of the participants believed that giving ELs more time on assignments is an appropriate form of academic support (Item 26), but none of the participants indicated a strong agreement with this statement. Ms. Barbera was one of the participants with low convictions on this topic. She writes, “If the student is struggling, then yes. It really depends on what it is.” Modifying assignments to meet the academic needs of ELs is another example of differing opinions of the participants. According to the data on Item 25, 50% of the participants “agreed” in modifying assignments to support ELs, while 50% “disagreed.” For this item, there were no selections that indicated the participants “strongly agreed” or “strongly disagreed” with modifying assignment. An example of low convictions can be seen in Ms. Douglas’ response when she writes that her assignment modification occurred “Sometimes, but not always.”

**Increased teacher workloads when teaching EL students.** There were differing opinions among the participants when asked if they believe that ELs increase teachers’ overall workloads. According to the data from Item 28, 50% of the participants believed
that ELs increase teacher workload, but these participants did not hold strong convictions on this belief. Ms. Barnes elaborated on why she believed that ELs increase her workload by stating "I'd have to create materials to support their learning because I don't have them available." Additionally, 25% of the participants “disagreed” that ELs increased teacher workload, while 25% “strongly disagreed.”

**Changing beliefs from The AL Project.** The one item that received high levels of disagreement from the participants was Item 48. When asked if The AL Project had a positive impact on the participants’ beliefs with ELs, 75% indicated some level of disagreement. To elaborate on her disagreement, Ms. Barbera writes, "I have always been a believer in my ELs. It is nice to be with like-minds."

**Summary of Survey Data: Beliefs**

The participants in this study all appear to have entered the PD experience with positive beliefs regarding ELs in their classrooms. These beliefs were reflected in the data showing the high levels of agreement toward academically supporting ELs, with many survey items scoring 100% agreement. These data suggest that the participants arrived to the PD experience with existing levels of positive beliefs toward ELs. There also appeared to be a disconnection to the positive beliefs and the ways to actually achieve academic success for ELs. Ms. Barbera illustrates this point by stating, "I believe they [ELs] are capable of all the work when provided the right strategies and when you are focusing on their skills."
Whole-Group Patterns: Practices

The following section examines the participant survey responses in regard to the PD activities of The AL Project. A more detailed account of the impact that these practices had on the participants occurs in the analysis section of both the one-on-one interviews and the focus group interview.

**General trends.** Positive feelings toward the activities of The AL Project are indicated in all eight items with a response of “strongly agree” or “agree.” The cumulative results of the survey, shown in Table 3, indicate that at the time of the survey, all participants held positive feelings toward the various PD activities of The AL Project, which include various inquiry practices such as engaging in two cycles of inquiry and collaborating within the structure of a PLC. For example, 75% of the participants indicated a level of agreement in seven out eight items, with six items having at least 38% of the participants indicating strong levels of agreement. Additionally, there was 100% agreement in five out of the eight items.

The survey items analyzed in the following sections were chosen to elaborate on the trends mentioned above. The specific items were chosen based on either strong participant trends, or were items that contained written explanations that serve to add context for the selection trends.
Table 3 Frequency Table of Survey Responses: Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Theme</th>
<th>&quot;Agree&quot;*</th>
<th>Participant Responses: Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Participant Responses: Agree</th>
<th>Participant Responses: Disagree</th>
<th>Participant Responses: Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Engaging in a cycle of inquiry has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Serving as a mentor to a teacher candidate has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Engaging in co-teaching with a teacher candidate has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Co-planning lessons with a teacher candidate has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Participating in an ongoing professional learning community with The AL Project has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Working with a university consultant within The AL Project has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Participating in activities of The AL Project has impacted your beliefs about the academic capabilities of ELs.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Participating in the elements of The AL Project has had a positive impact on your practices with instructing ELs.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mentor teaching.** According to the data in Item 43, 100% of the participants agreed that serving as a mentor teacher has helped them in working with ELs. Of all the participants in agreement, 50% strongly agreed. Ms. Margaret writes that serving as a mentor "makes for more clear and conscious modeling."

**Co-teaching.** Positive convictions toward co-teaching were indicated by 100% of the participants in both Item 44 and Item 45. For example, Mr. Lorenzo writes, "Designing opportunities for intentional co-teaching leads to more thoughtful planning, while increasing the teacher/student contact ratio." In relation, strong positive convictions were also indicated through the co-planning element of the co-teaching process. Ms. Margaret
writes that co-planning “heightens awareness for design of [lesson] delivery, and brings
the internal planning to the forefront.”

**PLC participation.** The participants also showed positive feelings toward
participating in the ongoing professional learning communities (PLC), and working with
a university consultant. For example, 88% of the participants indicated positive feelings
toward the PLCs put on by The AL Project. One of these participants was Ms. Barbera,
who writes, “I enjoy learning from others and learning new things that I can bring to the
classroom.”

**Working with a university consultant.** Participants indicated positive feelings
toward working with university consultants in various content areas as part of The AL
Project experience. There was an 88% agreement toward the positive impacts of working
with a content expert, with 25% of the participants indicating strong agreement. Ms.
Tuscano writes, "We get individualized support from university professors. This is key
because we have more time to flush out ideas and speak about individual focus students."

**Summary from Survey Data: Practices**

At the time of the survey, the participants indicated positive or strong feelings toward
most of the activities of the PD experience, and in particular, the relationship of the PD
experience in their work with ELs. Ms. Margaret is the one outlier from this section.
Ms. Margaret indicated disagreement on three of the items pertaining to a positive
relationship between working with The AL Project, and her work with ELs. She
indicated that she did not find it helpful to participate in a PLC or with a university
consultant. She conveyed that The AL Project did not impact her beliefs by writing, “A
majority of the material in [The AL Project] are a duplication of what I am already doing.” She also writes that working with a PLC “hasn’t really changed” what she was already doing.

**Whole-Group Patterns: Self-Efficacy**

The following section examines the participants’ survey responses in regard to feelings of self-efficacy toward working with ELs. This section also contains quotes that are relevant to the discussion of their feelings of self-efficacy. A more detailed account of the individual responses occurs in the analysis section of both the one-on-one interviews and the focus group interview.

**General trends.** Positive feelings toward the activities of The AL Project are indicated in all eight items. This is shown when participants responded with “strongly agree” or “agree.” The designation of a teacher holding “positive” feeling toward ELs by indicating item agreement is also based on the self-efficacy work of Bandura (1977) and the self-efficacy work of Siwatu (2007), specifically in culturally responsive teaching. The cumulative results of the survey, shown in Table 4, indicate that at the time of the survey, all of the participants indicated some degree of self-efficacy toward working with ELs. For example, 100% of the participants responded positively in eight out of the 11 items pertaining to self-efficacy. Of these items, five out of eight of the participants indicated strong levels of self-efficacy.

The survey items analyzed in the following sections were chosen to elaborate on the trends mentioned above. The specific items were chosen based on either strong participant trends, or were items that contained written explanations that serve to add
context for the response trends. The following section contains general trends of the whole group in the area of self-efficacy.

Table 4 Frequency Table of Survey Responses: Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Theme</th>
<th>&quot;Agree&quot;</th>
<th>Participant Responses:</th>
<th>Participant Responses:</th>
<th>Participant Responses:</th>
<th>Participant Responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am capable of adapting my instruction to meet the needs of ELs in my classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adapting instruction to include appropriate levels of language supports within my lessons will lead to increased learning for ELs in my class.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I can achieve greater academic success with my ELs if I obtain information about my ELs' language abilities.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I can assess EL learning using various types of assessments.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I can use my ELs' cultural backgrounds to help make learning meaningful.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I can establish a personal connection with all ELs in my classroom.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I can create a collaborative classroom environment by helping ELs to develop positive relationships with their classmates.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I can help ELs feel like important members of my classroom.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>I can address the learning needs of the ELs in my class with the current amount of resources I have to work with (i.e. time, technology, supplementary materials, professional development opportunities, etc.).</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>I can address the learning needs of the ELs in my class with increased resources (i.e. time, technology, supplementary materials, professional development opportunities, etc.).</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Participating in the elements of The AL Project has had a positive impact on your confidence that adding academic supports will lead to increased learning for ELs?</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapting instruction for ELs. According to the survey data (Item2), 100% of the participants agreed that they are capable of adapting instruction to meet the academic needs of ELs, with 50% of the participants indicating strong agreement. Ms. Portillo
indicated that her existing feelings of self-efficacy stemmed from her past experiences as an EL. Mr. Lorenzo strongly agreed with his capabilities in academically supporting ELs, and writes, “I will never master this [supporting ELs], but I recognize the necessity of it and will continue to grow in this area through PD and experience.”

**Using EL data to increase EL learning.** According to the data (Item 4), 100% of the participants agreed that they are able to increase academic success of ELs by obtaining data on the students’ English proficiency, with 38% of the participants indicating strong agreement. Mr. Lorenzo, who indicated strong agreement, writes, “It is not possible to plan lessons to meet my learning objectives without reliably knowing where my students are to begin with.”

**Addressing needs of ELs with increased resources.** According to the data from Item 22, 100% of the participants responded with agreement toward being able to address the academic needs of ELs with increased resources. Additionally, 25% of the participants indicated strong agreement with increased resources. One of these participants was Ms. Barnes, who writes, “I can address those needs now, to a certain extent, but I need additional support to address them more fully.”

**Items with mixed responses.** There were three survey items that generated mixed levels of responses (Items 10, 21, and 50). Item 10 asked about the participants’ abilities to establish personal connections with all of their students. In this item, 50% of the participants responded with “strongly agree,” and 25% indicated a disagreement. Ms. Tuscano elaborated on this item by writing, “Some [ELs] do not wish to know me if they
are forced immigrants.” Ms. Margaret elaborated on her selection by writing, “The statement of ‘all’ lends itself to disagreement. I can attempt this with ‘all’ students.”

The participants had mixed reactions on Item 21 when they were asked if they were able to address the academic needs of ELs with their current level of resources. According to the data, 50% of the participants agreed that they could address the academic needs of ELs with their current level of resources, but none of the participants strongly agreed with this item. Additionally, 50% of the participants indicated disagreement on this item, with one participant indicating a strong disagreement.

Finally, Item 50 generated mixed participant responses. According to the survey data, 63% of the participants agreed that participating in the activities of The AL Project had increased their confidence in their work with ELs, with 25% of the participants indicating strong agreement. Ms. Portillo elaborated on these feelings by writing that her participation has helped her to “develop [her] own materials and sentence frames [for ELs].” Ms. Tuscano also elaborated on her feelings by writing, “We are given the tools we need to successfully reach more ELs in the classroom.” In contrast, 38% of the participants disagreed that participating in the activities of The AL Project increased their confidence in working with ELs. Mr. Lorenzo was one of the participants who indicated disagreement in Item 50. He elaborated on his disagreement by writing, “It [The AL Project] has validated beliefs that are core to my educational philosophy that I know through experience to be effective.”
Summary of Survey Data: Self-Efficacy

At the time of the survey, the participants indicated positive degrees of self-efficacy toward academically supporting ELs (Item 2), assessing EL learning by using various types of assessment (Item 5), making learning meaningful by using the cultural backgrounds of ELs (Item 7), and making ELs feel like important members of the class (Item 16). Responses became mixed when the participants were asked about personally connecting with all EL students, using current levels of resources to address the learning needs of ELs, and the role that The AL Project had in the participants’ confidence in teaching ELs. Additionally, the survey data reflects strong collective levels of self-efficacy in academically supporting ELs.

Collective Summary: All Survey Data

The survey data reflects an appearance of strong collective levels of existing positive participant beliefs and levels of self-efficacy toward working with ELs. This was evident through the mixed responses and varying levels of agreement conviction on the items pertaining to self-efficacy. Two trends that are important to mention were the strong levels of self-efficacy for a first year mentor, Ms. Margaret, and the lower levels of self-efficacy for a fourth year mentor, Ms. Johnson. This raises questions regarding past experiences of Ms. Margaret that helped with her self-efficacy, and also questions concerning reasons that Ms. Johnson still indicated low-levels of self-efficacy despite multiple years of participating as a mentor within The AL Project. These trends were explored within the participants’ respective one-on-one interviews.
The survey data helps shine a light on general participant feelings toward the activities of The AL Project at the time of the survey. These data indicate that the participants began the PD experience with existing levels of positive beliefs and feelings of self-efficacy toward working with ELs. Coupled with the strong levels of positive responses toward the various PD activities of The AL Project, the survey generated data that needed additional exploration within the context of a one-on-one interview. As a result, interview questions were developed to explore the ways in which the participants felt they benefitted from the PD activities of The AL Project.

The following section provides an analysis for the one-on-one interview data. It begins with an analysis of the whole-group themes that emerged in a content analysis of the interview transcripts. The analysis of whole-group themes is followed by an analysis of themes that emerged among subsets of individuals.

**Whole Group Trends: One-on-One Interviews**

The interview questions, found in Appendix B, contain a set of questions that allowed for an exploratory conversation between the interviewer and the interviewee in the areas of beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy toward working with ELs. Additionally, the interview questions created the opportunity to specifically explore the participants’ experiences with the various PD activities of The AL Project. The researcher coded all of the interviews, and each utterance was assigned a specific code. All codes used were compiled into a coding scheme, found in Appendix E, and were divided into the categories of “beliefs,” “practices,” “self-efficacy,” and “null.” The coding scheme contains a written explanation for each code used during the coding process.
Three frequency tables are provided in this section, corresponding to the areas of beliefs, practices and self-efficacy, and include those topics that surfaced eight or more times across participants’ interviews. In addition, codes that were discussed by seven or more participants have been highlighted in each table. The highlighted codes represent the whole group trends discussed in this section. Individual participant trends are discussed on an individual basis later in this chapter.

**Collective one-on-one interview data trends: Beliefs.** As evident from the data in Table 5, during their interviews, the participants discussed a variety of topics pertaining to “beliefs.” There were three topics that at least seven participants discussed within their interviews (highlighted rows in Table 5). Trends and quotes regarding these three topics are included in the following sections and will be discussed as follows: a) Perceived skills/abilities of ELs, b) supporting all students, and c) views of teaching. Discussion topics were selected that resonated for teachers. The selected topics include a mix of both positive and negative participant responses.
Perceived skills/abilities of ELs. During the one-on-one interviews, the participants collectively discussed their perceptions on the academic skills/abilities of ELs a total of 40 times throughout the eight interviews. Most utterances on this topic were discussed by Ms. Tuscano (11) and Ms. Johnson (10). Collectively, there were 16 positive statements and 24 negative statements regarding perceptions on the skills/abilities of ELs. The mixture of both positive and negative utterances for this topic contrasts with the collective survey results that reflected shared positive beliefs toward the abilities of ELs. This trend is important to point out because positive beliefs toward students capabilities is a fundamental component for participants who wish to improve their work with ELs.

Positive themes. There were two positive themes that emerged in this section. The first positive theme that emerged within the collection of utterances on this topic was ELs’
abilities to succeed with content knowledge, even if the students’ written expression of the content knowledge needed additional support. Ms. Tuscano conveyed the belief in grading on both “content” and “literacy” as a way to support ELs in her science class. She says, “A lot of the time, kids are really good at science, but can’t communicate it.” The second theme that emerged was the wealth of outside experiences that ELs enter the classroom with. Mr. Lorenzo discussed this issue in a positive way by saying, “Kids come with a wealth of experience that school doesn’t recognize. Tapping into that is key to engaging them.”

**Negative themes.** There were two negative themes that emerged in this section that contrast with some of the positive opinions that were conveyed in the survey regarding the academic capabilities of ELs. The first negative theme that emerged was the idea of ELs coming into a class with limited English vocabulary. Ms. Johnson said the following:

> Our [school] population is not strong in English. They’re not. Their exposure to vocabulary is limited, the critical thinking is limited, and they’re fantastic, don’t get me wrong. These are some of the best people you can ever meet. I love our kids, but it is remarkable how many of them read, what appears to be a really, a relatively simple sentence and completely misconstrue what’s happening.

The second negative theme was the reading abilities of many ELs. Mr. Lorenzo states, “They are all struggling with reading.” The third theme was the writing abilities of ELs. Ms. Tuscano states, “My kids, they have trouble writing a complete sentence.” The final theme that emerged was student motivation. Ms. Margaret states that ELs “have to be really motivated to throw them in a class full of EOs [English-only students].”
Summary. The statements coded as “negative” contrast with the survey responses given about the capabilities of ELs. In the survey, 100% of the participants indicated agreement that ELs succeed when teachers adapt their instruction to meet the needs of ELs. The interview data shows a contrast to the survey findings because 60% of the utterances on this topic were negative. The interview data patterns indicated that despite teachers’ best efforts in modifying lessons for their EL students, EL students’ existing levels of reading, writing, and vocabulary play a part in their abilities to find academic success.

Supporting all students. Statements that addressed the topic of supporting all students occurred on 34 occasions. In total, there were 30 utterances that were coded as “positive,” and four utterances were coded as “negative.”

Positive themes. Ms. Portillo discussed the need to support all students in a positive way by stating, “Every single student has individual needs.” Mr. Lorenzo discussed ways that he supports all of his students by stating, “My instruction is not just for ELs, but for all kids. It is predicated on the belief that scaffolds need to be built in at every point.” He later followed up this idea by stating, “We do what’s right for kids. Kids come first, and we do what’s best for kids.” The final example of positive participant beliefs toward supporting all students came from Ms. Barbera, who stated, “We want to meet everybody. Not one person’s going to fall behind.”

Negative themes. The main theme that came up within the four negative statements had to do with teacher resources in supporting all students. For example, Ms. Douglas said, “I think we [teachers] are very limited.” Ms. Douglas also discussed the decline in
SDAIE classes as a way of previously supporting all students, and then stated, “I don't think there is a lot of support [courses].”

Summary. These statements, along with the 26 other positive participant statements, demonstrate the group’s collective positive beliefs toward academically supporting all of their students. Multiple participants, including Ms. Douglas, expressed the belief that strategies to academically support ELs also work to academically support all students. She states, “I believe what we need to do to support ELs is just good teaching. It’s what we need to do to support everybody.” This statement matches the results from Item 18 of the survey, which states, “Designing instruction that matches the developmental needs of ELs can lead to increased students learning for all students.” The survey results show that all participants indicated agreement on this item, and 75% of the participants indicated strong agreement. In both the survey and interview data, the expression of positive beliefs toward supporting all students reflect a strong trend for the participants’ use of EL support strategies as a way to academically support all students.

Furthermore, the interview data conveys the feeling that more resources are needed to academically support all students. The negative themes from this section reaffirm the responses from Item 21 of the survey, addressing the learning needs of ELs with current levels of resources. In Item 21, 50% of the participants showed agreement toward the statement, and 50% disagreed.

Views of the teaching profession. There were 19 instances in which the participants discussed their views of the teaching profession. Statements were coded with “views of teaching” when the participants expressed their general dispositions toward teaching
students or the teaching profession. Of the 19 instances, 15 statements represented a positive view of the teaching profession, and four instances represented a negative view. The frequency of statements were spread relatively even across the seven responding participants. It is important to mention that most statements toward the teaching profession pertained to students in a general sense and did not focus on ELs specifically. These statements are still relevant to the study, as they show the participants’ general dispositions toward the teaching profession, which helped to add context to the participants in this study in regard to their views on the profession.

**Positive themes.** Ms. Portillo discussed her views of the teaching profession in a positive way by saying, “I love to teach, it has always been my passion.” Ms. Barbera discussed her positive views of teaching on four instances, the most out of the participants. In one instance, she discussed her passion for teaching when she talked about lesson planning. She says that teaching is “more than just a job. It’s your career and it’s always on your mind. Even in the summer, it’s always on your mind.” Ms. Margaret added to the topic of lesson planning in a positive way by saying, “Everything you plan has to be about them [students].”

**Negative themes.** Mr. Lorenzo expressed a negative viewpoint on the profession as he discussed a lack of collaborative opportunities with his colleagues. He says, “Too much of what we do, is in isolation as teachers, you know, the good and the bad. I don’t get to share what I’m super good at.” Ms. Tuscano added a negative viewpoint in regard to teachers making changes to their practices. She said, “Sometimes as a teacher, you’re
super busy.” Ms. Douglas echoed this idea by saying, “Sometimes we [teachers] feel like, ‘Oh my gosh, I need to do everything.’”

**Summary.** The ideas toward “beliefs” expressed from the interviews reflect similar ideas expressed in the survey data. The participants expressed positive outlooks toward the teaching profession, especially in the areas of student support and lesson planning. The negative statements tended to center on the desire for increased collaboration, and the tendency for teachers to work alone. These ideas reaffirm a positive outlook toward the teaching profession, even if the statements are said in a negative way. These data reflect positive dispositions toward the teaching profession from all of the participants.

**Collective One-on-One Interview Data Summary: Beliefs**

The collective one-on-one interview data convey positive beliefs toward the participants’ work with ELs. These data reaffirm much of the survey data pertaining to “beliefs.” Two positive belief trends were found regarding the teaching profession and academically supporting all students. All of the participants indicated positive beliefs toward the teaching profession, and participants such as Mr. Lorenzo and Ms. Tuscano indicated a desire to collaborate with colleagues in order to improve their own practices. This viewpoint reaffirms the 100% participant agreement from survey Item 45, which states, “Co-planning lessons with a teacher candidate had a positive impact on your work with ELs.”

As previously stated, the data on the perceived skills/abilities of ELs reflect beliefs that are not fully aligned with the data from the surveys. A discrepancy appeared through the process of comparing data sets. This discrepancy shows that on the survey, 100% of
the participants indicated positive beliefs toward ELs capabilities, and 60% of the interview utterances on the same topic were negative. This created a need to explore this discrepancy within the individual participant data. This exploration occurs later in this chapter.

**Collective One-on-One Interview Data Trends: Practices**

As evident from interview data shown in Table 6, the participants discussed a wide array of topics pertaining to “practices.” There were five topics that were discussed by seven or more participants during interviews (highlighted in Table 6). Trends and quotes regarding these five topics are included in the following sections and will be discussed as follows: a) Co-teaching, b) supporting students in classroom, c) school supports for ELs-support courses, d) reflective dialogue, and e) supporting students in classroom-scaffolds.
Table 6 One-on-One Interview Frequency Table: Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Sub-Code</th>
<th>Total Instance Frequency</th>
<th>Teacher #1</th>
<th>Teacher #2</th>
<th>Teacher #3</th>
<th>Teacher #4</th>
<th>Teacher #5</th>
<th>Teacher #6</th>
<th>Teacher #7</th>
<th>Teacher #8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The AL Project</td>
<td>Co-Teaching Model-Co-Teaching</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The AL Project</td>
<td>Co-Teaching Model-Planning</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Working with All Students</td>
<td>Supporting Students in Classroom</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The AL Project</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Changes in Practice</td>
<td>New Practices-Trying New Practices</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assessment Practices</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. School Supports</td>
<td>School Supports for ELs-Support Courses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The AL Project</td>
<td>Reflective Dialogue</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Working with ELs</td>
<td>Data Analysis/Use (CELDT)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Changes in Practice</td>
<td>New Practices-Vocabulary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The AL Project</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. School District</td>
<td>District Supports</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The AL Project</td>
<td>Cycle of Inquiry</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Working with All Students</td>
<td>Supporting Students in Classroom-Scaffolds</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Working with All Students</td>
<td>Supporting Students in Classroom-Writing Strategies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Professional Development</td>
<td>Attending PD as a Participant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Assessment Practices</td>
<td>Co-Assessing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Collaborative Practices</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The AL Project</td>
<td>Working with Experts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Working with ELs</td>
<td>Practices Supporting ELs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-teaching. There were 29 instances in which the research participants discussed their experiences with co-teaching through The AL Project. Statements were coded with “co-teaching” when participants made utterances that pertained to direct classroom instruction with the participant's co-teaching partner. Of the 29 instances, all 29 statements represented positive views about co-teaching. Three themes emerged from the interview data in regard to co-teaching: a) “making changes to lessons during instruction,” b) “student-teacher ratio,” and c) “co-planning.”
Making changes to lessons during instruction. Ms. Barnes expressed thoughts about ways in which co-teaching helped her to change lessons during instruction. She stated the following:

“When we’re teaching, we just sort of talk it out as we’re doing it. If something’s not working or if I think something needs to be more scaffolded… If I see, as something’s going, that I think we need to scaffold something more, I’ll just whisper to him [teacher candidate], ‘Hey, I think we should have them do this graphic organizer.’ Then he’ll just tweak it on the fly. We just kind of do it as we go.”

Ms. Tuscano also discussed this topic in a more general sense. She said that her co-teaching partner can “step in and teach” when a lesson needs to change.

Student-teacher ratio. Multiple participants discussed ways in which co-teaching impacts the student-teacher ratio in the classroom. Mr. Lorenzo stated that he and his partner “well, there are two of us in the classroom so we get to double up on kids these days.” Ms. Margaret says that with co-teaching, “There is an extra set of eyes, extra set of people to ask.” Ms. Barnes also made connections between co-teaching and improvements in the student-teacher ratio by saying, “I really feel like the co-instruction is huge. It makes a huge difference when you’re fifteen to one.” Ms. Barbera discussed a time in which having two teachers in the room helped create an environment for an engaging class discussion. She said, “So you’ve got the kids engaged and kind of looking back and forth. They’re raising their hands, and I felt it was just a very natural conversation.” Ms. Barbera also discussed the benefits of being able to observe more students when co-teaching. She said they were able to “focus in on a student or a pocket of the room to see what’s going on. To see how they’re taking to something.” In
discussing the student-teacher ratio, Mr. Lorenzo says, “I get to work with fewer kids, so the kids get more of me. It’s richer.”

The improvements in student-teacher ratio also help to improve a teacher’s ability to provide faster academic support for the students. For example, Ms. Barbera says, “When there is a [student] misconception, you can step in right away and fix it.” She also says that having an extra person in the room allowed her to focus on “a pocket of the room and see what’s going on, or how they [students] are taking something.” Ms. Portillo describes the ways in which having a second teacher in the room improves student outcomes. She says that having another person in the room helps her “to meet the academic needs of all her students.”

**Co-planning.** Most of the participants discussed co-planning as a positive aspect to co-teaching. When Ms. Douglas was asked which elements of co-teaching best assisted her in working with ELs, she responded by saying, “the co-planning.” She elaborated by saying there were “two heads to think about potential issues [within a lesson design].” Ms. Tuscano conveyed the idea that the nature of a co-teaching model, almost forces partners to co-plan. She cited increased analysis of student work as a motivating factor for co-planning. Mr. Lorenzo discussed that he and his co-teaching partner spend two hours a day co-planning. He says this creates “an optimal situation for someone to learn and teach and to build co-teaching.” Ms. Barnes says, “we co-plan everything,” and she even discussed times when she and her co-teacher e-mailed each other lesson plan feedback on evenings before the lesson instruction. She says that the process “allows me to learn from him.”
Summary. The participants spoke positively regarding the co-teaching process, and indicated signs of transformation to their practices as a result of the co-teaching process. They shared insights on ways in which co-teaching helped with lesson modifications, increased academic supports for all students, and increased learning for both co-teaching partners. It was not entirely clear whether or not the changes in practices were short-term changes while in the presence of a co-teacher or whether or not the transformation had long-term implications. The data on co-teaching reflects the same collective sentiments that were indicated in the survey. The topic of co-teaching is explored in more detail in the analysis of the individual participants.

Supporting students in the classroom. There were 22 instances where the participants discussed supporting students in the classroom. Of the 22 instances, 22 statements represented positive views. Three themes emerged from this topic: a) “instructional support strategies,” b) “student engagement strategies,” and c) “changing practices through co-teaching.”

Instructional support strategies. Multiple participants offered insights on the ways in which co-teaching enhanced their practices with implementing instructional support for their students. Ms. Portillo discussed ways in which co-teaching allowed for increased implementation of instructional support strategies for her students. She conveyed increased use of “signals, picture cards, computer games, videos, and movies” as a direct result of ongoing student-support conversations with her teacher candidate. This utterance shows signs of long-term changes in her practice, and possible transformation as a result of the mentoring and co-teaching process. Ms. Portillo
explained that she and her co-teaching partner consistently reflected on ways they can “support the students when they are not learning.” Ms. Douglas stated that she increased her use of “visuals and manipulatives” for her students as a result of collaborative conversations.

Ms. Tuscano conveyed an increased use of guiding questions, sentence frames, displaying student-work samples, and using rubrics for her students’ science lab reports. She adds that she gradually decreases elements of support for specific students when they demonstrate increased levels of academic progress. Ms. Barnes discussed an increased use of sentence frames for her EL students as a method for creating a sense of academic safety in her classroom and says that she likes to provide supports that “students can use.” Ms. Barbera expressed an increased use of a variety of student support strategies. She says that when providing supports she tries to consider students’ “individual needs.” She explains that in previous years she provided graphic organizers to her students, but this year she increased her use of questions on the board, visuals, and vocabulary support. Ms. Barbera says that this year she has been able to provide “immediate intervention” for her students, as opposed to figuring out ways so that students can make up a failing grade. She credited this in part to having an additional teacher in the classroom this year. She explained that she had been utilizing similar student support practices during her 15 years of teaching. For example, she explained that this year she has had the opportunity to conduct one-on-one meetings with more of her students. She also states that at the beginning of the school year she told herself that she was going to use this year as an opportunity “to do something different.” In terms of the new practices, Ms. Barbera says
that she is “seeing success” and is “feeling good about it.” These quotes seem to indicate a long-term impact on Ms. Barbera’s practices as a result of the mentoring and co-teaching process.

**Student engagement strategies.** Multiple participants discussed ways in which co-teaching helped them to improve ways in which they increased participation of all students, including ELs, during lesson instruction.

Ms. Barnes explained that she has increased her use of “round robins” during class discussions, which gives more students a chance to speak. She has also increased her use of “partner-pair-shares” during instruction as way to get all students engaged in a partner discussion. Additionally, she has made the rule that “nobody speaks over a person” as a way to promote a safe learning environment in which all students can participate. When asked about ways she has changed her practices for engaging ELs, she responded by saying that she has added, “structured conversations so that English language learners have an opportunity to share their thoughts, build on thoughts of somebody else, but they don’t get spoken over.” She also discussed the new practice of providing sentence stems for ELs to use during discussions. She explained that the changes in her practices have created an educational environment “safe enough that they [ELs] feel that they can talk.” She concluded the discussion topic by saying that the changes in her practices are a “work in progress.”

Ms. Barbera discussed ways in which co-teaching has created opportunities to increase student engagement during class instruction. She stated that co-teaching has given her the opportunity to “pull someone aside in that moment [to give academic
support] while the rest of the kids are not waiting or being lost.” She added that having the resources to address specific student concerns affords the opportunity for the class to “still keep moving” through the lesson.

Ms. Margaret did not convey any changes in her practice in regard to increased student engagement. She stated that she typically encourages all of her students to participate. She gave examples of this with the following statement:

I make sure that I ask students to participate, invite them in, make sure that everybody is participating and then I look for those kids who are not. They don’t get to opt out in here, but they get to change how they participate if they need to…but there’s no opting out.

**Summary.** The interview data coded as “supporting students in the classroom” reflects changes in practices for many of the participants as a result of co-teaching. These changes include the implementation of instructional strategies with the goal of increasing academic support for all students, particularly ELs. These trends also include participants’ increased use of new strategies that allow more students to participate during class lessons, especially ELs. Finally, it is worth noting that Ms. Margaret and Mr. Lorenzo did not make any statements regarding changes in their instructional practices as a result of co-teaching this year. These individual trends are analyzed later in this chapter.

**School supports for ELs: Support courses.** There were 15 instances in which the participants discussed support courses that their respective schools provide for ELs. Statements were coded with “school supports for ELs-support courses” when the participant expressed instances that discussed the types of academic courses their respective schools offer for ELs. Of the 15 instances, five statements represented positive views about support courses, and 10 statements represented negative viewpoints.
There were two trends from this section: “Lack of EL support courses”, and “the teacher as the EL support.”

**Lack of support courses for ELs.** Ms. Douglas explained that her school provides support courses for EL students. She says, “… we have an ELD class, English language development, for students who are like [CELDT] level 1, 2, or 3. And that teacher tries to support those kids throughout the day too, they get grade checks.” All other participants who spoke on this topic indicated a contrasting opinion.

Ms. Margaret explained the lack of EL course support by making the point that her school mainstreams ELs into classes with their English proficient peers. She says that mainstreaming is the main form of support for a large numbers of ELs attending her school. She added that not all ELs are mainstreamed before stating, “We do have an ELD class support for ones and twos [CELDT levels]. Everybody else is pretty much mainstreamed in.” Ms. Tuscano indicated similar feelings toward a lack of EL support courses, saying, “Usually, it’s just one teacher who teaches the sheltered science class.”

Ms. Barbera discussed negative feelings on her school’s support of ELs. She indicated that her school has actually removed some of the existing supports for the ELs. She said the following:

> There was an issue last year where teachers were speaking up, saying what supports do we have for EL’s? Then we had an official email come out from admin saying, “We don’t have enough students for ELD classes. We have X amount. We can’t support them.”

Ms. Johnson discussed that there have been recent changes in the levels of support courses offered to ELs at her school. She says, “We do have sheltered English 1, and I’m
not sure if we have sheltered English 2. We used to have more ELD classes, and I don’t think we have them on our campus anymore.”

**Teacher as EL support.** Much of the conversations regarding EL support courses generated statements from the participants regarding themselves as a main support for the EL students attending their respective schools. For example, Mr. Lorenzo says, “I feel like I am that support. The academic language support class is what we offer to ELs or low-performing kids. It has been so sort of unstructured and directionless.” He continued by saying that many of the students who were CELDT level two attended summer school. He says these particular students, “now find themselves in an English 1 sheltered class and then they’ve got my support class to support that. And then the other half are freshmen who have a history of struggling with English.” Ms. Barnes shared similar sentiments about her school’s lack of support courses for ELs, saying, “The EL learners that I have actually should be also in an English workshop and are currently not. This is a problem that we are working on.”

**Summary.** Most of the participants expressed the general opinion that their respective schools are not providing enough support courses for ELs. Furthermore, most of the participants expressed that much of the EL support needs have fallen on specific classroom teachers, including them. There is a general sense that there are systemic issues with providing ELs with adequate instructional support. This sense is evident from Mr. Lorenzo expressing that he is the EL support at his school, Ms. Barnes stating she would like her English department to increase supports, and Ms. Barbera expressing feelings about her school’s reduction in EL support courses. These statements show the
frustration among the participants and are in line with the sentiments expressed in the
survey regarding the need to academically support ELs.

**Reflective dialogue.** There were 15 instances in which the participants made
statements regarding their engagement with reflective dialogue during the PD process.
Statements were coded with “reflective dialogue” when the participant expressed
instances that discussed the impact of participating in reflective dialogue with another
teacher. Of the 15 instances, 15 statements represented positive views about engaging in
reflective dialogue. There were three themes that emerged in regard to “reflective
dialogue.” These themes are “increased student support,” “collaboration,” and “self-
improvement.”

**Increased student academic support.** Some of the participants conveyed the idea
that ongoing reflective dialogue is beneficial for providing increased student support.
Ms. Douglas was one of these participants, and she expressed some of the important
aspects of engaging in reflective dialogue. She says that as a mentor, part of her job is to
“always be thinking about, ‘how am I making sure that my teacher candidate is going to
meet all of those students’ needs.’” Ms. Tuscano expressed the importance of engaging
in reflective dialogue within the scope of the PLCs provided by The AL Project. She
says that she benefits from “the discussion with the other teachers, other mentor teachers
and their candidates. Like, when we all go in the room and we share out, I think that’s
really helpful to hear.”

Ms. Barbera expressed ways in which her engagement in reflective dialogue helps to
increase her levels of academic support for her students. She stated that she is able to
change her lessons to better meet her students’ performance levels. For example, she said that in a recent lesson, she “was expecting that the kids would understand [the content], and there were so many questions, [she thought to herself] ‘I didn’t expect this.’” She explained that engaging in reflective dialogue helps her to design her lesson.

**Collaboration.** Mr. Lorenzo felt positively about engaging in reflective dialogue and indicated that for him, “Reflective dialogue takes place daily.” He expressed that co-teaching provides the opportunity for daily reflective dialogue, and for him, reflective dialogue usually takes the form of an informal “cycle of inquiry” with his co-teaching partner. He says that engaging in reflective dialogue is “how we [co-teaching partners] function daily.” Ms. Johnson, who expressed that she struggles to find the time to engage with reflective dialogue, indicated positive feelings toward the process with the following statement:

> Being able to talk with another adult about what we’re observing, about student success and student failures really goes back to that idea of being critical about what’s happening.

**Self-Improvement.** Some of the participants discussed reflective dialogue as a way for improving their own instructional practices. Ms. Barbera expressed strong positive feelings toward engaging in reflective dialogue by saying that she benefitted from “sitting and talking [with the teacher candidate] about what’s to come the next day, and how it builds up into the instruction.” She says this process helps her to make “smoother” lesson transitions. Ms. Barnes expressed that reflective dialogue helps her to determine what instructional practices are “not working,” what new strategies she should try, and what existing strategies she needs “to tweak.”
Summary. Most of the participants expressed positive views toward engaging in reflective dialogue with either their co-teaching partner or with the members of the PLC within The AL Project. These qualitative data within the pattern categories show the amount of professional growth that can occur when engaging in reflective dialogue with another teacher in regard to their own teaching practices. The process leads to increased levels of student support, ongoing collaboration, and increased levels of self-improvement. These sentiments are aligned with the survey item responses that mention positive feelings toward the activities of The AL Project.

Supporting students in the classroom: Scaffolds. There were 12 instances in which the participants discussed using scaffolds in a lesson to better support their students. Of the 12 instances, 11 statements represented positive views about scaffolding and one statement was made representing a negative outlook toward scaffolding. There were three themes that emerged from the participants in regard to scaffolds. They are “content-specific scaffolds,” “skill-building scaffolds,” and “improved scaffold use from co-teaching.”

Content-specific scaffolds. Some of the participants discussed using scaffolds as a way to provide academic support to their EL students in various content areas. The content areas that were discussed are math, science, and English.

Ms. Douglas discussed using scaffolds in her math class as a way to help her students to better understand math better. She says that she uses “visuals, manipulatives, sentence frames, and worksheets” as a way to support her EL students. Ms. Portillo conveyed
similar ideas during her interview, saying that she uses “graphic organizers” in her math class to help her EL students to better work through math word problems.

Ms. Margaret conveyed the importance of using scaffolds when teaching science. She explained that using scaffolds are particularly important when teaching “something procedural,” such as a science lab. She stated that she implements scaffolds to reinforce specific parts of the lab, and that she usually does scaffolds by modeling the correct procedures at various points of the lab. She explained that these are practices that she will continue to use in her classroom.

Ms. Barnes discussed using scaffolds when teaching her English classes. She mentioned that scaffolds help all of her students in these classes. She said “the strategies that work with EL’s are just good strategies.” She continued by expressing that many of her lowest readers are not actually ELs, but students who only speak English and have lived in the United States their entire lives. However, Ms. Johnson held a caveat to a positive outlook on scaffolding for all students, saying, “There is a tendency [for teachers] to offer excessive scaffolding.”

**Skill-building scaffolds.** Some of the participants discussed using scaffolds as a way to build specific academic skills for their students. Ms. Barnes discussed building English skills with her students through the use of scaffolds. She stated the following:

> You scaffold it to provide them [EL students] the support and the scaffolds they need in English to help them get the material while they’re also gaining the English language skills.

Ms. Tuscano explained that she uses scaffolds in her science classes to help her students with their writing. She said, “My kids have trouble writing complete sentences,
so I have to scaffold this back a little bit.” Mr. Lorenzo discussed his feelings on the use of scaffolds in a classroom. He conveyed the feeling that not all teachers put appropriate thought behind why a scaffold is included in a lesson. He says that scaffolds need to be used “towards some skill” and “the manifestation of that skill.”

Improved scaffold use from co-teaching. Some of the participants discussed increasing their use of scaffolds as a result of the co-teaching process. Ms. Douglas discussed ways in which she improved her use of scaffolds by engaging in the cycles of inquiry with her co-teacher candidate. She elaborated on this with the following statement:

I think, just the awareness, you know bringing it to the forefront and looking at those specific, the inquiry cycles, where we look at, a specific academic language goal and how to reach it, I think that’s very useful. I think sometimes we just feel like, “oh my gosh, I need to do everything.” And to have that help to pin it down, to one thing and so being aware of that as I’m working with my teacher candidate, to talk about those issues with her, I think that really helps.

Ms. Barnes conveyed similar feelings about increased scaffolds through the co-teaching process. She explained that her teacher candidate would create new lesson ideas through the co-planning process. During this process, the two of them discussed areas of the lesson that may require additional academic support. Ms. Barnes talked about a time in the semester when she and her teacher candidate created a new unit assessment. The new assessment required the students to create an audio podcast, which had the students doing a large amount of speaking. During the co-planning process, Ms. Barnes and her teacher candidate had predicted which areas they would need to scaffold. She says, “We were nervous about it because, you know, this could be a big hassle.” Ms. Barnes
explained that her teacher candidate “scaffolded a script for them and, you know, they had a little hard time.” She explained that the students ended up having problems with some of the non-scaffolded parts of the assignment and did not seem to need the scaffolds they created. She elaborated by saying, “The things you thought they were going to have problems with, were not the things they had problems with.” She concluded her story by explaining that she and her co-teacher listened to the podcasts together and in the end, “They're not bad.”

**Summary.** Most of the participants expressed the feeling that providing scaffolds for all students, and ELs in particular, are helpful instructional practices. These statements show that most of the participants use some types of scaffold within their lessons to academically support their students, and that the use of scaffolds were increased through the co-teaching process. These sentiments are aligned with survey Item 18 that references positive feelings toward designing instruction that matches the developmental needs of ELs.

**Collective One-on-One Interview Data Summary: Practices**

The themes presented in the interview data on “practices” align with the positive “practices” trends found within the survey data. The participants conveyed the use of various practices that are intended to academically support their students. These practices seemed to become more focused and more frequent through the activities of The AL Project. These trends are further explored in the analysis of the individual participants.
Collective One-on-One Interview Data Trends: Self-Efficacy

As evident from Table 7, the participants discussed an array of topics pertaining to “self-efficacy.” There were three topics that were discussed by seven or more participants during the interviews (highlighted in Table 7). Trends and quotes regarding these topics are included in the following sections: a) “Two teachers in the room,” b) “time to implement practices,” and c) “ability to academically support ELs.”

Table 7 One-on-One Interview Frequency Table: Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Sub-Code</th>
<th>Total Instance Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructional Change</td>
<td>Trying New Strategies</td>
<td>35 5 3 8 7 1 0 0 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Co-Teaching</td>
<td>Two Teachers in the Room</td>
<td>30 1 5 0 7 5 2 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructional Change</td>
<td>Time to Implement Practices</td>
<td>24 0 3 4 6 1 2 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional Development</td>
<td>Impact of PD Participation</td>
<td>22 10 3 0 4 2 1 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supporting All Students</td>
<td>Confidence in Supporting Students</td>
<td>19 2 0 0 6 6 0 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supporting ELs</td>
<td>Ability to Academically Support ELs</td>
<td>16 0 1 3 1 2 1 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>15 1 3 1 0 8 0 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Co-Teaching</td>
<td>Collaboration with Teacher Candidate</td>
<td>13 1 1 0 2 2 2 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reflection</td>
<td>Impact of Reflection</td>
<td>12 0 0 1 2 2 2 5 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Supporting All Students</td>
<td>Perceived Impact of Supports</td>
<td>12 1 1 6 1 1 2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Supporting ELs</td>
<td>Early Career Struggles with EL Instruction</td>
<td>11 1 2 0 2 4 0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Professional Development</td>
<td>Time for Professional Development</td>
<td>9 0 0 8 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Reflection</td>
<td>Time for Reflection</td>
<td>8 0 0 2 0 0 3 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The AL Project</td>
<td>Working with Expert Consultant</td>
<td>8 0 2 0 1 3 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two teachers in the room. There were 30 instances in which the participants made statements pertaining to the positive impact of having two teachers in the room during instruction. Of the 30 instances, all 30 statements represented positive views toward having a second teacher in the room while teaching. There were three themes that stood out from the statements made by the participants: “Student-teacher ratio,” “new perspectives,” and “increased student support.”
**Student-teacher ratio.** Some of the participants discussed the positive impact that co-teaching has on the student-teacher ratio. Ms. Douglas explained that co-teaching creates the opportunity for more people to help with the students. For example, she said that she and her teacher candidate often “break down the classroom into smaller groups” when co-teaching. She explains that the students “get more response, more feedback when there’s two people [teaching].” Mr. Lorenzo conveyed similar feelings toward the increased student-teacher ratio when co-teaching. He says that co-teaching “doubled my contacts with kids, and that’s enormous.” He elaborated by saying that he and his co-teacher get “to double up on kids these days, and I think that’s always helpful.”

**New perspectives.** Many of the participants discussed ways in which having another teacher in the classroom gave them an opportunity to view teaching through a new perspective. For example, Ms. Tuscano discussed a time when she was able to view student work through the perspective of her partner. She explained that she and her co-teaching partner were grading the writing of a particular student. She and her partner read the same writing but had differing opinions toward the assessment of the writing. They decided to give the paper back to the student and asked him to “add more detail.” The student later resubmitted the paper and after reading the assignment Ms. Tuscano told her partner, “Oh, this is much better.”

Ms. Portillo explained that she experienced professional growth from having a second person in the room. She elaborated by saying, “Having her in the classroom has helped me to grow as a professional because now I’m able to see sometimes things that I [overlook] because you have been [teaching] for so long in the classroom.” Mr. Lorenzo
expressed similar feelings, saying that when teaching with another person in the room “you’re almost forced to be reflective.” He continued by saying that the opportunities to be reflective “leads to reflective dialogue and then to co-planning.” Ms. Margaret discussed that she gains new perspectives from her teacher candidate. She said that teachers tend to develop “a little bit of blinder” when it comes to their instruction, and can benefit by mentoring “someone who comes with fresh eyes.” Ms. Barbera conveyed similar ideas regarding new perspectives from co-teaching. She says that while co-teaching, her teacher candidate “would see something that I wouldn’t see or vice versa.”

**Increased student support.** Many of the participant statements regarding “two teachers in the room” centered on the ability to provide increased levels of support for all students. For instance, Ms. Douglas stated that when co-teaching, there are “more people to help the kids.” Ms. Tuscano indicated similar feelings, saying, “Less students fall through the cracks” with “the second set of eyes.” Ms. Tuscano also explained that having an extra teacher in the room helps with discipline issues. She elaborated with a story about a recent student discipline problem that occurred in her classroom during instruction. She explained that she “was able to pull the student aside and then she [teacher candidate] was able to teach.”

Mr. Lorenzo discussed ways in which two teachers in the room increases the overall level of student support, as well as his own learning. These ideas are conveyed in the following statement:

I think recognizing that there are two of us in the room, and how to maximize the impact of two of us in the room, leads to, again intentionality. Being thoughtful about how do I, how do we use each other to best reach kids and that plays out, in designing instruction, in you
bringing different things to the table. I’m learning new technology and I’m learning all kinds of things, and yeah, I mean we benefit from, we mutually benefit from that relationship and as a result kids do as well.

Ms. Margaret discussed the increased levels of student support with a second teacher. She says, “There’s an extra set of eyes, an extra set of people to ask.” Ms. Barnes expressed similar thoughts by saying that supporting students during instruction is “a lot easier when there are two of you in the room. You can always be targeting certain students when there are two of you as opposed to one.” Finally, Ms. Barbera echoed many of these ideas regarding student support by saying, “Two teachers in the room is most effective.” She elaborated by saying that one of the ways in which co-teaching allows for increased student support is “having that ability to talk to somebody [student] in the moment.”

**Summary.** The participants who spoke about having two teachers in the room did so with a great deal of positivity. The ideas were expressed through the various utterances about the positive impact of a reduced student-teacher ratio, the positive professional growth that occurs from learning new perspectives from their co-teacher, and the increased levels of student support as a result of a second teacher in the room. Having a second teacher in the room seemed to create an environment in which the mentor was able to focus on the implementation of new practices. It was not clear whether or not the mentors experienced a long-term transformation to their practices, or if they simply explored new practices as a result of having an additional classroom resource in their co-teacher. The data expressed in this section reaffirms the 100% agreement in survey Item
44, which states, “Engaging in co-teaching with a teacher candidate has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.”

**Time to implement practices.** There were 24 instances in which the participants made statements regarding the impact that time has in implementing student support practices. Participant statements varied in the degree of positivity, depending on the context in which they were speaking. These participants spoke about time to implement practices in three ways: a) “Teaching alone,” b) “co-teaching,” and c) “time for professional growth.”

**Teaching alone.** A few of the participants discussed difficulties they experience with implementing new instructional practices while teaching alone. Ms. Johnson explained her frustrations with not being able to make lesson changes during a typical class day. She says, “So there are a lot of very obnoxious limitations to my ability to stop and fix, what needs fixing.” She also explained her frustrations with not being able to engage in cycles of inquiry toward student success when working alone, which seems to suggest that the activities within The AL Project created a space for the research participants’ transformation. She says, “I really like, the idea of inquiry cycle, although I have to admit that I end up focusing more on the cycle for the student teacher and not doing it myself and I’m thinking maybe I should be doing it myself. But you know, time. Having the time.”

Ms. Margaret discussed ways in which she struggles with implementing student supports, such as student check-ins, when teaching alone. She says, “I just don’t have… the individual time.” Ms. Barnes echoed similar frustrations in regard to teaching alone.
She says, “You don’t have the time, you don’t have the head space to do the things that you can do.” Ms. Barnes also discussed other job-related obligations as a reason for time constraints. She says, “I have three AP classes and I’m department chair and I have an AVID class...I have no head space.” Ms. Tuscano also discussed similar concerns due to the high numbers of students in her science classes. She says, “When you have 170 students, you have 36 kids in everyone of your lab classes. It’s really hard to give them individualized feedback and immediate feedback.” She also conveyed feelings toward having the time to implement practices, such as “exit tickets,” that she knows are important for student learning. She says that the process is “very time consuming.” She continued by speaking to the importance of using exit tickets saying, “You really get to know what they’re [students] knowing when you see it on paper.”

**Co-teaching.** Most of the participants discussed having less time restraints as a result of co-teaching. Ms. Tuscano explained that she created new types of lessons while co-teaching, saying, “I have someone helping me develop [lessons] and taking the time to do it.” Mr. Lorenzo conveyed feelings of having increased time with co-teaching. He partly credits the scheduling for the increased time by saying, “Our schedules afford us time to talk before and after class every day and just sort of plan.” He elaborated by saying co-teaching is “an optimal situation for someone to learn to teach.”

Ms. Barnes discussed a reduction in time constraints as a result of the co-teaching process. She explained that the reduction in time constraints has helped her to teach better. She elaborated on this with the following statement:

I don’t have to grade all of their papers. I don’t have to create all of their lessons. I’ve got someone else to split the thinking. It makes it easier to
just even have the headspace to talk about it [supporting students]. And also, I have someone to [say], “Hey, I saw this in class, did you see this? What do you think?”

Ms. Barnes concluded her discussion on some of the benefits of co-teaching by saying that co-teaching “alleviates some of the burden of the day-to-day tasks, so you have the mental space.”

**Time for professional growth.** Some of the time constraints that the participants discussed were in relation to professional growth. The participants who spoke to this topic mainly focused on collaboration and professional development (PD) at their school sites. For example, Ms. Douglas expressed her frustrations in regard to collaboration with her colleagues at her school site. She says that her school “has collaboration time scheduled at school where once a week…we get together with other course alike teachers, and we spend an hour planning, but there’s not that time to just reflect about it.”

Ms. Barbera discussed frustrations regarding time constraints with the PD at her school site. She conveyed positive feelings toward the information presented at a PD earlier in the year, but expressed feelings of frustration, saying, “I just didn’t have enough time to look at something in depth because all of this information was thrown at me, [PD presenter said] ‘You can do this, this, this’ and I’m like, ‘Wait, step back.’” She explained that she wanted more time to look at the resources, but was given “like five minutes” to look at it all.

In contrast, Ms. Johnson expressed positive feelings toward having time for professional growth as a result of working with The AL Project. When asked what was
the most impactful element of The AL Project toward improving her work with ELs, Ms. Johnson said, “collaboration time.”

**Summary.** Many of the participants expressed similar views in regard to time when teaching alone. Large class sizes and multiple course preparation periods were some of the reasons that created strain on the participants’ time. Most of the participants discussed decreased time constraints as a result of co-teaching. Assistance with lesson planning, and student feedback, were some of the ways that co-teaching seems to help save time for teachers looking to implement new practices. Finally, some of the participants discussed the desire to engage in professional growth, but have found school site collaboration and PD to increase time constraints. Having increased time for inquiry practices, such as a reflection, creates a learning environment in which participant transformation can take place. The reflection allowed for the development of a new frame of reference for approaching EL instruction, and the opportunity to try new practices helps in the creation of new habits of mind, such as engaging with cycles of inquiry. For example, collaboration through participation with The AL Project was cited as a way to provide professional growth without adding to the time constraints of day-to-day teaching.

**Ability to academically support ELs.** There were 16 instances in which the participants made statements regarding their abilities to academically support ELs. Their statements contained a variety of opinions and levels of self-efficacy. Three themes emerged among the statements: “External challenges,” “self-efficacy in teaching ELs,” and “ongoing struggles.”
**External challenges.** A few of the participants made statements in regard to various external challenges that have inhibited their levels of self-efficacy toward ELs. For example, Ms. Douglas discussed the issue of poverty as a reason some ELs continue to struggle at school. She says, “I feel like we have an intersection of EL and class and poverty that becomes a real challenge.” Mr. Lorenzo discussed the challenge of serving students with different EL proficiency levels as a barrier to his abilities in serving ELs. He elaborated by saying students of different EL levels have “different needs, completely different needs. And so that’s the challenge.” Ms. Johnson expressed similar views as Mr. Lorenzo by conveying her own struggles with teaching students of different EL levels. She expanded her thoughts by explaining that she struggles with how to balance the needs of students “who are not ready for the language I’m using,” and the students who “need to continue to build that language.” She also stated that she is serving ELs “poorly” and partly contributes this to low levels of school supports offered for ELs.

**Self-efficacy in teaching ELs.** There was a group of participants who expressed feelings of self-efficacy in teaching ELs. These statements fell into two themes: “Self-efficacy from past experiences” and “self-efficacy from The AL Project.”

Ms. Margaret expressed feelings of high self-efficacy toward teaching ELs, but attributed her self-efficacy to her past teaching experiences. For example, she expressed that she uses EL strategies when teaching all students. She elaborated by describing a time that her classroom was observed. According to Ms. Margaret, the observer said, “Wow, you really do this naturally.” Ms. Margaret says that she then replied, “It’s the only way I know how to teach.” She continued expressing her feelings of self-efficacy
by saying that many of the ELs at her school “typically get put in my classes, simply because they can understand a little bit more.”

Other participants who discussed high levels of self-efficacy gave credit to their participation in The AL Project as a large reason for the self-efficacy increase. Ms. Tuscano explained that The AL Project gave her “access to what is working [in terms of EL instruction].” She continued by saying that having access to new instruction ideas “really helps.” Ms. Barnes, who is the English department chair at her school, admits that she only recently came in contact with EL instruction “in the last four years.” She explained that being in a position of curriculum leadership as department chair and not having a background in EL instructional strategies made her feel “panicked.” She elaborated by saying she “needed to know about it.” She expressed similar feelings as Ms. Tuscano in regard to her participation in The AL Project. She expressed an increase in self-efficacy toward teaching ELs by saying that participating in The AL Project is “training me on what it means to work with English learners.” She concluded by saying, “Anything I can learn [about EL instruction] is important.”

Ongoing struggles. A few of the participants discussed some of their ongoing struggles with teaching ELs. Ms. Douglas described ways in which changes in the math curriculum have created the need for ELs to have additional language support in their math classes compared to previous curriculum. She elaborated by saying, “I think one of the changes is that our math is so much more language based now.” Ms. Barnes expressed that she is aware of her weaknesses with EL instruction and explained that she
continues to struggle with “not knowing, again, what the appropriate level [of instructional support] is.”

**Summary.** The views expressed by the participants show mixed indications of self-efficacy toward academically supporting ELs. Some of the participants cite external factors, such as poverty, as a reason for low EL academic performance. Other participants expressed positive levels of self-efficacy, with some of the credit given to their participation with The AL Project, and other credit given to past experiences. There appears to be ongoing struggles with EL instruction that were not addressed through the participation as a mentor in The AL Project. There also appears to be a desire from the participants to continue to grow in their perceived areas of instructional weakness.

**Collective One-on-One Interview Data Summary: Self-Efficacy**

The themes presented in the interview data on “self-efficacy” partly align with the positive “self-efficacy” trends found within the survey data. The participants conveyed various ideas that reaffirmed the mixed feelings of self-efficacy toward teaching ELs that were indicated on survey Item 21, which discussed the participants’ abilities to address “the learning needs of ELs in my class with the current amount of resources.” Many of the participants indicated increased self-efficacy as a result of their participation with The AL Project. These trends are further explored in the analysis of the individual participants.

**Individual Trends: One-on-One Interviews**

**Mezirow’s theory of transformative learning.** Mezirow (1997) discusses that his Theory of Transformative Learning originates from the assertion that over time, all adults
have developed various “frames of reference” throughout their life experiences. These frames of reference are sets of assumptions that impact one’s beliefs and serve to influence their daily decisions (Mezirow, 1997). Additionally, frames of reference often originate through various degrees of cultural assimilation over a person’s lifetime, and depending on the person, making changes to one’s own frame of reference could be particularly challenging.

In the scope of this research, the transformative learning construct relates to teachers in their work with ELs by shaping their beliefs of the academic capabilities of ELs. These beliefs influence the types of instructional practices that teachers use in the classroom. In applying Mezirow’s theory to a teacher’s instructional practice, there is a cause-and-effect relationship of a teacher’s classroom instruction toward student achievement. If a teacher is not seeing positive levels of student achievement from his or her instruction, then he or she runs the risk of reaffirming low beliefs toward the academic capabilities of ELs. This process can influence a teacher’s overall feelings of self-efficacy toward working with ELs.

Mezirow’s theory asserts that a transformative learning process is essentially a change in a person’s frame of reference, and occurs through a variety of learning activities. According to Mezirow (1997), one of these learning activities has shown to be “critical reflection.” This process can occur through various degrees of discourse with persons who share a similar frame of reference. Additionally, transformative learning is likely to occur when the learner becomes aware and critical of his or her own
assumptions. This process is made easier when educators create an environment in which similar-minded people can learn from each other.

The conditions of The AL Project match those that Mezirow has shown to be necessary for adults to engage in transformative learning. The nature of transformative learning is cyclical, and it requires one to continuously revisit his or her assumptions while engaging with ongoing reflective discourse. The data collected within the scope of this research reflect the assertion that the participants in this study are in various stages of the transformative learning process. These stages, which are named and described in the sections that follow, have been developed to fit with the nature of the participants’ experiences as they pertain to their work with ELs through the scope of The AL Project.

Learning Categories

Overview. There were three learning categories that emerged after an analysis of all participant data sets. The first category is “entering transformation,” or people who indicated evidence of transformation from the mentoring experience. The second category is “refining transformation,” or people who were previously transformed by the mentoring experience but were still experiencing professional growth from continuous service as a mentor. The final category is “transformed,” or people who have previously been transformed in the way they academically support their EL students. These individuals indicated high levels of self-efficacy toward ELs and gave a series of responses that indicate a plateau in professional growth, and in academically supporting ELs. The following sections describe the method in which data was used to categorize participants, and describe each of the participant categories.
**Categorizing the participants.** In categorizing the participants, the researcher looked for evidence of participant change in the areas of “beliefs,” “practices,” and/or “self-efficacy” during the data analysis process in order to make the determination as to which category each participant would be assigned to. To help with this task, the researcher created profile sheets for each participant, found in Appendix F. The individual profile sheets contain individual survey trends, data trends from the one-on-one interviews, and various participant quotes from the focus group interview. The researcher included participant data from sub-codes discussed three or more times during the participants’ one-on-one interview.

Each profile sheet includes the number of total utterances for each binned item (“beliefs,” “practices,” and “self-efficacy”). These data were included as a way to get an initial sense as to how each participant framed his or her interview responses. For example, one participant may have framed most of his or her responses in his or her beliefs, while another participant may have framed most of his or her responses based on his or her feelings of self-efficacy. Each included utterance was categorized as “positive,” “negative,” or “neutral” to get a sense of the participants’ feelings toward a particular topic. Additionally, focus group statements were included in each profile sheet as a way to capture additional data trends. The profile sheets were used to analyze response patterns between the data sets, and to understand which topics the participants chose to elaborate on or revisit throughout their interviews. Also, the profile sheets were used to gauge the level of positivity in which each participant spoke about a particular topic. The participants were assigned to one of three different groups as a result of the
analysis of the data sets. These groups are “entering transformation,” “refining transformation,” and “transformed,” and are described in the following sections.

**Entering transformation.** Participants who were categorized as “entering transformation” provided evidence toward their own changes in their beliefs, practices, and/or self-efficacy as a direct result of the mentoring and/or co-teaching process. These participants indicated feelings of change, which included the desire to change and/or the beginning of a change process in one of the three research areas. The participants who were categorized as “entering transformation” are Ms. Barbera, Ms. Barnes, and Ms. Portillo. Additionally, all participants from this category were first-time mentors with The AL Project.

**Refining transformation.** Participants who were categorized as “refining transformation” provided evidence toward their desire to use the mentoring, co-teaching, and/or other elements of the PD experience as a vehicle to improve their instructional practices, to match their existing beliefs toward ELs and/or increase their general feelings of self-efficacy toward teaching ELs. These participants have had experience in changing their curriculum to academically support ELs, but made statements that suggested they are still searching for more ways to improve their practice. The participants categorized as “refining transformation” are Ms. Douglas, Ms. Johnson, and Ms. Tuscano. Additionally, all participants in this category were multi-year mentors with The AL Project.

**Transformed.** Participants who were categorized as “transformed” provided evidence that suggested strong positive beliefs toward ELs, a wide array of instructional
practices toward ELs, and strong feelings of self-efficacy toward working with ELs. These participants indicated the use of mentoring and co-teaching as ways to provide additional support for their students, including ELs. These participants provided evidence suggesting that they have refined their instructional support strategies for their EL students during prior years, but chose to serve as a mentor for a variety of other reasons. These reasons include using a teacher candidate to provide additional academic support for their current students, using the teacher candidate as a resource for their own learning, giving back learned knowledge to younger teachers, and/or an exercise in educational leadership. The participants categorized as “transformed” are Mr. Lorenzo and Ms. Margaret. Mr. Lorenzo was a multi-year mentor with The AL Project, and Ms. Margaret was a first-year mentor with The AL Project. Additionally, Ms. Margaret has spent multiple years teaching EL support strategies to teachers at the college level.

**Group One: Entering Transformation**

**Ms. Barbera.** During her survey, Ms. Barbera indicated positive beliefs toward the academic abilities of ELs, as well as positive feelings toward all of the elements of The AL Project. These elements include being a mentor, engaging in co-teaching, working with a consultant, and the ongoing participation in a professional learning community. Additionally, she conveyed positive feelings toward her self-efficacy in teaching ELs. The one-on-one interviews allowed for a closer analysis into these topics, as well as the relationship between her participation in The AL Project and her beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy.
During her interview, Ms. Barbera discussed some of her previous experiences with PD, and ways that those experiences impacted her motivation for participating as a mentor in The AL Project. She expressed general frustrations with past staff developments that she had participated with at her school site. Some of these frustrations include a feeling of being rushed through the staff development, and having to attend staff development meetings after a full day of teaching. She elaborated on these frustrations during the interview when she stated, “I can’t do staff development when I’m doing so many other things during my day. I’m drained.” She also expressed feelings of inauthenticity during the staff development meetings. For example, she stated, “Everything is rushed. I feel like sometimes it’s just a check mark.” She explained that she experienced a difference through her participation within The AL Project. She elaborated on this thought with the following statement:

I really like being a part of [The AL Project]. I like knowing that I’m going to be at the university a couple of times through the year. I leave the work behind, I get to focus, and I get to plan. We get to focus versus, “Okay, so I’ve had my work day, I’ve had to get grades in, now you want me over there doing two hours or two and a half hours of staff development?”

Ms. Barbera expressed that having the time to focus on PD was something that she valued throughout her time with The AL Project. During the focus group, she revisited these thoughts by saying, “It’s nice having support outside your school district by working with smart, intelligent, like-minded people.”

Ms. Barbera indicated positive feelings toward her experiences with co-teaching. In doing so, she made a variety of positive statements toward co-teaching with her teacher candidate, and she viewed her candidate as a resource for both increased student learning
and her own learning. For example, she stated, “It’s cool to know about current practices, what’s happening now in 2016.” She stressed the impact that the extra teacher has on student performance by stating, “The only way to teach English is with another English teacher in the classroom.” Ms. Barbera added context to this statement by claiming increased teacher access for students during instruction. She stated, “Having that ability [for students] to just sit and talk to the teacher fosters communication. You have help when you need it.”

During the focus group, Ms. Barbera conveyed additional thoughts about having a second person in the room with the following statement:

There’s this different source of comfort in the room knowing the students can come to one of two teachers. Just having another set of eyes in the room to zone in and if there’s a student of concern, you can deal with it right away.

These statements express Ms. Barbera’s views toward seeing her teacher candidate as a resource that she was able to learn from. This is a contrast from a viewpoint that the mentor teacher is the master teacher with nothing to learn from the mentee.

During the interview, Ms. Barbera discussed some of the practices from the mentoring experience that she found to be the most helpful. She conveyed that the mentoring experience afforded her the increased opportunities to reflect about specific students. She conveyed that ongoing reflective dialogue with her partner created professional growth opportunities by allowing her to increase her level of self-reflection. She added that the process of reflection is ongoing, and suggested that an extra teacher in the room afford her the extra time to reflect. Additionally, she expressed professional
growth from co-planning with her teacher candidate, and said that her co-teaching partner gave her lesson ideas that she never had thought about.

Ms. Barbera began this experience with positive feelings toward the academic abilities of ELs, and she was open to collaborating with her teacher candidate in order to implement new instructional strategies aimed at increased academic support for her EL students. Ms. Barbera indicated increased confidence with implementing academic support strategies and also expressed increased self-efficacy toward academically supporting ELs by saying, “I am confident that I can serve all of my ELs.”

Ms. Barnes. During her survey, Ms. Barnes indicated positive beliefs toward the academic abilities of ELs, positive feelings toward the practices within The AL Project, including being a mentor, and engaging in the cycles of inquiry. She also conveyed positive feelings toward her self-efficacy in teaching ELs. The one-on-one interview allowed for a closer examination into these claims, and also into the ways in which these three categories have evolved as a result of her participation in The AL Project.

During her one-on-one interview, Ms. Barnes explained that she has worked at Haylee High School for most of her career and has found herself in a position of leadership as the English department chair. Ms. Barnes admitted to not having experience in teaching ELs, even though she has been teaching for many years. She indicated increased determination in recent years to improve her EL instruction. She expanded on this idea with the following statement:

For me, it’s been a focus because I feel like it’s an area of weakness. I feel like, as a teacher in California, it’s bizarre that I haven’t had that experience, and I realize that. I feel like it’s my responsibility to get up to speed.
Ms. Barnes discussed efforts toward her own improvements with EL instruction, as well as ways that she wished to support ELs from a leadership perspective. For example, she says, “I wanted to know, as English department chair, ‘were all our students appropriately placed?’ So, I had all our teachers in English go through their rosters and identify who their EL students were.”

Ms. Barnes conveyed a positive relationship between her work as a mentor and her work with ELs. She discussed the co-teaching experience by first describing the ways she believed her teacher candidate was a resource. She says that her teacher candidate “has more access to updated techniques and data. It allows me to kind of learn from him.” She continued by saying, “It’s been a while since I’ve been in credential school or been in an education class, so he’s got access to newer pedagogy than I probably do.” Additionally, she discussed ways in which her teacher candidate has helped her to change her instructional practices, by stating, “I’ve stolen stuff that he’s done and I’ve adapted it for AP.”

These statements convey Ms. Barnes’ overall approach to the co-teaching experience, particularly in viewing her co-teaching partner as a resource that she could learn from. This idea frames Ms. Barnes’ day-to-day co-teaching experiences as a collaborative mentor.

Ms. Barnes discussed the positive ways in which she and her co-teacher collaborated and engaged in new practices toward supporting all students, and ELs in particular. She stated that she engaged in co-planning and reflective dialogue daily with her co-teacher. She even recalled instances in which they co-planned some of their lessons the night
before the instruction. Ms. Barnes described the importance of co-planning with the following statement:

Co-planning helps a great deal. It’s so much easier when you have someone to bounce ideas off of and it’s somebody else’s brain and not just yours. I mean, we all have blind spots instructionally or pedagogically, and we have strengths and weaknesses.

These statements demonstrate a close and collegial working relationship between the two co-teachers throughout the semester. Additionally, they took opportunities during instruction to discuss student progress and to make adjustments in their lessons during instruction. Ms. Barnes discussed a change in her practices as a result of working with her teacher candidate. When asked what changes she made in regard to EL strategies, she said, “I have changed and adapted all of them [EL support strategies] because I had none.”

Ms. Barnes appeared to have used the mentoring experience within The AL Project as a way to improve her work with her EL students in a variety of capacities. In terms of her beliefs, Ms. Barnes says, “A lot of times teachers assume students can’t do things, and so they don’t ask them to. They don’t give them the opportunity to.” She discussed that new instructional practices, initiated through co-teaching, helped her to see the capabilities of her EL students. This is evident in the following statement:

We’ve actually been surprised that the things that we do have not been crashing and burning and that the kids pretty much are able to step up and do it. Maybe we have been underestimating for a long time what it is they can do. And that’s true of all kids, but especially of English learners.
Ms. Barnes continued to discuss her positive beliefs toward ELs during the focus group interview. In the following statement, Ms. Barnes described ways in which she plans on maintaining her positive beliefs even when colleagues talk negatively of ELs:

There’s always those people on campus who are negative and undercut these things (EL strategies) and they don’t believe they’re going to work and then you go, “Oh, but let me show you.” So, you can tune out those negative voices because you’ve got some actual proof and some data that this stuff actually works. That felt satisfying, empowering.

Seeing her ELs academically succeed with the new instructional practices appears to have helped Ms. Barnes to approach instruction differently for all students. For example, Ms. Barnes stated, “I just think that the strategies that work with EL’s are just good strategies. They’re just good strategies. It’s the idea that you scaffold things appropriately.” She later revisited this topic in her interview by saying, “I’ve used it (EL strategies) with my AP kids, but it works with EL’s.”

Ms. Barnes discussed increased feelings of self-efficacy as a result of trying out EL support strategies with her AP English classes. She said the following:

I figured that out when I tried it (EL support strategies) in AP, I realized it was the best response I’d ever had with that particular poem, which is a challenging poem. They had the best understanding of the poem that I’d ever had with them. So that was the moment it went, “Click.”

She continued by saying that witnessing student success “reinforces that idea to not be afraid [to try a new strategy].” She elaborated by saying, “Why are you afraid that it won’t work? Okay, so it didn’t. Who cares? Then do something else. What’s the big deal?”

Ms. Barnes made a variety of statements regarding the benefits of having a second teacher in the room. First, it afforded her the time to professionally grow, because co-
teaching gave her increased “headspace” to talk about supporting ELs. Second, it allowed her the opportunity to learn from others’ teaching “strengths” in order to improve her own teaching “weaknesses.” Finally, during the focus group she said that having a second teacher in the room has been, “really great for the students because it’s allowed us to give that extra attention and really focus on it [supporting ELs].”

Ms. Barnes indicated feelings of long-term benefits from the PD experience. During the focus group interview, she said the following:

I think it’s made me hyper-vigilant and hyper-aware of the EL’s in my classroom and thinking about them more consciously, which is nothing but a benefit to them, and to me. It’s made me more aware going forward, I think, in my practice with other EL’s that I’ll have in the future.

In the focus group interview, she continued by saying, “Seeing kids get excited and that they have growth, gives you the confidence to continue doing what you’re doing and to continue implementing those strategies.” These statements help demonstrate ways in which Ms. Barnes experienced professional growth toward teaching ELs during the PD experience.

These data suggest that Ms. Barnes solidified her positive beliefs toward her academic abilities as a result of her PD experience. The PD experience appeared to also improve Ms. Barnes’ teaching practices toward addressing the needs of ELs through the implementation of new instructional practices. Using the new practices appeared to lead to increased student success, which helped to increase Ms. Barnes’ feelings of self-efficacy toward teaching ELs. Additionally, she indicated a sense of empowerment toward leading other teachers in this work. She says that teachers “need to be part of the solution going forward.”
**Ms. Portillo.** During her survey, Ms. Portillo indicated positive beliefs toward adapting instruction for ELs, and for making positive personal connections with her students. She also indicated positive feelings toward all PD activities within The AL Project. These activities include mentoring, co-teaching, working with a consultant, participating as part of an ongoing PLC, and engaging in the cycles of inquiry with her teacher candidate. She conveyed positive feelings toward her general feelings of self-efficacy in teaching ELs, and she expressed positive feelings of self-efficacy in creating a collaborative classroom environment for all students. These trends were further explored in an analysis of her one-on-one interview and focus group comments.

During the one-on-one interview, Ms. Portillo made a variety of statements that implied a transformative experience in her practices and self-efficacy toward ELs as a result of her participation in the PD experience. There did not appear to be any changes in the area of “beliefs,” as she maintained strong beliefs toward the capabilities of ELs throughout all data sets. For example, during the interview she said, “All the students are capable to learn, but not all of them in the same way and at the same time.”

During her one-on-one interview, Ms. Portillo expressed a variety of positive statements in her beliefs toward mentoring. For instance, Ms. Portillo stated that mentoring has been “the best professional development I have ever had.” She added that mentoring made her aware of her personal needs in PD. During the focus group, she explained in the following statement the positive role that mentoring played in her PD experience:

> We have someone that is watching us, constantly watching us, and we have to be true role models for those student teachers because we want to
bring someone into the profession that is in love with the profession, not afraid of the profession. I feel like, we’ve given ourselves the opportunity to be role models for those new teachers, it’s like we are leaving something for someone else.

Ms. Portillo expressed a positive relationship between working with her teacher candidate and her own learning. Evidence of this can be found in all data sets. For example, during the one-on-one interview, Ms. Portillo stated that her teacher candidate arrived to her class with “fresh ideas” and adds, “having a teacher that is supporting me in the classroom, makes me aware of what is new besides me having to go to professional development.” During the focus group interview, Ms. Portillo reaffirmed these opinions, saying, “The collaboration with the co-teaching has provided me with new ideas and has supported me in developing new materials that I can use to support my students.”

Ms. Portillo expanded on these feelings during the focus group interview by discussing ways in which co-teaching changed many of her own instructional practices that she had come to realize were routine. For example, she stated, “It was at some point, it [instructional practices] was too routine, always constantly the same thing. Now that she is with me, she asks me things and I need to justify why I’m doing certain things.” She later expressed that she experienced growth through the co-teaching and co-planning process because of her partner’s new ideas. Ms. Portillo concluded her discussion of these new practices by expressing feelings of excitement toward her newfound ways to support students.

Ms. Portillo conveyed a general feeling of being able to adapt lessons to include support for ELs. For example, during the interview she stated, “I can develop the things that were given to me and make it more understandable for my English learners.”
the focus group, she conveyed in the following statement increased self-efficacy as a result of serving as a mentor:

To see how much you can grow by having this experience, you have to be there. You have to take the opportunity [to mentor]. Because actually, it’s not an increase in work, it’s not. It actually impacts the way we teach.

The collective data from Ms. Portillo indicates that she used the mentoring experience as a vehicle for her own transformation with her instructional practices toward all students, and ELs in particular. She reported an increased use in graphic organizers and vocabulary supports for her students. These data suggest a transformation in both practices and self-efficacy toward her work with ELs. This assertion can be made due to the credit that Ms. Portillo afforded to the collaborative experiences that she had as a mentor within the PD process.

Group Two: Refining Transformation

Ms. Douglas. Ms. Douglas’ survey data indicated positive beliefs toward teachers’ capabilities in supporting ELs. These capabilities include facilitating collaborative mainstream classrooms, containing ELs and English-only students (EOs), positive teacher/EL connections, and the use of EL students’ prior knowledge to increase student learning. She expressed disagreement toward simplifying coursework for ELs as a form of academic support, and conveyed the belief that all teachers have the time to academically support their EL students. She indicated positive opinions toward the PD activities of The AL Project, and indicated strong positive feelings toward participating in the program’s ongoing PLC. She expressed disagreement with the idea that The AL Project changed her beliefs toward the academic capabilities of ELs, and wrote that she
“already had the belief.” Finally, Ms. Douglas disclosed positive levels of self-efficacy toward her work with ELs. She conveyed the feeling that participation with The AL Project improved her confidence in teaching her EL students.

During the one-on-one interview, Ms. Douglas discussed ways in which she was benefitting from her participation as a mentor within The AL Project. She expressed the opinions that teachers are limited with instructional resources for supporting all students, and that using EL support strategies for all students lead to increased student learning for all. She discussed her recent struggles in adopting the Common Core State Standards within her math curriculum by explaining that the increased language demands from the new standards have been a source of struggle for her. She elaborated on this idea with the following statement:

So that’s really hard for kids who have language issues. I definitely think that’s [Common Core] been a big change over time. It used to be that everybody could do math, because there’s no words in it. Now there are more words than anything else.

Her recent struggles with these changes created the desire for Ms. Douglas to increase her own abilities in teaching math to her EL students. She expressed a positive relationship between the time she spent collaborating within the program’s PLCs, and her professional growth. She elaborated during her one-on-one interview by saying that participating within the PLC was “an opportunity, at a professional level, to talk to other people who are in the same place. It’s priceless.”

Ms. Douglas conveyed professional growth from co-planning, engaging in cycles of inquiry, and ongoing reflection with her teacher candidate. First, during her one-on-one interview, she stated that co-planning with her teacher candidate allowed for more
awareness of her students’ needs and brought her teaching to “a higher level.” Second, she stated that engaging in the cycles of inquiry was “really useful in giving us that opportunity to try something, test it and reflect on it.” She then added that the cycle of inquiry process “just doesn’t happen in daily teaching.” Finally, Ms. Douglas discussed that engaging with ongoing reflection played a positive role in her practices toward ELs. She elaborated by saying, “I think it makes it much more likely that I’m going to put my attention there and that I’m going to do a better job.” She continued by saying, “I think we have so little time to reflect and have conversations in education. I think anytime we have the opportunity to do that, it helps.”

During the focus group interview, Ms. Douglas discussed a general lack of professional growth opportunities for teachers, especially those who are not visibly struggling with their instructional practices. She expressed that experienced teachers rarely get coached, even though they can benefit from the coaching. She admitted that it’s easy for experienced teachers to get lazy and to “just phone it in,” but found that the mentoring process pushed her to focus on her teaching practices and to do better. Finally, Ms. Douglas shared the ways in which she believed that participating in the elements of The AL Project helps mentor teachers. She said that the mentoring process helps mentors to “achieve more” and “get to where we believed we could go.” She concluded her discussion on mentoring by saying, “We always knew we could get there, but weren’t sure how.”

These data suggest that Ms. Douglas had been experiencing a lack of professional growth opportunities, especially at a time when education standards have been changing.
She began the PD experience with positive beliefs toward the academic abilities of ELs, but she appears to have used the mentoring experience, and the other activities within The AL Project, as a way to improve her practices with her EL students.

**Ms. Johnson.** At the time of her survey, Ms. Johnson expressed positive beliefs toward teachers’ general capabilities to academically support ELs. She indicated strong positive beliefs that teachers should activate ELs’ prior knowledge during lessons, and create collaborative classroom environment for their ELs in mainstreamed classes. She expressed the belief that all teachers have the time to address the needs of ELs, and she disagreed with simplifying assignments as a way to academically support ELs. She expressed positive feelings toward the activities within The AL Project, including engaging in cycles of inquiry, serving as a mentor, and co-teaching. She conveyed positive levels of self-efficacy in addressing the academic needs of ELs, and indicated increased confidence in working with her EL students as a result of her participation with The AL Project.

During her one-on-one interview, Ms. Johnson discussed the problems that she had been experiencing with implementing challenging, yet supportive, instructional practices to match her existing positive beliefs toward the academic abilities of ELs. For example, Ms. Johnson expressed difficulty in maintaining high levels of classroom rigor while providing accommodations for her EL students. She elaborated on this idea by saying the following:

> I struggle very much with the accommodations. With how to establish a balance between the needs of the students who are not yet working at the level according to the standards, whichever standards you want to use, California State, Common Core, whatever. How do you accommodate
their needs and still maintain the rigor that, in my mind, needs to exist for a college prep class?

She continued to discuss these struggles by saying, “I don’t think that it does anybody any favors to make things so simple that there’s no growth, but I don’t know where the line is.” Ms. Johnson conveyed that co-teaching has helped her address some of these struggles, particularly during the observation process of her teacher candidate. During her one-on-one interview, she explained why the observation process has helped her own instruction by saying, “It gives me the opportunity to observe what I can’t observe when I’m the lead teacher.”

Also, during the one-on-one interview, Ms. Johnson discussed her current teaching practices, and her ideas on changing these practices. She admits to feeling uncomfortable changing her instructional practices, even if the changes are meant to increase her students’ academic success. She lightheartedly stated that instructional change is not her “happy place.” She elaborated on this idea with the following statement:

I don’t want to do something just because somebody else says it is a good idea. I need to understand why it’s a good idea. So if I don’t appreciate the value of it, I’m not doing it, unless you make me, but even if you make me, I might not do it.

Ms. Johnson conveyed the belief that trying new strategies means the elimination of some of her existing instructional strategies, and that she already views her current practices as “legitimate.” Despite these feelings toward instructional change, she admits that she is more likely to make instructional changes if she sees that a new practice is “a meaningful activity.” For example, she explained that the observation element of the co-teaching process was a way for her to get more comfortable with making instructional
changes in her own practice. She stated, “Observing someone take a different approach probably helps me either evaluate and reinforce my reasons for doing what I do, or evaluate and reconsider what I do.”

Ms. Johnson explained that making instructional changes in her own practice is easier through the process of self-reflection. She stated that the process of self-reflection was made easier through the process of co-teaching. She expanded on this idea by saying that even though she constantly reflects, “doing something about it is more likely to happen with a witness.”

During the focus group interview, Ms. Johnson explained the ways in which she felt The AL Project helped her with reflecting on her own instructional practices. She elaborated on this idea with the following statement:

I do think the program forces you to be more thoughtful about what you’re doing, more explicit about your rationale, and that can only lead to either clarity of purpose or the understanding that there are things that need to be revisited and revised.

The process of reflection seemed to be the most helpful activity of the PD experience for Ms. Johnson. She expressed the idea that mentoring and co-teaching helped her to make changes to her own instruction by considering “more broadly how I need to approach my EL students.”

These data suggest that even though Ms. Johnson held positive beliefs toward the academic abilities of her EL students, her participation within The AL Project helped her to refine the way in which she implements new instructional strategies to meet these positive beliefs, especially in her college preparatory courses. These data also suggest that Ms. Johnson made instructional improvements in these areas through the observation
process of her teacher candidate, which was afforded to her from the mentoring experience. These observations allowed for Ms. Johnson to engage in ongoing self-reflection, which is what she admits is a key process in changing her own instructional practices.

**Ms. Tuscano.** At the time of her survey, Ms. Tuscano expressed positive beliefs toward teachers’ capabilities to provide academic support to ELs in a variety of areas. She indicated that teachers could create a collaborative classroom environment when ELs are mainstreamed with EOs. She also indicated the belief that teachers could increase learning for ELs by accessing their prior knowledge within lessons. Even though Ms. Tuscano conveyed positive beliefs toward modifying assignments for ELs, she expressed her own struggles with modifying assignments to meet the needs of her EL students. She expanded on this idea by writing about her difficulties in modifying lessons for students with varying degrees of English fluency. She also expressed feelings that ELs with low English proficiency may not always find academic success in a mainstream classroom. Additionally, Ms. Tuscano indicated positive feelings of self-efficacy toward instructing her EL students, but she did not feel efficacious toward establishing personal connections with all of her EL students. Finally, in her survey, Ms. Tuscano expressed positive feelings toward the activities within The AL Project. These practices include mentoring, co-teaching, working with a university consultant, and participating in ongoing PLC meetings. The survey data suggests that at the time of the survey, participating in the activities of The AL Project helped Ms. Tuscano to increase her self-
efficacy toward ELs of all fluency levels. She expanded on these feelings during the one-on-one interview and the focus group interview.

During her one-on-one interview, Ms. Tuscano expressed increasing her utilization of school databases as a way to learn about the English proficiency levels of her EL students. She stated that working with a teacher candidate increased her use of school databases for discovering her students’ English proficiency levels. For example, Ms. Tuscano explained that she had recently begun asking her teacher candidate to look at the CELDT levels of their EL students, in order to “see if there are any red flags that we need to watch out for before meeting the students.”

Throughout the interview, Ms. Tuscano consistently referred to her teacher candidate as “a resource” for her own learning, and mentioned that her teacher candidate brought in new ideas, during the co-planning process, that she learned from her university classes. Ms. Tuscano also expressed that her own practices benefitted from learning the “new ideas and new methods that she learned in class.” Additionally, Ms. Tuscano discussed ways in which her teacher candidate’s high expectations for their EL students pushed her own “realistic” expectations. Furthermore, Ms. Tuscano expressed increased levels of positive beliefs toward her student expectations by stating, “All my students need a higher level rigor and even my English language learners can succeed with that.”

Working within The AL Project seemed to help Ms. Tuscano with the day-to-day implementation of student support strategies. During her one-on-one interview, she conveyed a positive relationship between working with a university consultant and her abilities to provide various levels of student support for all of her students. She expanded
on this idea by saying, “Working with the consultant helped a lot because it’s individualized coaching. I can bring her individual questions and get feedback that I can try with a student.” During the interview, she expressed similar feelings about working with a university consultant by saying that the experience was “enlightening.”

During the one-on-one interview, Ms. Tuscano expressed her general frustrations with implementing student support while working in isolation at her school site. She elaborated, discussing the difficulty teaching, “If you’re isolated,” and says, “It’s important to find other people.” In the following statement, she discusses the role that working within the PLC structure of the program played in her classroom practices:

I have people I can collaborate with and get ideas off of if I’m struggling. So I will probably seek them out more from this experience, because I see the benefit of not being by yourself and so isolated in planning.

These statements demonstrate some of Ms. Tuscano’s day-to-day struggles with implementing student academic support strategies, and they also demonstrate ways in which her participation within the activities of The AL Project has helped her to implement new student academic support strategies.

These data indicate the positive relationship between working as a mentor within The AL Project, and Ms. Tuscano’s beliefs, practices and self-efficacy toward ELs. First, she increased her use of data collection methods to learn more about the language needs of her ELs. Second, she used her teacher candidate as a resource for not only trying new practices, but to raise her own expectations toward the academic abilities of her EL students. Finally, Ms. Tuscano used her teacher candidate, the university consultant, and the PLC as resources for her own learning. These data trends help to show that Ms.
Tuscano’s participation as a mentor in The AL Project helped her to enhance her beliefs toward ELs, improve her instructional practices, and raise her level of self-efficacy toward working with ELs.

**Group Three: Transformed**

**Mr. Lorenzo.** At the time of his survey, Mr. Lorenzo expressed strong positive beliefs toward a variety of topics pertaining to ELs. These topics include teachers’ capabilities in creating academic success for all students, using students’ prior knowledge for better instruction, and increasing collaboration between ELs and EOs in mainstreamed classes. Mr. Lorenzo indicated strong positive feelings toward all elements of The AL Project, including his engagement with the cycles of inquiry, mentoring, and co-teaching. He expressed disagreement that participating in The AL Project played a role in his beliefs toward ELs and writes that the experience “has validated existing beliefs.” His survey responses also indicated strong existing feelings of self-efficacy toward academically supporting ELs, as well as the disagreement that participating in The AL Project played a role in his confidence with ELs.

During his one-on-one interview, Mr. Lorenzo expressed positive feelings toward both the mentoring and co-teaching processes. First, he stated, “Co-teaching is by far the most successful strategy that we implement to reach kids.” He expanded on this idea with the following statement:

> Co-teaching promotes self-reflection. I know that as a mentor, I always want to show everybody my best. It keeps me on my toes and it makes me accountable, formally or informally, to somebody else, to myself, to the kids, so I think that brings out the best in what we do.
Later, in his one-on-one interview, Mr. Lorenzo discussed ways in which he learns new practices from his teacher candidate. He said mentoring “has been an opportunity for me to learn and to teach. It’s invigorating to me as an adult to be able to work with somebody else.” He later added that co-teaching is “just a more effective way of teaching anybody.” He expanded his opinions by discussing some of the ways in which co-planning helps to effectively teach his students. He stated that he believes “scaffolds need to be built in at every point [of the lesson]” and that “we need to be able to differentiate [instruction].”

During his one-on-one interview, Mr. Lorenzo also discussed ways in which the co-teaching experience promotes collaborative practices, and getting more students to personally connect with at least one of the co-teachers. He specified by saying, “Too much of what we do, is in isolation as teachers. You know, the good and the bad. I don’t get to share what I’m super good at.” He elaborated on the benefits of co-planning by saying the process makes him “more intentional about planning instruction, assessment,” and that “it just forces me to be, both of us, to be sort of reflective and intentional in what we’re doing.” Mr. Lorenzo added a point about the cyclical nature of co-planning and reflection with his teacher candidate. He says that when there is another person in the room, “you’re almost forced to be reflective. At the end of the day, as you sort of debrief, what went wrong, what didn’t. It leads to reflective dialogue and then to co-planning. That’s always the next step.”

Mr. Lorenzo discussed ways in which the mentoring process helped him to increase his teaching efforts through the modeling of effective teaching toward his teacher.
candidate, and also the increased use of data pertaining to student language proficiency.

The following statement is an example of the way in which Mr. Lorenzo feels that mentoring increases his teaching efforts:

> I probably don’t put as much thought or I wouldn’t be putting as much thought into it if I didn’t have to articulate, why it is that we’re doing what we’re doing everyday. As a result, lessons get tweaked or changed and I think that’s good.

In addition to improved everyday teaching, Mr. Lorenzo admits to using more student data in his lesson planning. He conveyed this idea with the following statement:

> The [AL] Project has forced me into the standards, into the research, and into databases of what’s available in terms of data of my students. I probably wouldn’t be digging for all of that stuff if I didn’t have to.

These statements suggest that the mentoring and co-teaching pushes Mr. Lorenzo to reach his existing teaching potential. During the focus group interview, Mr. Lorenzo expressed the opinion that more teachers should participate in a mentoring process as a form of professional growth. He elaborated on these ideas in the following statement:

> I’m wondering if I’m sabotaging myself by saying this, but I should be spreading the word to my co-workers that this [mentoring] is an impactful thing and that maybe you should be taking a student teacher or become a mentor yourself. I appreciate the opportunity to do this over and over and over again, but more teachers should get the opportunity to do this as well, or take the opportunity to do this as well.

This statement expresses the idea that Mr. Lorenzo believes that mentoring can be used as a vehicle for professional transformation for all teachers, and that he has continued to benefit from his ongoing participation as a mentor within The AL Project. For example, during the focus group interview, Mr. Lorenzo conveyed positive feelings toward ongoing engagement as a mentor with the following statement:
The whole experience has necessitated that I be more thoughtful, intentional about what it is that I do and why I do it. In doing so, it leads to that dialogue with the other adult in the classroom.

Discussing ways in which the mentoring process helps him to improve his practices, he stated the following:

Any cycle of inquiry that we engage with is generally done inside our own heads. So, this has given me the opportunity or has challenged me to run through that cycle and now I’m getting new voices beyond just my own. So, some of my practices have changed drastically, for the better.

During the focus group interview, Mr. Lorenzo discussed a lack of continued growth in his self-efficacy toward teaching ELs by saying, “Maybe mine hasn’t changed that much because I’ve been doing this for a while.” Instead, he directed many of his focus group comments toward his desire for increased school leadership by wanting to help other teachers who are struggling with teaching ELs. He began this topic by saying, “So my other role on campus is the English department chair, and part of trying to affect school-wide change as department chair is trying to get veteran teachers to change their practices.” He concluded his focus group comments by discussing a positive relationship between his four years of mentoring with The AL Project and the way he works with his colleagues. He said participating as a mentor with The AL Project had “given me a new framework to think about the work that I do with other adults on campus.”

These data indicate the positive outcomes that participating as a mentor within The AL Project has had on Mr. Lorenzo. As evident from the data sources, he has strong positive beliefs toward the academic capabilities of ELs, and he also understands how to implement the instructional practices needed to academically support his EL students. As evident from his interview statements, he seems to have benefitted from the mentoring
process and the daily push to provide model teaching to his mentee. Based on the focus group data, Mr. Lorenzo appears to be transitioning into a larger leadership role on his campus, in order to help other teachers get to a place of self-efficacy in teaching ELs.

**Ms. Margaret.** At the time of her survey, Ms. Margaret expressed strong positive beliefs toward teachers’ capabilities in creating academic success for ELs. She expressed that this could be done when teachers use their EL students’ prior knowledge when designing lessons, and by making their EL students feel like important members of the class. She indicated positive beliefs toward teachers’ capabilities in creating academic success for ELs, even though she also indicated that teachers do not have enough time in the day to meet the academic needs of their EL students. She conveyed the belief that ELs increase teacher workload when mainstreamed into EO classrooms, and also expressed that a student’s CELDT level might impact his or her ability to learn in a mainstream class. Additionally, at the time of the interview, Ms. Margaret expressed positive feelings toward her participation in many of the PD activities of The AL Project, including engaging in the cycles of inquiry, mentoring, and co-teaching. She conveyed an overall sense that she was not learning anything new from her work within the PLC and expressed that working within the PLC did not change what she was already doing in the classroom.

Ms. Margaret expressed a lack of growth from working with the university consultant and wrote that it was “a duplication of current practices.” According to the survey data, Ms. Margaret began the mentoring experience with existing high levels of positive beliefs and self-efficacy toward working with ELs. She conveyed high self-efficacy in adapting
her instruction for ELs, using her EL students to create academic success, and addressing the academic needs of her EL students with the current levels of school resources. Finally, she expressed that working with The AL Project did not play a role in her confidence with ELs, because it was “already in place.”

During her one-on-one interview, Ms. Margaret made a variety of statements that conveyed positive beliefs about her experience as a mentor, as well as her abilities in academically supporting all students. First, she expressed the belief that her teacher candidate was a resource for her own learning. She said, “My student teacher will be better at some things than I am, and that’s awesome. I want to celebrate that, I’m going to learn the heck out of that, and take it with me.” Second, Ms. Margaret discussed her general approach in academically supporting her students. She said her students “need to be individualized and listened to. We need to figure out where each one of them needs a little bit of tweaking.” Finally, she discussed her positive beliefs toward the academic abilities of ELs. She highlighted these beliefs by referencing a time when one of her EL students expressed feelings of sadness over not being able to communicate using English with many of his teachers. Ms. Margaret explained that this particular situation is “a little bit of a heartbreak.” According to Ms. Margaret, she then told the student, “Let’s see if we can’t work something out so that you are valued for what you can do.” She concluded this anecdote by saying that ELs “are not stupid children because they don’t speak English, you just need a different avenue to get there.” She also expressed the opinion that teachers need to increase academic supports for ELs, but feels that teachers sometimes “over support” ELs.
During her one-on-one interview, Ms. Margaret discussed the range of her teaching abilities and past teaching experiences. She explained that she has taught at every level, from elementary to college, and has the ability to teach in both English and Spanish. She feels that teaching ELs comes down to “really good instruction” that benefits all students.

One of the themes that Ms. Margaret discussed in her one-on-one interview was the amount of growth that she experienced from working as a mentor. She admits that she “learns from every experience,” and having the opportunity to mentor afforded her increased learning opportunities. She stated that mentoring forces her to be transparent in her instruction, and she elaborated on this idea in the following statement:

When you’re mentoring, you have to be transparent about what you’re doing and in fact if you have a good student teacher they’re questioning, “Well why did you do that? What was that about?” It makes you much more reflective about your own practice.

Ms. Margaret elaborated on the process of reflection by expressing the belief that many PD programs are “forcing reflections,” but believes that the nature of mentoring promotes “a reflective process.”

During her one-on-one interview, Ms. Margaret shared her mixed feelings toward PD programs. Even through she said that she learns “from every experience,” she wished that she learned more from PD programs. She explained that many PD instructors are her colleagues, and says, “A lot of times when I go to PDs, the instructors are where I am.” She also explained that PD tends to “get really collegial.” She told a story about a recent PD experience in which she learned a lot from. She said the instructors “were light years above where I am, so I had something to look up at and across. They weren’t just colleagues. They really just became instructors.” She enjoyed the instructional ideas that
the instructors provided for the participants, and says that the experience allowed her to “pick the fruit from the tree.”

During both the one-on-one interview and focus group interview, Ms. Margaret conveyed a positive outlook over the process of mentoring and the belief that her years of teaching experiences have helped her to understand how to adapt lessons during instruction to meet the needs of her students. She stated that the reflection opportunities, afforded through mentoring, helped her to remember what she may have “forgotten” about her own practices, which she calls “almost innate at this point.” Ms. Margaret expressed positive feelings toward having a co-teacher who was available to talk through the steps of her own teaching.

During the focus group, Ms. Margaret discussed that her participation as a mentor in The AL Project did not play a role in her beliefs toward ELs. She elaborated on this idea with the following statement:

I think you’d be hard pressed to say that it changed my mind about how I thought about my students. This is decades of rodeos going on here in terms of my beliefs that they can do things. They constantly surprise you.

The collective data from Ms. Margaret’s survey, one-on-one interview, and focus group interview indicate that her experiences with The AL Project did not change her beliefs, practices, or self-efficacy toward ELs. Her years of teaching, and her experiences teaching at all grade levels, seemed to have put Ms. Margaret in a place where she has trouble finding new programs to learn from. She admits that the reflective nature of mentoring has helped her with instructional transparency and recalling instructional practices that she may have forgotten about. She also expressed her overall enjoyment in
being a mentor but did not seem to experience much professional growth from her participation as a mentor within The AL Project.
CHAPTER 5
Conclusions and Recommendations

Research Question

What is the relationship between mentoring, in a professional development program focused on co-teaching, and the mentors’ professional growth in the following areas?

a) Beliefs about the academic capabilities of ELs.
b) Practices with instructing ELs.
c) Self-efficacy in their work with ELs.

The nature of the research question called for an exploration of data through multiple data sources in order to find similarities and differences in the professional development (PD) experiences of each participant. According to Cresswell (2013), an exploratory multiple-case study allows a researcher to discover the similarities and differences in the various experiences of the research participants. Additionally, Baxter and Jack (2008), advocate for the use of an exploratory multiple-case study when asking “why” or “how” in a research question. The data collected within the context of this study afforded the opportunity to find the similarities and differences between each participant’s PD experiences within context of The AL Project. Additionally, the data collected created the opportunity to examine how participants experienced PD and to explore its influence on their beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy with respect to ELs. The results of the study are discussed within a transformative learning framework (Mezirow, 1997).

Discussion

Beliefs. Collective data trends reflect the initial existence of positive beliefs among participants regarding the academic capabilities of ELs, and the importance of teacher
implementation of practices that match these beliefs. As mentioned in Chapter 4, these beliefs were reflected in the data that showed high levels of agreement toward academically supporting ELs. The one-on-one interview data reflected mixed beliefs toward the capabilities of ELs, and positive beliefs toward the PD activities of The AL Project. Furthermore, the focus group interview data reaffirmed many of the collective levels of positive beliefs that were initially indicated in the surveys.

The combined data trends show overall positive participant beliefs toward the capabilities of ELs. The survey response data reflect mixed feelings toward lesson modifications for ELs. However, the data also indicate a gap between the participants’ positive beliefs toward ELs, and their classroom practices in supporting ELs. Additionally, the volunteer nature of The AL Project demonstrates the willingness of teachers to participate in professional growth opportunities, despite the indication of teacher time constraints. These findings suggest that PD programs can be effective, at least for teachers who hold positive beliefs toward the academic capabilities of their EL students but struggle to design lessons that are in conjunction with their own beliefs.

**Practices.** The survey and interview data suggest that all of the participants held positive feelings toward many of the activities within the PD experience. These practices included mentoring, co-teaching, working with a university consultant, and collaborating with peers within the context of a PLC. Survey item responses showed general levels of positive feelings toward the PD activities within The AL Project. In particular, all of the participants showed positive responses toward their participation as a mentor teacher, and through their engagement with the elements of co-teaching. Most of the participants also
conveyed positive feelings toward working within a PLC and with ongoing meetings with a university consultant.

Data from both the one-on-one interviews and the focus group interview reflect that the PD activities within The AL Project provided the mentors with the types of professional supports needed to engage in a variety of inquiry practices. These practices include opportunities to engage in cycles of inquiry, collaborative dialogue, and ongoing reflection. Research has shown these types of inquiry practices to be effective toward promoting teacher growth and shifting instructional practices (Butler, 2012).

The participant responses toward the role of The AL Project’s inquiry practices varied, depending on the participants’ experience levels in teaching ELs. Additionally, regardless of the experience levels of the participants in this study, data from all of the participants indicated positive feelings toward at least one of the activities within the PD program.

**Self-Efficacy.** Data trends from both the surveys and one-on-one interviews reflect varying levels of self-efficacy among the participants throughout the PD experience. For example, at the time of the survey, the participants indicated positive degrees of self-efficacy toward academically supporting ELs. The statements coded as “self-efficacy” presented in the one-on-one interview data partly align with the positive “self-efficacy” trends found within the survey data. Data from the focus group interview reaffirmed the varying levels of self-efficacy growth among the participants as a direct result of the PD experience. Six out of the eight participants indicated growth in self-efficacy as a result of the PD experience. Of the six participants, the research findings
reflect that co-teaching and mentoring helped them to increase their self-efficacy toward academically supporting all students, and ELs in particular. Additionally, participant responses conveyed the need for increased opportunities for teachers to participate as a mentor teacher within a semester-long co-teaching context. These findings show the importance in offering PD programs to teachers that are comprised of activities that promote the professional growth of teachers (Guskey & Yoon, 2009), especially growth opportunities that focus on participants’ beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy toward academically supporting their EL students.

**Transformative Learning**

As previously discussed, Mezirow’s Theory of Transformative Learning proposes the mechanisms by which experiences can change the frame of reference of the learner (Mezirow, 1997). By changing one’s frame of reference, changes can occur in the learners’ habits of mind (e.g. inquiry practices), and their points-of-view (e.g. beliefs) toward a particular topic. In the context of this research, a transformative learning experience refers to the ways in which teachers utilize the inquiry practices of The AL Project, such as cycles of inquiry, collaboration, and ongoing reflection, to work with their EL students. For example, a frame of reference in this context refers to the ways in which a teacher views the learning capabilities of ELs, and the habits of mind refer to the inquiry practices that teachers use when working to improve their instructional practices toward ELs (e.g. scaffolds). These inquiry practices include ongoing reflection exercises, engaging in cycles of inquiry, and utilizing collaborative opportunities with like-minded people when designing lesson plans that meet the learning needs of ELs.
**Stages of PD participant transformation.** As discussed in Chapter 4, there were three participant learning trends that emerged after an analysis of all participant data. After the analysis of participant data trends, this researcher created three learning themes that serve to add to Mezirow’s existing framework on transformative learning. These themes represent a process approach to transformative learning. More specifically, each teacher who participates in a PD experience arrives with existing frames of reference and varying levels of experience. It is important to differentiate PD programs in order to meet the specific learning needs of the participants, regardless of their learning stage. Meeting the learning needs of PD participants can help everyone to experience professional growth from a PD experience. For the sake of this research, these stages are called “the stages for PD participant transformation.” These stages are elaborated upon in the following sub-sections.

**Entering transformation.** During the data collection process of this research, participants who were categorized as “entering transformation” provided data showing that they were just learning how to use mentoring and co-teaching as a vehicle for their own professional growth. For example, participants categorized as “entering transformation” engaged in all elements of PD and found value in working as a mentor, engaging with the activities of co-teaching, collaborating with an ongoing PLC, engaging in cycles of inquiry, and working with a university consultant. Data from the participants in this group reflect the notion of that they were beginning to see the ways in which they could use the activities from the PD experience as a vehicle for their own professional growth. Using mentoring as an example, Ms. Portillo conveyed the idea that mentoring
helped with her own professional growth. She elaborated by saying, “We have someone that is watching us, constantly watching us, and we have to be true role models for those student teachers.” She discussed her beliefs that other teachers will be able to grow professionally from serving as a mentor. She elaborated her opinion with the following statement:

I think to understand this and to see how much you can grow by having this experience; you have to be there. You have to take the opportunity. Because actually, it’s not an increase in work, it’s not; it actually impacts the way we teach.

Continuing with mentoring as an example, Ms. Barnes, also categorized as “entering transformation,” conveyed the ways in which she felt that the mentoring process has given her the ability to focus on her own professional growth within the PD program. She says that mentoring “alleviates some of the burden of the day-to-day tasks, so you have the mental space.” In short, the data reflects that the participants who were categorized as “refining transformation” appeared to find growth opportunities through the use of the inquiry practices within The AL Project. These participants conveyed the use of the various inquiry practices as a way to specifically improve particular instructional weaknesses. More specifically, they cited the mentoring experience, as a whole, as a vehicle for advancing their own professional growth toward teaching ELs.

**Refining transformation.** Participants who are categorized as “refining transformation” provided data showing that they have previously learned that mentoring, co-teaching, and engaging with the other PD activities within The AL Project could play a positive role toward their own professional growth. These participants, in particular, provided data that indicates they have already honed in on their professional weaknesses
and were utilizing specific activities of the PD to strengthen these particular areas of weakness. For example, data from participants in this group indicated using ongoing collaboration from the PLC work (e.g. collaborative conversation) to experience professional growth, as well as utilizing their time with the university consultant to discuss various problems with implementing new practices. Ms. Douglas, a participant categorized as “refining transformation,” discussed ways in which the PD has helped her to grow professionally. During the focus group, she explained that the activities within The AL Project have helped her to “achieve more” and “get to where we believed we could.” She concluded by saying, “we always knew we could get there, we weren’t sure how.” Ms. Douglas contributes much of her professional growth to co-planning and engaging in cycles of inquiry with her co-teacher.

**Transformed.** Participants who are categorized as “transformed” provided data indicating existing positive beliefs toward the capabilities of ELs, and a strong working knowledge of the instructional practices that improve learning for ELs. These participants expressed using co-teaching as a way to improve student learning, and they discussed using their co-teacher as an additional classroom resource for student learning. In addition to conveying high self-efficacy toward EL instruction, these participants also indicated some degree of professional growth from working with their co-teaching partners. Much of the described learning involved the polishing of existing instructional strengths, inquiry practices, and absorbing new pedagogy that the teacher candidate is learning from his or her teaching credential program. Responses from these participants show increases in professional growth through co-planning lessons, reflective dialogue,
and analysis of student work. For example, Mr. Lorenzo, who is categorized as “transformed,” reported during his one-on-one interview that he has increased his use of student-language data as a result of the PD experience. He says, “The [AL] Project has forced me into the standards, into the research, and into databases of what’s available in terms of data of my students. I probably wouldn’t be digging for all of that stuff if I didn’t have to.” During the focus group, Ms. Margaret, also categorized as “transformed,” discussed ways in which mentoring has helped her to remember many of her prior instructional practices. She says, “Anytime you’re working with mentors and co-teachers, they bring a sense of what you may have forgotten about your own practice.” She also described the ways in which mentoring required her to be more transparent in her practices. She elaborated on this topic during the focus group with the following statement.

I think the transparency of our practice when you’re working as a mentor teacher, because there are a lot of things that I’ve never been challenged on. “Why did you do that?” And I’m thinking, “Huh?” You know, “Why did you work with that student that way and this student that way?” And so, I might’ve done something a little bit different in terms of, you know, piecing language for an EL student or pushing another student harder and being really transparent about why I’m doing that.

The data from the participants in this category suggest other motivations for participating as a mentor and co-teaching with a teacher candidate. During the focus group, Mr. Lorenzo conveyed that he uses mentoring as a form of school leadership, specifically as a way to make systemic changes to his school’s English department. He says, “So my other role on campus is the English department chair and, in trying to affect school wide change as department chair, I’m trying to get veteran teachers to change their
practices.” He elaborated on his point by saying that participating as a mentor has “given me a new framework to think about the work that I do with other adults on campus. And it’s also making me think about the work that I do with kids and it sort of fits in that same construct as well.”

Ms. Margaret describes other factors that influenced her participation in The AL Project. She seems to approach the experience as a way to give back to the teaching profession. During the focus group, she explained that since she is in the “twilight” of her career, she is “looking to give back and to kind of go viral with the strong feelings, the strong, positive feelings we have about what kids really can do.”

The data from the “transformed” participants indicate that no changes occurred in their beliefs toward ELs. These participants already held strong positive beliefs, and they use the PD experience as a way to spread these beliefs to other teachers. There did not appear to be any professional growth in the area of self-efficacy. Participants categorized as “transformed” indicated existing levels of high self-efficacy. The growth that appeared for these participants occurred in the area of their inquiry practices. This apparent growth occurred due to the need to be transparent in their practices, and the added motivation to deliver their best instruction by having an observer present. Finally, participants categorized as “transformed” frame their mentoring experiences as both an opportunity for school leadership and as a way to share their own teaching experiences with less-experienced teachers.

**Summary.** Figure 1 is a visual summary of the stages of PD participant transformation. Educational leaders attempting to develop and implement teacher PD
that focuses on EL instruction need to take each stage into consideration when designing the PD program. It is important to differentiate, or individualize, a PD experience to fit the professional growth needs of the participants, and to ensure that every PD participant maximizes professional growth opportunities through their participation with a PD program. In order to help participants to improve their work with ELs, PD programs need to be tailored toward each stage of PD participant transformation.

**Figure 1** Schematic representation of the stages of PD participant transformation

**Transformative Learning Implications**

These findings suggest that principals and other leaders of PD should acknowledge the PD participants’ previous professional experience and existing knowledge as they enter professional development opportunities. For example, Ms. Margaret, a first-year mentor, was placed in the “transformed” category. It would have been easy to categorize all first-year mentors into the same learning category, but it was through the data
collection process that Ms. Margaret revealed her tremendous amount of knowledge and experiences in teaching ELs. Fortunately, she is a teacher who describes herself as someone who can learn in any situation, and she conveyed positive feelings on her time in The AL Project. In contrast, she could have been a participant with a negative attitude toward a PD program that does not address her professional growth needs. This type of situation could result in a participant who brings negative energy to a PD program, which could ruin the learning experiences for other participants. For these reasons, it is important to monitor the progress of teachers as they participate in a PD program. By doing so, PD leaders can make the necessary adjustments in order to ensure that participants are progressing through each stage successfully.

Monitoring PD participants through the stages of PD participant transformation can help PD program leaders to determine how to best differentiate their programs so that more participants could experience transformative learning. Due to the low academic success rates of many ELs in California, the goal of transformative learning for teachers is especially important within PD programs focused on EL instruction. Administrators and PD leaders can help to improve the academic growth of thousands of ELs by helping teachers to transform their beliefs, practices, and/or self-efficacy toward their work with ELs. More specifically, it is important for educational leaders to develop PD programs that enable professional growth for groups of participants representing all stages of PD participant transformation. This idea is particularly important for administrators who design PD for their faculty, since many school administrators are tasked with implementing school-wide PD.
Participants in this study found value within the activities of The AL Project, but these were participants who had existing levels of positive beliefs toward ELs, and who also volunteered to be a part of the PD program. The result of the collaborative actions of the participants was a collegial learning environment. This type of environment may not be the case for all school sites, especially when the PD is mandatory or built into a school schedule. The data from this study shows the importance of providing teachers with PD programs that developmentally meet them where they are. Additionally, it is important that PD programs build on teachers’ existing strengths and assist them in professional growth around their own perceived weaknesses through the use of many of the activities in The AL Project. Data from this study indicated that these goals could be accomplished through mentoring, co-teaching, and inquiry practices such as reflection, collaboration, working with a consultant, and/or engaging in cycles of inquiry.

Limitations of the Study

Participants. The nature of the clinical residency program used in this study created the opportunity to work with a convenient sample of participants who were already engaging in daily co-teaching experiences within The AL Project. These experiences are not typical opportunities for teachers working alone in the field. According to Farnan, Hudis, and LaPlante (2014), university clinical residency models create unique opportunities for the participants to collaborate with their partnering teacher candidate in the areas of planning instruction and assessment. The structure of The AL Project provided for a variety of PD activities that created a unique opportunity to analyze multiple data sources regarding a wide variety of professional development activities.
However, it is also important to note that all of the teachers had elected to participate in the project, and this self-selection may limit the generalization of the data findings to the broader population of teachers. For example, the participants who volunteered to be a part of The AL Project and who chose to be a part of this study may have already been receptive to using the program’s activities to improve their own work with ELs. Additionally, the participants may already possess positive beliefs toward the capabilities of ELs, and may have already been looking for new ways to implement their EL instruction. Furthermore, the participants may have already had an interest in mentoring a teacher candidate, and/or co-teaching. In contrast, a teacher may have differing experiences with the activities of The AL Project if he or she holds negative beliefs toward the capabilities of ELs, does not want to change his or her instruction for ELs, may not want to mentor a teacher candidate, and/or has no interest in co-teaching. These distinctions are important when analyzing the data, because the willingness of the participants frames the results toward more positive outcomes from PD participation.

**Use of interviews.** The self-reporting nature of the one-on-one interviews and the focus group interview are limitations to the overall accuracy of the collective interview data. The participants could say anything they choose about a particular topic, with little or no opportunity for the researcher to verify the claim during the interview. The flaws of the one-on-one and focus group interviews may be apparent when the participants discuss their beliefs about ELs, as there are few opportunities to validate their claims within the context of a one-on-one interview. Triangulating multiple data sources, and establishing coding reliability through the use of a second rater are ways to assist in the
validation of the collected data. However, research limitations exist when relying on self-reported data from one-on-one and focus group interviews. These limitations create the need to analyze general participant trends within the data sets in order to capture the essence of the participants’ responses. Additionally, follow-up studies with participants in similar PD programs can help to reaffirm the data findings from this study.

**Research Implications**

Data trends found in Chapter 4 can help school administrators to better understand the ways in which professional development can support teachers who have existing positive beliefs about the academic capabilities of ELs, in order to provide increased academic support for their students during classroom instruction. The positive feedback that the participants indicated toward the inquiry practices used in The AL Project can be used in designing PD that promotes the use of inquiry practices in more PD programs. These data also indicate that participating as a mentor, through a co-teaching model, can be an impactful way for veteran teachers to experience professional growth toward their work with ELs. More specifically, this PD process can serve as a way to provide scaffolds for teachers who wish to link existing positive beliefs toward ELs to implementing instructional practices that match their beliefs through the use of inquiry practices. One way this can be accomplished is through the leveraging of mentor and teacher candidate relationships when designing various PD activities. These activities can comprise of ongoing reflective dialogue with the candidate, engaging in multiple student-outcomes based cycles of inquiry, and daily co-planning of lessons. Furthermore, the indication of existing levels of positive beliefs toward ELs, and the volunteer nature of The AL
Project, shows a demand for PD opportunities among veteran teachers who hold existing positive beliefs toward ELs.

Data from this research reflect the need for teachers to have access to PD programs that contain elements such as mentoring and co-teaching. This is especially true for teachers with existing positive beliefs toward the academic capabilities of ELs. Teachers need PD experiences to provide the necessary scaffolds to bridge existing positive beliefs with the implementation of classroom practices that match existing positive beliefs toward ELs.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The data trends showing initial levels of positive beliefs toward ELs among the participants raise questions regarding the potential PD experiences of a participant who holds negative beliefs toward ELs prior to engaging in the same type of PD experience. This includes teachers who are assigned mandatory PD at their school sites, or teachers who enter a similar PD experience for other types of incentives, including monetary. The data trends found within the context of this study raise a number of questions that future studies may want to address. First, what role can PD play toward the professional growth of teachers who possess negative beliefs about academic capabilities of ELs? Second, how can administrators encourage teachers with negative beliefs toward ELs to volunteer for similar PD experiences? Third, will the PD experiences of teachers who hold positive beliefs about ELs motivate teachers with negative beliefs to attend similar PD programs? Finally, how can educators develop collaborative opportunities for teachers to showcase
their learning and the learning of their ELs to colleagues with negative beliefs and low self-efficacy toward ELs?

The results of this study help to shed light on the role that serving as a mentor teacher, through a co-teaching experience, has on the professional growth of the mentors. The researcher of this study did not analyze the participation experiences of the teacher candidates, nor did he analyze any of the impacts that ELs experienced as a result of their teacher’s engagement in the PD program. Additionally, the researcher of this study did not analyze the differing experiences of first-time mentors, and mentors who have participated in The AL Project for multiple years.

The data findings from this study have served to answer the original research questions, but they have also generated new questions in other areas pertaining to the PD experience. The following recommendations address these questions. First, it is recommended that future studies on this topic correlate teacher participation with overall student achievement results, in order to see the benefits that teacher PD participation has on student learning. Second, it is also recommended that future studies analyze the impact that co-teaching has on a teacher candidate’s abilities to serve ELs. The purpose of such a study would help determine whether or not a co-teaching model is an effective learning model for teacher candidates earning their teaching credential. Finally, this research did not specifically analyze the relationship between participation in The AL Project and professional growth for participants who served as mentor teachers over the course of multiple years. It is recommended that future studies analyze the role that serving as a multi-year mentor plays in the professional growth of the participants.
compared to first-year mentors. Such a study may influence universities to continue to invest in multi-year PD programs such as The AL Project.

**Recommendations for Public Schools**

The study highlighted the ability for veteran teachers with positive beliefs toward the academic abilities of ELs to engage in transformative learning experiences as a result of mentoring, co-teaching, and the inquiry practices used within the context of The AL Project. It is important for the researcher to recommend ways to replicate the effective PD activities of The AL Project within the confines of a school district, or secondary school, while bearing in mind that The AL Project was implemented over multiple years using funds from a large PD grant from the United States Department of Education. The following sections describe the researcher’s recommendations to both school district and school site administrators who are searching for ways to use similar PD to increase teacher efficacy toward ELs.

**School district administrators.** The first recommendation is for school district administrators to prioritize the closing of the academic achievement gap for EL students. To do this, school district administrators need increased numbers of engaged school administrators, teachers, and community stakeholders participating in ongoing, data-driven discussions that are related to the EL achievement gap. These discussions should highlight both EL and English-only achievement data for the purpose of comparison and to create stakeholder buy-in toward finding solutions to the problem.

The second recommendation is to prioritize the ongoing implementation of well-structured PD, focused on inquiry practices toward EL instruction for all teachers.
throughout the school district. In doing so, school districts should become familiar with the research done on the effective activities of professional development (Desimone, et al., 2002; Garet, et al., 2001; Guskey, 2002, Guskey & Yoon, 2009). These activities include mentoring, co-teaching, and engaging with inquiry practices such as reflective dialogue, PLC participation, and collaboration with colleagues. School district leaders should utilize the activities of effective PD, such as working with an outside expert, allotting appropriate amounts of time for participants to engage with PD activities, timely follow up, and reflection opportunities. The PD practices should focus on the best practices from PD research in order to help the PD participants to focus their thinking of student learning. Most importantly, the PD experience should be differentiated, based on the needs of the PD participants. The results from this research reflect the various stages of PD participant transformation toward improving their work with ELs. It is important to create differentiated PD opportunities in order to meet the professional growth needs of each participant.

The third recommendation for district administrators is to leverage PLCs for veteran teacher PD and allocate appropriate levels of funding in order to pay for the substitute teachers while the veteran teachers collaborate with a PLC. The volunteer nature of the PD showed that many veteran teachers are willing to participate in a PLC, even at a district level. Many of the participants from this study cited the positive impact of leaving the school campus to engage in a full day of PD. Some of the participants cited the ability to focus on the PD without the distractions of day-to-day teaching. Meeting with a PLC off-site would also draw PD participants away from their school environment
in order to work with like-minded teachers through collaborative activities. In this study, the researcher found that teachers from all experience levels cited professional growth benefits from their collaborative involvement within a PLC. This type of collaboration was only able to occur because the participants had the time and resources to collaborate within the structure of a PLC. Leveraging PLCs and allocating funds to support the collaborative work would allow more teachers to engage with the inquiry practices, which this study has shown to create professional growth for all participants.

The final recommendation for school district administrators is to create partnerships with teaching credential programs from local universities. The goal of these partnerships would be to create co-teaching and mentoring opportunities for veteran teachers who are looking for their own professional growth in their work with ELs. The research participants from this study, who possessed varying levels of teaching experiences, expressed positive professional growth benefits as a result of both co-teaching and mentoring. Data from this research shows that mentoring is an untapped resource that has shown to provide professional growth benefits for veteran teachers, especially when paired within a co-teaching model. Many of the research participants cited that increased instructional transparency and ongoing lesson planning discussions with their mentee has a positive impact on their professional growth toward teaching ELs. Additionally, the research participants expressed an interest in continuing to work as a mentor, which supports the notion that more teachers should mentor as a form of PD.

**Secondary school site administrators.** The first recommendation is for school site administrators to recruit teacher-volunteers who are searching for ways to professionally
grow in their work with ELs. The volunteer nature of The AL Project was a core component that allowed for the participants to collaborate with like-minded people. More specifically, the participants wanted to attend the PLC meetings and also self-selected to serve as a mentor to a teacher candidate. The volunteer nature of The AL Project demonstrates a demand among experienced teachers to volunteer for PD programs in order to experience professional growth in the area of EL instruction. Once teacher-volunteers have been recruited, administrators will need to facilitate a well-structured PD experience that ensures professional growth for all volunteers. The well-structured PD should contain PD elements that research has shown to be effective, and it should occur over an extended period of time (Desimone, et al., 2002; Garet, et al., 2001; Guskey, 2002, Guskey & Yoon, 2009).

The second recommendation is for school administrators to modify the school’s master schedule by building in collaboration time. This would help to ensure that the teachers involved in the PD would have allocated time within the school schedule to engage with the inquiry practices needed to experience professional growth. Data from this study indicate that mentors experience professional growth from collaborating within a co-teaching model. These benefits include co-planning lessons, co-assessing student work, and engagement with inquiry practices such as reflective dialogue and cycles of inquiry. Creating a master schedule that could allow for collaborative interactions throughout a school year would provide participating teachers the time needed to engage with the PD activities that have shown to increase the self-efficacy of teachers toward their work with ELs.
The final recommendation for school site administrators is to allow non-participating teachers the opportunities to learn about the PD experience. This could include opportunities for classroom observations, interviews with PD participants regarding the PD experience, and attending a focus group discussion at the end of the year that highlights the experiences of all of the teachers who participated in the PD. Opening the focus group to other teachers may help encourage the observing teachers to engage in future PD opportunities. Following these recommendations could allow other teachers to learn more about the ways in which their colleagues’ levels of self-efficacy toward teaching ELs were impacted through their work with mentoring and/or co-teaching.

Conclusions

As previously discussed in Chapter 1, California’s growing enrollment of EL students has created new challenges for California teachers, especially in times of increased school accountability. Teachers, faced with a multitude of challenges within the profession, need additional supports for working with EL students, especially at a time when ELs are being mainstreamed into English-only classrooms at increasing rates. The data from this project confirm that many of the high-leverage practices from teacher PD can be effective in transforming teachers’ beliefs, practices, and self-efficacy. These findings add to the existing literature, summarized in Chapter 2, that outline the elements of PD that research has shown to be effective. Many of the methods found within existing literature reflect the inquiry practices that were used during The AL Project.

The results of this study show that both mentoring and co-teaching can be used as a vehicle for professional growth, given that both participants are committed to
professional growth and both hold positive beliefs toward the academic capabilities of ELs. Additionally, depending on the participant’s stage of transformative learning, utilizing mentoring, co-teaching, and the inquiry of The AL Project can increase general levels of self-efficacy toward working with ELs. Furthermore, results from this study show the need for increased mentorship and co-teaching opportunities for veteran teachers as a way to experience professional growth. Finally, teachers who hold negative beliefs toward the academic capabilities of ELs may be influenced into seeking out PD opportunities for themselves after learning about the positive impact that mentoring and co-teaching had on their colleagues.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Survey- Beliefs and Self-Efficacy Towards ELs

1. Teachers are capable of adapting their instruction to meet the needs of ELs.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree
   Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*2. I am capable of adapting my instruction to meet the needs of ELs in my classroom.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree
   Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*3. Adapting instruction to include appropriate levels of language supports within my lessons will lead to increased learning for ELs in my class.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree
   Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*4. I can achieve greater academic success with my ELs if I obtain information about my ELs’ language abilities.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree
   Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit
*5. I can assess EL learning using various types of assessments.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree
   Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*6. Teachers have the capability to create academic success for all students when their class contains ELs.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree
   Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*7. I can use my ELs’ cultural backgrounds to help make learning meaningful.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree
   Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*8. Using elements of students' cultural backgrounds within a lesson can lead to increased student learning.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree
   Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*9. ELs are likely to experience academic success if teachers use their ELs’ prior knowledge to help them make sense of new information
Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Agree
Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*10. I can establish a personal connection with all ELs in my classroom.

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Agree
Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*11. Increased student/teacher connections will lead to increased academic achievement for all students.

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Agree
Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*12. Teachers can create a collaborative classroom environment by helping ELs to develop positive relationships with their classmates.

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Agree
Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*13. I can create a collaborative classroom environment by helping ELs to develop positive relationships with their classmates.

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
*14. Facilitating classroom collaboration between ELs and their English proficient peers can lead to increased student learning for all students.

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*15. ELs’ can better understand the curriculum when teachers model classroom tasks for their students.

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*16. I can help ELs feel like important members of my classroom.

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*17. Helping all students to feel like important members of a classroom can lead to increased student learning for all students.

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree
Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*18. Designing instruction that matches the developmental needs of ELs can lead to increased student learning for all students.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*19. The inclusion of ELs in subject-area classes creates a positive educational atmosphere for all students.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*20. Subject-area teachers do not have enough time to address the academic needs of ELs.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*21. I can address the learning needs of the ELs in my class with the current amount of resources I have to work with (i.e. time, technology, supplementary materials, professional development opportunities, etc).
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree
Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*22. I can address the learning needs of the ELs in my class with increased resources (i.e. time, technology, supplementary materials, professional development opportunities, etc).
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*23. It is good practice to simplify coursework for ELs.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*24. It is good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ELs.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*25. Teachers should modify assignments for ELs enrolled in subject-area classes.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*26. Teachers should allow ELs more time to complete their coursework than their English proficient peers.
*27. Teachers should give ELs less coursework than their English proficient peers.

☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*28. The inclusion of ELs in my class increases my workload.

☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly Agree

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*29. Demographics: What is your gender?

☐ Female
☐ Male

*30. Demographics: Which age range best describes you?

☐ 18-21 years old
☐ 22-29 years old
☐ 30-39 years old
☐ 40-49 years old
☐ 50 years old or older

*31. Demographics: How would you describe your ethnicity or cultural identity? (Check all that apply)
☐ White / Anglo
☐ Black / African-American
☐ Hispanic / Latina/o
☐ Asian / Pacific Islander
☐ Native American / Alaska Native
☐ Other
☐ Decline to Answer
Further Explanation (Optional) 50 character limit

*32. Education: Which degree(s) do you currently hold? (Check all that apply)
☐ Bachelor’s Degree
☐ Master’s Degree
☐ Doctoral Degree
☐ Post Doctoral Degree
Further Explanation (Optional) 50 character limit

*33. Education: Which credential(s) do you currently hold? (Check all that apply)
☐ Multiple-Subject credential
☐ Single-Subject Credential
☐ Administrative Credential
☐ Other (please explain in comment box)
Further Explanation (Optional) 50 character limit

*34. Education: How many college or university courses did you take during your
credential program, which included an emphasis on working with English learners?
☐ 1-2 courses
☐ 3-4 courses
☐ 5 or more courses
☐ none
Further Explanation (Optional) 50 character limit
*35. Education: How many college or university courses did you take during your MASTER’s degree (GRADUATE level), which included an emphasis on working with English learners?
- 1-2 graduate (master’s degree) level
- 3-4 graduate (master’s degree) level
- 5 or more graduate (master’s degree) level
- none
- N/A

Further Explanation (Optional) 50 character limit

*36. Education: How well do you feel your teacher preparation program prepared you to effectively teach English learners?
- Extremely well
- Pretty well
- Somewhat well
- Not well at all

Further Explanation (Optional) 100 character limit

*37. Teaching Experience: Which best describes your teaching experience?
- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 10-15 years
- 16 or more years

Further Explanation (Optional) 50 character limit

*38. Teaching Experience: Which grade level(s) have you taught? (Check all that apply)
- Kindergarten, 1st or 2nd grade(s)
- 3rd-5th grade(s)
- 6th-8th grade(s)
- 9th-12th grade(s)
- College level or adult students

Further Explanation (Optional) 50 character limit
*39. What subject(s) do you currently teach? (Check all that apply)

- Math
- Science
- History/Social Science
- English
- Visual/Performing Arts
- World Language
- Other Elective

Further Explanation (Optional) 50 character limit

*40. Short Answer: Please list what you consider to be the greatest benefits of including ELs in mainstream classes.

*41. Short Answer: Please list what you consider to be the greatest challenges of including ELs in mainstream classes.

*42. Short Answer: Engaging in a cycle of inquiry has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Please Explain

*43. Short Answer: Serving as a mentor to a teacher candidate has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Please Explain
*44. Short Answer: Engaging in co-teaching with a teacher candidate has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   Please Explain

*45. Short Answer: Co-planning lessons with a teacher candidate has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   Please Explain

*46. Short Answer: Participating in an ongoing professional learning community with (The AL Project) has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   Please Explain

*47. Short Answer: Working with a university consultant within (The AL Project) has had a positive impact on your work with ELs.
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   Please Explain
*48. Short Answer: Participating in elements of (The AL Project) has impacted your beliefs about the academic capabilities of ELs?
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree
Please Explain

*49. Short Answer: Participating in the elements of (The AL Project) has had a positive impact on your practices with instructing ELs?
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree
Please Explain

*50. Short Answer: Participating in the elements of (The AL Project) has had a positive impact on your confidence that adding academic supports will lead to increased learning for ELs?
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree
Please Explain
Appendix B: One-on-One Interview Questions

1. How many English learners would you say that you have in your classes this year? Is that a typical amount? (Setting the stage)

2. Let’s go back to your early days of teaching. What did you find the most difficult about teaching English learners? To what degree has this changed over time? What were the factors that created the change? (Beliefs)

3. What supports are available at your school to assist English learners? How are you able to serve your English learners with that level of support? What types of support would you need to better assist your ELs? (Self-efficacy)

4. Looking over your survey, you indicated that serving as a mentor had a positive impact on your work with ELs. To what degree has serving as a mentor impacted your work with ELs? What elements of the mentoring process created this impact? How has working as a mentor helped you to better understand the needs of your students? To what degree has the mentoring experience helped you to understand the general needs of ELs? How has the mentoring process impacted your future work with ELs? (Practices)

5. Looking over your survey, you indicated that co-teaching helped you in supporting ELs in your classes. What specific elements of the co-teaching process assisted you in working with ELs? How did co-teaching help? To what degree was your co-teacher a resource in serving ELs? How did they mitigate any problems that occurred during instruction? Is there anything that you gained or learned while engaging in the co-teaching experience that will continue to help you in the future? (Provide list of co-teaching activities) (Listen for response and follow up in area of beliefs, practices)

6. Are there any supports, scaffolds, materials, practices, procedures or routines that you have added this semester to support ELs as a result from working with your teacher candidate? To what degree will you continue to use this practice? (Shows permanent change of practice)

7. What are some instructional strategies that you have used in the past to support English learners? Have you changed or adapted any of these practices this year? What led you to make that change? (Practices)

8. Describe any new insights about teaching all students, and teaching ELs in particular, that you have had as a result of the co-teaching experience. Describe the precise co-teaching experience that led to these insights. To what extent do you feel like students, and ELs in particular will respond or benefit from these insights? (Practices and self-efficacy)
9. Given all of these professional development experiences, how do you feel that participation in (The AL Project) has enhanced your abilities to serve ELs? Which program elements in particular had the most impact on your abilities to serve ELs? (Last question…self-efficacy)

10. Open Discussion:

* Have any of these activities on this list encouraged you to try new practices in your classroom? Describe what those practices include. In what ways did you change as a result of these activities?

   Academic Language Development
   Co-Assessing
   Co-Instruction
   Co-Planning
   Inquiry Cycles
   Instructional Coaching
   Observing/Being Observed
   Ongoing PLC Meetings
   Mentoring
   Planning Conversations
   Problems of Practice
   Providing Feedback
   Reflective Dialogue
   Self-Reflection
   Working With Consultant
Appendix C: Focus Group Questions and Script

Welcome
“I want to first thank everyone for your time, and I want to welcome you all to the final research component to this project. My name is Terry Flora, and I will be the moderator for this focus group. This is (name of university professor), she will be assisting me during our session together.”

Topic of Discussion
“We will be spending out time today talking about mentoring, co-teaching, professional development, and working with English learners. Throughout the discussion, we will focus on the ways that participating as a mentor and co-teacher in (The AL Project) professional development program impacted your work with English learners.

You were selected for this project because you are all mentor teachers participating in (The AL Project), and because you were kind enough to volunteer to be a participant in this study.”

Guidelines for Focus Group
- During this focus group, there are no right or wrong answers, only differing points of view.
- We are tape-recording this conversation and during the discussion one person speaks at a time.
- We will be on a first name basis with everyone.
- You don’t need to agree with others, but must listen respectfully as other share their views.
- During this discussion, I ask that you please turn off your phones and other electronic devices. If you cannot, and if you must respond to a call, please do so as quietly as possible outside and rejoin us as quickly as you can.
- My role as a moderator will be to guide the discussion while you talk to each other.

Opening
“Let’s begin. We’ve placed name cards on the table in front of you to help us remember each other’s names. Let’s find out some more about each of you by going around the circle. Tell us your name, the subject matter you teach, and the school you teach at.”

Current Impact from (The AL Project)
“Throughout the semester with (The AL Project), you participated in a variety of professional development elements such as mentoring, co-teaching, co-planning, co-
assessing, engaging in student-outcomes based cycles of inquiry, involvement with an ongoing professional learning community, and ongoing work with a university consultant.”

1. How has your experiences as a mentor and co-teacher in this project impacted the following:
   a. Your beliefs about the academic abilities of ELs. To what degree has the activities in this project impacted ELs in a positive or negative way? Why do you think your beliefs were not impacted? What else could have been done to create an impact?
   b. Your instructional practices in academically supporting ELs? In what ways? Why do you think your instructional practices were not impacted? What else could have been done to create an impact?
   c. Your belief that the work you do to support ELs will have a positive impact on them, in other words, your sense of self-efficacy? In what ways? Why do you think your self-efficacy was not impacted? What else could have been done to create an impact?

New Insights from (The AL Project)

“During your individual interviews, the following themes were discussed in varying degrees, by all or most of this group.”

- Perceptions of the academic skills/abilities of ELs
- Academically supporting all students
- Co-Teaching
- School supports
- Writing scaffolds
- Trying new instructional practices
- Abilities to academically support ELs
- Having 2 teachers in the classroom

3. Now that you are finished with (The AL Project), what new insights, if any do you have regarding any of these topics. Which element of the professional development experience contributed to these insights? In what ways?

Future Impact from (The AL Project)

“Now that your time co-teaching is coming to an end, you will no longer have a second teacher in the room to assist you.”

4. How have your experiences as a mentor and co-teacher in this project impacted the following:
a. Your future academic expectations for ELs when designing your curriculum?
   In what ways, if any have your experiences in this program caused this impact?
   - Why do you think there will not any future impact in this area? What else could have been done to create an impact toward your future academic expectations of ELs?

b. Your future use of academic instructional supports when teaching ELs? In what ways will you continue to academically support ELs?
   - Why do you think your instructional practices will not be impacted? What else could have been done to create a long-term impact?

c. Your future beliefs that the work you do to support ELs will have a positive impact on them, in other words, your sense of self-efficacy? In what ways have your experiences in this project created a long-term impact?
   - Why do you think your future self-efficacy will not impacted? What else could have been done to create a long-term impact?

**Ending Questions**
- Reflect on entire discussion

1. Of all the things we discussed, what to you is the most important topic in academically supporting ELs?

2. After summary is read, “Is this an adequate summary?”

3. Review the purpose of the study, “Have we missed anything?”
Appendix D: Research Consent Form

REQUEST FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

(Identifying Names and Information Emitted)

TITLE OF STUDY
(The AL Project): Addressing Academic Language Development across the Teacher Continuum

NAME OF RESEARCHERS:
(Name of Professor), Ph.D., (Name of Professor), Ph.D., (Name of Professor), Ed.D., Dept. of Teacher Education, (Name of Professor), Ph.D., Dept. of Mathematics, (Name of Professor) Ph.D., College of Science, Terry Flora, Doctoral Candidate, (Name of University) Educational Leadership Program

PURPOSE
You are being asked to participate in (The AL Project), a research study by (Name of University), in collaboration with (Name of Participating School District) and high schools within (Name of County), investigating how an inquiry-based professional development program focused on supporting English Language Learners impacts novice and expert teacher beliefs and practices.

PROCEDURES
If you consent to participate, you will be asked to do the following during the 2016-2017 school year:

• Complete a survey about your thoughts regarding what makes for effective teaching of English Language Learners. This will happen at the onset and end of the program. Completing the survey takes about 45 minutes.

• Work collaboratively with a student teacher and/or colleague in completing two cycles of inquiry (see attached) with a focus on meeting the needs of English Language Learners in mainstreamed classrooms.

• Allow (The AL Project) research team to observe you during lessons as you teach the normal curriculum. These observations would last about 45 minutes. Dates and times of observations will be arranged with you in advance, as fits your schedule.

• Participate in 5 days of professional development, two in August and three throughout the school year.

• Participate in audio-recorded interviews, surveys and student work analysis activities within professional development and inquiry cycles.

• Allow work products created during project activities to be shared with others in an online archive of work. Credit will be given to you as the author if you wish.

POTENTIAL RISKS
There is a risk of a loss of privacy; however, to mitigate that risk, information obtained during this research project will be kept confidential.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS
The benefits that could potentially be attributed to participation in this research include professional preparation in teaching English language learners and the opportunity to collaborate with colleagues in your discipline from different schools/districts.
COMPENSATION
You will receive a professional development stipend of $300 for your participation in the study. We are able to offer the stipend as the result of a U.S. Department of Education grant from the Office of English Language Acquisition.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The results of this study may be published and/or presented at professional meetings, but your name would not appear in any publications or presentations related to this study. Data generated from this study may be used in the future for studies consistent with the original purpose of this study.

PARTICIPANT RIGHTS
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You can refuse to participate in the entire study or any part of the study without any negative effect on your relations with (Name of University). You also have the right to skip any question you do not wish to answer on the surveys and interview in the study. This consent form is not a contract. It is a written explanation of what will happen during the study if you decide to participate. You will not waive any rights if you choose not to participate, and there is no penalty for stopping your participation in the study.

QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS
You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study.
• For further information about the study, please contact (Name of Professor), Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Teacher Education, at (Professor’s email address).
• Complaints about the research may be presented to (Name of Department Chair), Chair, Department of Teacher Education, at (Department Chair’s Email Address)
• For questions about participants’ rights or if you feel you have been harmed in any way by your participation in this study, please contact (Name of Faculty Member), Associate Vice President of the Office of Research, (Name of University), at (Phone Number).

SIGNATURE
Your signature indicates that you voluntarily agree to be a part of the study, that the details of the study have been explained to you, that you have been given time to read this document, and that your questions have been answered. You will receive a copy of this consent form for your records.

Participant Signature

Participant’s Name (printed)    Participant’s Signature    Date

Researcher Statement
I certify that the participant has been given adequate time to learn about the study and ask questions. It is my opinion that the participant understands his/her rights and the purpose, risks, benefits, and procedures of the research and has voluntarily agreed to participate.

Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent    Date
### Appendix E: One-on-One Interview Coding System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Category</th>
<th>Code Family</th>
<th>Sub-Code Category</th>
<th>2x Sub-Code Category</th>
<th>Frequency/Collective</th>
<th>Code Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An outlook on what should be done toward a particular group of students (Richardson, 1996). More specifically, attitudes toward a specific topic (i.e. Having the conviction that ELs can academically achieve at high levels given the appropriate academic supports).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Supporting Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A teacher's collective beliefs toward teaching all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Perceived Skills/Abilities of All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Preconceived notions of the academic capabilities of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Connecting with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Believing that creating strong personal relationships with students will increase their chances for academic success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Gender of Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The belief that students will better connect with a teacher based on the teacher's gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Student Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Students will experience academic growth with the proper academic supports in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>EL Strategies for All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The belief that all students can benefit when the teacher uses EL instructional strategies toward students of all academic ability levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Reaching All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ways that teacher can connect and support students of all abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Views of Achievement for Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teacher's perspective on the levels of academic success that students can achieve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>High Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Belief that learning occurs for all students when the classroom is built into a community for learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Classroom as Learning Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belief that learning occurs for all students when the classroom is built into a community for learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Socioeconomic Status of Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teacher's viewpoint on challenges that students face depending on the socioeconomic level of the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Student Abilities in Math</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beliefs that math is a level playing field for ELs and language support strategies don't work in math.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Discipline of Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beliefs on how discipline should be administered to students during class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Valuing Students' Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Believing that students bring a variety of experiences into the classroom that are assets to the learning community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Importance of Formative Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Belief in the use of formative assessments throughout a given lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The belief that everyone in the class has power within the class learning community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Learning Goals/Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Belief in the importance of teaching the day's learning goals to all students prior to and throughout a given lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>2x Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Modeling Behavior for Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Student Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Student Success</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Model of English Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Perceived Skills/Abilities of ELs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>AP/Advanced vs. EL</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Rigor</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Supporting ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Extra Support for ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Perspectives of ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Perceived Attitudes of ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Views on EL Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Willingness for ELs to Learn</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>EL vs. RFEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Views of CELDT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Appropriate EL Class Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Course Curriculum for ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>Needs of ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Personal and/or Professional Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>2x Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Personal and/or Professional Growth</td>
<td>Instructional Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Belief that changes in teaching practices are needed if the changes improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Personal and/or Professional Growth</td>
<td>Unwillingness to Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Belief in maintaining one's teaching practices unless evidence shows how instructional changes will impact students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Personal and/or Professional Growth</td>
<td>Teaching Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beliefs in ways that teaching experiences can help a teacher to grow and increase the learning for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Personal and/or Professional Growth</td>
<td>Teacher Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Belief that learning never stops for teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Personal and/or Professional Growth</td>
<td>Opportunities for Professional Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perspectives regarding a lack of professional growth opportunities for experienced teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Personal and/or Professional Growth</td>
<td>Self-Improvement for Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Belief that everyday is an opportunity to improve as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>PD Elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs encompassing multiple topics regarding professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Perspectives on the impacts that co-teaching has on the professional development of a co-teaching participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>The Mentoring Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Perspectives on the ways that serving as a mentor for a teacher candidate impacts the participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Instructional Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Perspectives on ways that observing another teacher's instruction or being observed by another teacher impacts the professional development participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Opportunities for Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Perspectives on ways that engaging in reflective practices impacts the participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Mentor/Teacher Candidate Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Specific ways that co-teaching impacts the mentor and teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Perspectives on ways that participation in The AL Project impacted the participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Giving and Receiving Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beliefs in ways that giving and receiving feedback on instructional practices impacts professional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Views of Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs toward participating in professional development a means for professional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Effective PD/Trainings</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Participant perspectives on what elements of PD/training are effective/impactful for professional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Lack of PD Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perspective on the types of professional development programs offered to teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Mandatory PD Attendance for Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Belief toward the impact of PD that is mandated by a person of authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Teacher Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perspective on ways that a teacher candidate can increase student learning, and professional growth for the mentor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>2x Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency/Collective</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Teacher Candidate</td>
<td>Teacher Candidate as a Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Perspectives on ways that the teacher candidate acts as a resource for students and the mentor teacher during the co-teaching process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Teacher Candidate</td>
<td>New Practices from Teacher Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Perspectives on ways that the mentor teacher learned new instructional practices from the teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Teacher Candidate</td>
<td>Instructional Transparency with Teacher Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Perspectives on ways that co-teaching with a teacher candidate forces the mentor teacher to be transparent with lesson learning goals and instructional intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Teacher Candidate</td>
<td>Connecting to Teacher Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Belief that building a good working relationship between the mentor and the teacher candidate will improve the learning environment for all involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Teacher Candidate</td>
<td>Setting a Good Example for Teacher Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perspective on the mentor's awareness on the importance of setting a good example for their teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>Teacher Candidate</td>
<td>Teacher Candidate Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Belief that the teacher candidate will experience professional growth over time through the co-teaching process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statements that reference challenges, attitudes, practices, or innovations within the teaching profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Views of Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>General dispositions toward teaching students or the teaching profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Participant beliefs about in benefits of collaborating with colleagues on common practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Supplementary Materials for Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Perspective on the effectiveness and quantity of supplementary teaching materials designed for instructing ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Instructional Changes in the Education System</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Perspective on ways instructional goals have changed in schools over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>The Clinical Model</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Perspectives on duration of teacher candidate residency and it's impact on the model has on learning for both participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Technology in the Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perspectives on ways that technology has impacted the education experience for students and teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Teacher Time Constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perspectives on ways that time constraints due to professional obligations impact teachers in both professional development and the implementation of new instruction practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Assisting New Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Belief that assisting new teachers at a school impacts the professional growth of a veteran teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beliefs that student-to-teacher ratio makes a significant difference in the learning environment for both student and teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Attitudes Towards Credential Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The perspective that credential programs of the past did not adequately prepare teachers for instructing ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Impacts of Common Core</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perspective on the ways that the implementation of Common Core has impacted curriculum and instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Teacher Seniority</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perspective on the ways that teacher seniority impacts the creation of a school's master schedule and the subsequently, the level of support offered to ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Teacher Turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Belief that teacher turnover occurs when teachers get overloaded and do not get an opportunity to grow professionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>2x Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Views on Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Belief in the importance of supporting students by allowing an assessment to be taken more than once to improve a student's grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Assessment Practices</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actions with the purpose of increasing levels of student support. Practices may include lesson planning, direct instruction, scaffolds, personal growth and/or professional development on the part of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Assessment Practices</td>
<td>Co-Assessing</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the mentors' practices in co-assessing student performance with the teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Assessment Practices</td>
<td>Formative Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the use of formative assessments during instruction as a way to assess student performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Changes in Practice</td>
<td>Early Career Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Instances that discuss instructional practices used by the mentor in their early years of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Changes in Practice</td>
<td>New Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Instances that discuss new instructional practices as a result of the mentors' co-teaching participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Changes in Practice</td>
<td>Trying New Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the mentors' willingness in trying new instructional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Changes in Practice</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Instances that discuss new ways in teaching vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Changes in Practice</td>
<td>Continuing to Use New Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the degree in which the mentor will continue to use a new instructional practice that was introduced by the teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Changes in Practice</td>
<td>Practices from Teacher Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instances that discuss new instructional practices that the mentor acquired directly from the teacher candidate they are mentoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Changes in Practice</td>
<td>New Routines</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the implementation of new classroom routines as a result of the mentor's co-teaching work with a teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Changes in Practice</td>
<td>Breaking Routines</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the mentors' willingness to try new classroom routines as a result of collaboration with the teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Changes in Practice</td>
<td>Permanent Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss permanent changes in the mentors' approach to the teaching profession as a result of working with the teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Changes in Practice</td>
<td>Lack of Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the mentors' unwillingness to change their instructional practices when co-teaching with a teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Collaborative Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instances that discuss general collaborative practices at the school, or district level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Collaborative Practices</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instances that discuss collaborating within the department at the participant's school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>2x Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency/Collective</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Collaborative Practices</td>
<td>Content Alike Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instances that discuss collaborating with colleagues who teach similar content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Collaborative Practices</td>
<td>District Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instances that discuss collaborating with colleagues from other schools within the school district of the participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Collaborative Practices</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss in the impact of remaining isolated from collaborative practices with colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Curriculum</td>
<td>Learning Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the use of learning objectives when designing lesson and/or giving direct instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Curriculum</td>
<td>New Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the implementation of new standards to various content areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Curriculum</td>
<td>Course Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the practice integrating curriculum from other content areas within the lessons of the participant (i.e. writing strategies in a math class).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Curriculum</td>
<td>Curriculum Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss ways to design challenging curriculum that supports the learning of all students, and ELs in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Curriculum</td>
<td>Backwards Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the use of backwards planning a unit as a way to design day-to-day lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Feedback</td>
<td>Giving Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the impact of giving verbal or written feedback toward another teacher's instructional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Feedback</td>
<td>Feedback (General)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss verbal or written feedback regarding teachers' instructional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Feedback</td>
<td>Receiving Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the impact that receiving verbal or written feedback from another educator has on the recipient's instructional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Feedback</td>
<td>Student-to-Student Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the practices of students giving one another feedback on class work/assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Professional Development</td>
<td>Attending PD as Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the practice of regularly attending professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Professional Development</td>
<td>Leading PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the practice of leading professional development for colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Professional Development</td>
<td>School Mandated PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the practice of attending school mandated professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices School District</td>
<td>District Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instances that discuss practices that districts use to support teachers in professional growth and/or academically support all students, and ELs in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>2x Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency Collective</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td>TOSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the ways in which working with a teacher on special assignment (TOSA) impacts the instructional practices of the participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>School Supports</td>
<td>Support Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the types of academic courses offered for ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>School Supports</td>
<td>School Supports for ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Instances that discuss general EL supports offered by the school of the participating teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>School Supports</td>
<td>School Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the types of school resources that are available to academically support ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>School Supports</td>
<td>Support Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the types of support programs offered to ELs by the school of the participating teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>School Supports</td>
<td>Too Many Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the participant's perceived problem of having too many supplementary materials available for the instruction of ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>School Supports</td>
<td>Use School Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the use of the school library as a way to academically support ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>School Supports</td>
<td>Staff Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the various types of school staff supports available to academically support ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Teacher Credentialing</td>
<td>CLAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss participant experiences in obtaining a CLAD certification within a teacher credential program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Teacher Credentialing</td>
<td>Clinical Model</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the clinical model as a form of student teaching within a teacher credential program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Teacher Credentialing</td>
<td>Credential Program Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instances that discuss past participant experiences from their teacher credential program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Co-Teaching Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Instances that discuss direct classroom instruction with the participant's co-teaching partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Co-Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Instances that discuss participation in co-planning lesson with the participant's co-teaching partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Instances that discuss observing another teacher's instructional practices, or another teacher observing the participant's instructional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Cycle of Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instances that discuss participation in a student-outcomes-based cycle of inquiry toward a focus group of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Justifying Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the mentor teacher's the need to justify instructional practices to their co-teaching partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>2x Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency/Collective</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Supporting Teacher Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instances that discuss methods in which the mentor supports the direct instruction of the teacher candidate within the context of the co-teaching model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Instructional Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the impacts of giving and/or receiving instructional coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Planning Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Specific instances that discuss participation in planning dialogue as a part of the larger co-planning model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss ways in which participating as a mentor teacher impacts either the mentor or the teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the impact of participating in reflective practices as a form of professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Reflective Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the impact of participating in reflective dialogue with another teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Work w/ Experts</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the impact of working with an expert as a form of professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>The AL Project as PD</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the mentors' general participation in The AL Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>PLC</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the impact of participation in a professional learning community with other mentor teachers as a form of professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Teaching Multiple Grade Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instances that discuss past or current practices in teaching a variety of grade levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Teacher Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instance that discusses participants' specific academic preparation for teaching ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Teaching Skills, not Content</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the educational shift from planning curriculum based on teaching curriculum content, and toward transitioning into planning curriculum based on teaching academic skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Holding Teachers Accountable for Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses methods that a participant may use to hold other teachers to high standards of instruction for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Pursuing Extra Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the participants' experiences in pursuing higher education within the teaching profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Supporting Students in Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Instances that discuss various methods in which the participant academically supports all student in their classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Scaffolds</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instances that discuss scaffolds that the participant uses during direct instruction to academically support all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Writing Strategies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Instances that discuss writing strategies that the participant uses to academically support all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Technology Use</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the participants' implementation of technology during classroom instruction to academically support all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Claims Evidence Reasoning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the participants' use of the support strategy &quot;Claims Evidence Reasoning&quot; to academically support all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the participants' use of demonstrations during direct instruction to academically support all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Encouraging Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses various ways to use words of encourage when academically support all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Increased Student Engagement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses ways to increase student engagement during direct instruction as a way to academically support all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Student Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses giving students activity choices during a lesson as a way to academically support all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instances that discuss ways in which class size impacts the levels of academic support that a teacher can give to all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>New Math Strategies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss ways in which students can be supported in math when the participant uses various math instructional strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Alternative Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss ways in which students with credit deficiencies can be academically supported through enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses impact of classroom community building on the academic success of all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with All Students</td>
<td>Restorative Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses ways in which the implementation of restorative justice practices creates a positive impact for all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Data Analysis/Use (CELDT)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the participants' use of databases and test scores when planning their academic support for ELs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Practices Supporting ELs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instances that discuss various classroom practices that the participants regularly use to academically support ELs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Academic Language</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the participant's use of academic language in academically supporting ELs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>EL Ratio in Class</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instances that discuss ways that ratio of ELs in a mainstreamed class impact the teacher's ability to academically support ELs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Reading Strategies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instances that discuss various reading strategies that the participant uses to academically support ELs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>2x Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency Collective</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instances that discuss ways that ELs can be academically supported when the teacher differentiates a lesson to multiple meet the academic needs of multiple ability levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>BICS/CALP</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss ways that the teacher's understanding of the language concepts, BICS and CALP, impacts the teacher's ability to academically support ELs in their class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Culture of Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss ways that the acknowledgement of ELs' ethnic culture within the classroom setting impacts the teacher's ability to academically support ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Use of Visuals</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the use of visuals when giving direct instruction as a way of academically supporting ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Changing Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss challenges in teaching classes year-to-year that have steadily increased in need for language supports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Supporting Parents of ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the need to support parents of ELs through collaborative efforts as a way of academically supporting ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>LTEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the challenges of teaching long-term English learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Mainstreaming</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the challenges of teaching classes that differ in language needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Peer Support for ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discuss the practice of academically supporting ELs by using ELs' bilingual peers for language support in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Serving High Percentage of ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the challenges the participant has experienced in teaching classes containing a high percentage of ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Tracking ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the academic courses for ELs compared to the courses for their English proficient peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Working with ELs</td>
<td>Using Realia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the teacher's use of &quot;realia&quot;, or live artifacts, as a way to increase learning for ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The strength of people’s convictions in their own effectiveness toward a given situation. Factors that influence self-efficacy: past accomplishments, experiences of others, verbal persuasion from others, and emotions aroused from a given situation (Bandura, 1977).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>New Types of Assessments (Formative)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Instances that discuss effectiveness in academically supporting all students through the use of formative assessments during instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Impact of Co-Assessing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the impact toward academically supporting all students through the process of co-assessing between the mentor and teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Benefits of Collaboration with Other Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the newly learned benefits of collaborating with other teachers, and the potential impact that collaboration has on a teacher's ability to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>2x Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency/Collective</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instances that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students with the presence of a second teacher in the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td>2 Teachers in Room</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students through mentor collaboration with the teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td>Collaboration with Teacher Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students when the mentor engages in the co-teaching process with the teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td>Co-Teaching (General)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students when the mentor puts trust in their co-teaching partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td>Cycle of Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students when participating in a student-outcomes-focused cycle of inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td>Overcoming Problems of Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the increased effectiveness in overcoming problems in one's own instructional practices by participating in the co-teaching model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td>Using Teacher Candidate Suggested Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students when using instructional strategies suggested by the teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td>Lesson Planning with Teacher Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students when the mentor engages in lesson planning with the teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td>Analysis of Assessments with Teacher Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students when the mentor analyzes student assessments with the teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td>Impacts of Planning Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students when the mentor actively engages in planning dialogue prior, or during the lesson planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Current Abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examples that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students when the mentor analyzes student assessments with the teacher candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Current Abilities</td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the teacher's perceived abilities to manage the student behavior during instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Current Abilities</td>
<td>Current Instructional Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the teacher's perceived effectiveness in teaching students using their current instructional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Current Abilities</td>
<td>Perceived Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the teacher's perceived effectiveness in maintaining control of student behavior and student learning during classroom instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Current Abilities</td>
<td>Confidence in Speaking Another Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the teacher's perceived ability to speak another language as a way to support students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Current Abilities</td>
<td>Perceived Ability to Learn New Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Examples that discuss the teacher's perceived ability to learn new types of instructional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Current Abilities</td>
<td>Confidence in Teaching Style</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Example that discusses the teacher's perceived effectiveness in supporting students using their own current style of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency/Collective</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Adapting Lessons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the teacher's confidence in adapting lessons mid-lesson based on student feedback with the goal of meeting the academic needs of all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Using Standards with Lessons Objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the increased effectiveness in academically supporting students by learning curriculum standards and teaching using learning objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Early Struggles with Curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the increased effectiveness in academically supporting students by focusing on only a few standards during a lesson, or during assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Learning Goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the increased effectiveness in academically supporting students when the teacher focuses on a learning goal during a lesson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Impact of Feedback (Giving/Receiving)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss a teacher's increased effectiveness to academically support all students when engaging in a feedback process aimed at improving classroom instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Confidence in Giving Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instances that discuss overall levels of confidence in giving another person feedback on their instructional practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Instructional Change</td>
<td>Trying New Strategies</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students when the mentor tries new types of instructional strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Instructional Change</td>
<td>Time to Implement Practices</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students when the teacher has the time to implement new instructional practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Instructional Change</td>
<td>Permanent Change in Practice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students when permanently changing instructional practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Instructional Change</td>
<td>Reliance on Old Practices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the increased effectiveness in serving students when the mentor relies on old practices when delivering instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Coaching/Mentoring/Leading PD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the growth in one's own teaching abilities through the process of teaching other educators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Collaboration with Another Coach/Mentor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the increased effectiveness in serving all students through collaboration with other teachers serving as mentors/coaches for teacher candidates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Continued Student Support After Mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the increased effectiveness in serving all students through the process of being a mentor for a teacher candidate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Increased Mentor Engagement with Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses one's own increased engagement with all students when mentoring a teacher candidate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>2x Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency/Collective</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instances that discuss increased mentor learning through the process of observing the teacher candidate during instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Observing Teacher Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instance that discusses increased confidence in being observed, and using observation feedback to increase ability to academically support more students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Being Observed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss increased mentor learning through the process of observing student responses while the teacher candidate delivers lesson content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Observing Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Engaging in the Observation Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses increased overall effectiveness in academically supporting all students through lesson learned from the observation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Impact of PD Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the teacher's perceived impact on teaching abilities from participating in professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Time for PD</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the teacher's perceived ability to participate in professional development due to time constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Continuous Opportunities for PD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the teacher's perceived ability to continuously find professional development opportunities to improve their teaching abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Impact of Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the perceived impact of reflecting on one's own instructional practices, and its relation to the teachers' ability to academically support all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Time for Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the teacher's perceived ability to find time to engage with reflective practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Personal Strengths/Weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the perceived ability to see own instructional strengths and weaknesses through self-reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>School Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>School Supports</td>
<td>Impact of Administrator Support for Teacher Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the impact that administrators have on academically supporting students when they support the professional growth of teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting All Students</td>
<td>Confidence in Supporting Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the teacher's perceived effectiveness in their abilities to academically support all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting All Students</td>
<td>Perceived Impact of Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the perceived impacts of the academic supports the teacher uses to support all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting All Students</td>
<td>Teaching Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the teacher's perceived effectiveness in teaching writing to all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting All Students</td>
<td>Student Assignment Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the perceived academic impact when giving students choices in their assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting All Students</td>
<td>Ability in Teaching Mixed Ability Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the teacher's perceived abilities in teaching classes containing students with a range of academic ability levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>2x Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency / Collective</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting All Students</td>
<td>Achieving Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the teacher's perceived effectiveness in creating an equitable learning environment for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting ELs</td>
<td>Ability to Academically Support ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the mentor's perceived abilities to academically support ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting ELs</td>
<td>Early Career Struggles with EL Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the mentor's increased effectiveness in academically supporting students in comparison to their early career struggles in academically supporting ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting ELs</td>
<td>Early Career Training for ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the effectiveness of the EL support training the mentor received early in their careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting ELs</td>
<td>Teaching as an EL</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the effectiveness in serving ELs when the teacher is also an EL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting ELs</td>
<td>International Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the mentor's perceived effectiveness in serving international students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting ELs</td>
<td>Rigor</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the teacher's perceived effectiveness in creating rigorous lessons for ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting ELs</td>
<td>Using Student Language Data (CELDT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the effectiveness in serving ELs when the teacher uses student language data from a school database to plan academic supports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Supporting ELs</td>
<td>Confidence Teaching Migrant Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the teacher's perceived effectiveness in academically supporting migrant students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Teacher Growth</td>
<td>Veterans vs. Novice Teachers' Abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instances that discuss higher perceived abilities of veteran teachers in academically supporting students compared to novice teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Teacher Growth</td>
<td>Increased Patience</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the impact that experience has on increasing one's own patience level with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Teacher Growth</td>
<td>Learning from Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses one's own ability to increase effectiveness in academically supporting students by learning directly from the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Teacher Growth</td>
<td>Learning from Mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses one's ability to improve their own instructional practices by learning from past mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Teacher Growth</td>
<td>Overcoming Outside Classroom Distractions</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instance that discusses the teacher's ability in overcoming outside distractions when delivering direct instruction to the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Category</td>
<td>Code Family</td>
<td>Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>2x Sub-Code Category</td>
<td>Frequency: Collective</td>
<td>Code Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Working with Expert/Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the perceived impacts that working with a university expert within The AL Project had on the teacher's ability to academically support all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Impact of Cycles of Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the perceived impacts that engaging in a student-outcomes-based inquiry cycle had on the teacher's abilities to academically support all students, and ELs in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>The AL Project</td>
<td>Impact of The AL Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the perceived impacts that engaging in The AL Project had on the teacher to academically support all students, and ELs in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the perceived impact that growing years of teaching experience has on their ability to academically support all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>The Teaching Profession</td>
<td>Adapting to Educational Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instances that discuss the perceived ability to adapt to changes in the larger system of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Code created for negative spaces within the interviews that were not coded during any of the rounds of coding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Short/Vague Response to a Direct/Leading Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Responses given by the interviewee that were either generated from an answer influenced by a leading question from the interviewer, or a vague response that could not be applied to any code category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Question/Response Clarification Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dialogue with the intention of clarifying a question asked by the interviewer, or a response given by the interviewee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Casual Dialogue During Question Transitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dialogue that does not address any questions in particular, and occurs in between questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Interview Introduction/ Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dialogue between interviewer and interviewee at either the start or the end of an interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Summarizing Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dialogue in which the interviewee is summarizing a question prior to giving an answer, or the interviewer is summarizing an answer prior to moving on to another question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Response to an Interview Interruption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dialogue with a third party when interviewee is interrupted during the interview process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Brainstorming Ideas During Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Off-topic dialogue initiated by the interviewee in regards to possible ideas for instruction or classroom management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Participant Data Profile Sheets

Teacher #1: Ms. Portillo, Math Teacher
Corazon High School

Survey Trends

Beliefs
Strong positive beliefs toward…
- General teacher capabilities of supporting ELs, and designing curriculum to support ELs
- Importance of personally connecting with ELs, and respecting students’ cultural backgrounds, creating a collaborative classroom

Positive beliefs toward…
- Modifying some assignments for ELs
- Adapting instruction for ELs

Strong disagreement with…
- Simplifying coursework for ELs, lessening the quantity of work for ELs
- Inclusion of ELs creating extra work for teachers

Practices
Strong positive opinions toward…
- Positive impact of engaging with cycle of inquiry, mentoring, co-teaching, co-planning, PLC, working w/consultant, overall impact of participation of The AL Project

Self-Efficacy
Strong feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Abilities to adapt instruction for ELs, learning info about ELs to create success, assessing ELs, personally connecting w/ ELs
- Creating collaborative environment, using increased resources to support ELs

Positive feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Using current class resources to support ELs

Thoughts on Mainstreaming:
Benefits: Bringing opportunities to all students
Challenges: Making students believe they can learn regardless of language limitations

One-on-One Interview Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Instances: 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Instances: 4; Positive: 4, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: All Students- Reaching All Students

- “I want to see their thinking progress.”

2. Instances: 4; Positive: 3, Negative: 1
Sub-Code: All Students- Perceived Skills/Abilities of All Students
- “It’s like I said, all the students are capable to learn, but not all of them in the same way and at the same time.”

3. Instances: 4; Positive: 4, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: All Students- Supporting Students

- “Every single one of them has individual needs.”

4. Instances: 3; Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Teacher Candidate- Teacher Candidate as Resource

- “Then now, having a teacher that is supporting me in the classroom, it’s making me aware of what is new besides me having the opportunity to go to professional development.”

5. Instances: 3; Positive: 1, Negative: 0, Neutral: 2
Sub-Code: The AL Project- Mentor/Teacher Practices

- “I think the best professional development I have ever get, is having a, being a mentor. Being a mentor, because it’s making you aware of my personal needs. What are my personal needs in professional development? What else I need to know? What else I need to develop?”

6. Instances: 3; Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: All Students- Student Growth

- “That’s my main point, the students don’t need to memorize formulas in the class. They need to understand and reason the problems. They can show the process of solving the equation by consecutive additions, subtractions, multiplications, as long as they have the mental process. They can actually develop the mental process.”

7. Instances: 3; Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Teacher Candidate- New Practices from Teacher Candidate

- “She has fresh ideas.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Practices</th>
<th>Total Instances: 59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instances: 6; Positive: 6, Negative: 0</td>
<td>Sub-Code: Working w/ All Students- Supporting Students in Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “She makes recommendations to target very specific needs.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instances: 5; Positive: 5, Negative: 0</td>
<td>Sub-Code: Co-Teaching Model- Co-Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “She has brought to me new ideas of planning and discussing and look for more details that are embedded in the lesson that I didn’t see before.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Instances: 4; Positive: 4, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: New Practices-Vocabulary

- “Key vocabulary that we feel like we need to explain more. What is the target? The learning goal? What is the new vocabulary that must be target? We must be applying them to the lesson.”

4. Instances: 4; Positive: 0, Negative: 0, Neutral: 4
Sub-Code: Professional Development- Attending PD as a Participant

N/A (Example: “I went to a PD at [Name of University].”)

5. Instances: 4; Positive: 4, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: The AL Project- Observation

- “She’s teaching, I’m making my observations, when I’m teaching, she is doing her observations, and then we communicate about what we see.”

6. Instances: 4; Positive: 2, Negative: 0, Neutral: 2
Sub-Code: The AL Project- Reflection

- “You go through the practice and you never realized you said it.”

7. Instances: 3; Positive: 3 Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Supporting Students in the Classroom-Scaffolds

- “Graphic organizers based on co-teaching.”

Code: Self-Efficacy
Total Instances: 38

1. Instances: 10; Positive: 10, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Professional Development-Impact of PD Participation

- “I was thinking, “Okay, I can develop the things that were given to me and make it more understandable for my English learners.”

- “I feel like having that support, the extra time of professional development and new experiences with other people, with other teachers, facing the same struggle, I feel like we are making the growth.”

2. Instances: 5; Positive: 5, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Instructional Change- Trying New Strategies

- “Academic language and development and it has helped me to develop new graphic organizers for the students to develop new language.”
3. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Supporting ELs-Teaching as an EL

- “I have experience for two worlds and always thinking that I’m bringing into my classroom the best of the two worlds.”

Code: Null
Total Instances: 29

Sub-Code

Vague Response to a Direct/Leading Question- Instances: 26

Focus Group Quotes

Beliefs

Mentoring- “We have someone that is watching us, constantly watching us, and we have to be true role models for those student teachers because we want to bring someone into the profession that is in love with the profession, not afraid of the profession. I feel like, we’ve given ourselves the opportunity to be role models for those new teachers, it’s like we are leaving something for someone else.”

Practices

Automatized Practices- “It’s like, it was at some point, it was too routine, always constantly the same thing. Now that she is with me, she asks me things and I need to justify why I’m doing certain things.”

Modeling Teaching- “Just giving ourselves the opportunity to keep on learning, to keep on showing, to keep modeling.”

Self-Efficacy

Growth from Mentoring- “I think to understand this and to see how much you can grow by having this experience, you have to be there. You have to take the opportunity. Because actually, it’s not an increase in work, it’s not, it actually impacts the way we teach.”

Implementation of Academic Supports- “By having someone to co-plan and co-teach and discussing the ideas and bringing new ideas, fresh ideas into our planning, brings you back and gets you excited about what you can get from the students.”

Collaboration- “Having the support of knowing how many ways I can support the students and having the collaboration with the co-teaching has given me, provided me with new ideas and has supported me in developing new materials that I can use to support my students when they are learning new vocabulary.”
### Teacher #2: Ms. Tuscano, Science Teacher  
*Padilla High School*

**Survey Trends**

### Beliefs

Strong positive beliefs toward…
- More academic success when teachers use prior knowledge of ELs
- Increased learning through facilitating a collaborative classroom

Positive beliefs toward…
- Teachers abilities to adapt instruction for ELs, using ELs’ cultural backgrounds for learning, more success with increased connections to ELs,
- Increased learning by helping ELs feel important in classroom, designing instruction to meet needs of ELs
- Positive learning atmosphere for all with EL mainstreaming
- Modifying assignments for ELs (depending on CELDT level), allowing more time on assignments for ELs

Disagreement with…
- Success for all students when class contains ELs (Depends on CELDT level of EL)
- Practice of simplifying coursework for ELs, lessening the quantity of coursework, assigning less coursework

### Practices

Positive opinion toward…
- Positive impact that cycle of inquiry, serving as a mentor, co-teaching, co-planning, PLC, working with consultant, collective elements of *The AL Project* toward abilities to support ELs

Disagreement toward…
- Impact that *The AL Project* had on beliefs toward ELs (depends on level of participants’ experience)

### Self-Efficacy

Strong feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Ability to adapt instruction for ELs

Positive feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Ability to provide language supports, using information on ELs for increased support, assessment use for ELs, create a collaborative class environment, making ELs feel important
- Addressing needs of ELs with increased resources

Disagreement with…
- Ability to establish personal connections with all ELs (some don't want to connect)
- Addressing needs of ELs with current resources

### Thoughts on Mainstreaming

**Benefits:** ELs and Eos can benefit from each others’ cultures

**Challenges:** Sufficient in BICS, but not in CALP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Instances: 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Instances: 11; Positive: 7, Negative: 4

**Sub-Code:** English Learners-Perceived Skills/Abilities of ELs

- “I have very realistic expectations for this population and I don’t want to say that I’m making excuses for them or anything like that, but for me, they’re so smart. I mean, they’re just so amazing.”

- “My kids, they have trouble writing complete sentences, so I have to scaffold this back a little bit.”

2. Instances: 5; Positive: 3, Negative: 2

**Sub-Code:** English Learners-Rigor

- “Okay, so all my students need a higher level rigor and even my English language learners can succeed with that.”

- “I think it’s benefiting them to see the level of rigor and also, like, the fact that there is two people they can go to.”

3. Instances: 4; Positive: 0, Negative: 2, Neutral: 2

**Sub-Code:** All Students- Student Growth

- “I was just like, ‘Oh, my gosh, [Name of Local Tech Company] Science Fair really messed her up.’ So I feel really bad about that.”

4. Instances: 4; Positive: 1, Negative: 2

**Sub-Code:** All Students- Achievement for Students

- “If she can’t speak fluently in her L1, then her L2 learning is gonna also be inhibited.”

5. Instances: 3; Positive: 3, Negative: 0

**Sub-Code:** The Teaching Profession- Collaboration

- “If you’re isolated where no one is teaching the same subject as you, it really sucks. So I think it’s important to find other people.”

6. Instances: 3; Positive: 1, Negative: 2

**Sub-Code:** All Students- Socio-Economic Status

- “She comes from all these seniors from, a more affluent area where the kids all want to learn because they’re motivated to learn because they’re paying for that service that she was doing and so, you know, she has these really high expectations and I have very realistic expectations for this populations.”
7. **Instances:** 3; **Positive:** 1, **Negative:** 2  
**Sub-Code:** PD Elements- Feedback (Giving/Receiving)

- “Longer the time it takes for you to give feedback, the bigger chance that they’re not going to actually look at it. So I think having a student teacher really helps because then, like, it’s a second set of eyes to help me grade and help me, like, give them feedback.”

8. **Instances:** 3; **Positive:** 1, **Negative:** 2  
**Sub-Code:** The Teaching Profession- Views of Teaching

- “Sometimes as a teacher, you’re super busy.”

9. **Instances:** 3; **Positive:** 3, **Negative:** 0  
**Sub-Code:** Teacher Candidate- New Practices from Teacher Candidate

- “She’ll maybe bring up other things that she has learned in class, like new ideas and new methods that she learned in class. So I thought that was really helpful.”

10. **Instances:** 3; **Positive:** 2, **Negative:** 1  
**Sub-Code:** All Students- Supporting Students

- “The quiet students don’t really get that attention because we’re spending so much time with this one kid.”

11. **Instances:** 3; **Positive:** 1, **Negative:** 2  
**Sub-Code:** All Students-High Expectations

- “She has these really high expectations and I have very realistic expectations for this population.”

**Code:** Practices  
**Total Instances:** 65

1. **Instances:** 5; **Positive:** 5, **Negative:** 0  
**Sub-Code:** The AL Project- Working with Experts/Consultants

- “Working with the consultant helped a lot because it’s individualized coaching. I can bring her individual questions and get feedback that I can try with a student.”

2. **Instances:** 5; **Positive:** 5, **Negative:** 0  
**Sub-Code:** Assessment Practices- Formative Assessments

- “Typically you want to use that to see, ‘Okay, most of them got number three wrong, which means that I need to revisit that topic.’”

3. **Instances:** 5; **Positive:** 1, **Negative:** 0, **Neutral:** 4  
**Sub-Code:** Working with ELs- Data Analysis (CELDT)
- “I asked her to look at their levels and see if there is any red flags that we need to watch out for before we met the students and then ongoing we’ll look at their data.”

4. Instances: 3; Positive: 2, Negative: 1  
**Sub-Code:** New Practices-Trying New Practices

- “Were trying to do games and stuff that she saw from her other colleagues in her class.”

5. Instances: 3; Positive: 3, Negative: 0  
**Sub-Code:** Collaborative Practices- District Collaboration

“I have people I can collaborate with and get ideas off of if I’m struggling. So I will probably seek them out more from this experience because I see the benefit of not being by yourself and so isolated in planning.”

6. Instances: 3; Positive: 3, Negative: 0  
**Sub-Code:** The AL Project- Co-Teaching Model-Co-Teaching

- “I like looking at the student work and also the whole co-teaching model itself. We’re forced to co-plan together so we’re forced to think about the kids who are slipping through the cracks.”

7. Instances: 3; Positive: 1, Negative: 0, Neutral: 2  
**Sub-Code:** Working with All Students- Supporting Students in Classroom- Writing Strategies

- “We want them to write it and then we collect the lab notebook.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Self-Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Instances: 47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Instances: 5; Positive: 5, Negative: 0  
**Sub-Code:** Co-Teaching- 2 Teachers in Room

- “If I didn’t have the second set of eyes, I wouldn’t have known to, like less students slip through the cracks.”

2. Instances: 3; Positive: 3, Negative: 0  
**Sub-Code:** Co-Teaching- Cycle of Inquiry

- “When you have 170 students, you have 36 kids in everyone of your lab classes. It’s really hard to give them individualized feedback and immediate feedback.”

3. Instances: 3; Positive: 3, Negative: 0  
**Sub-Code:** Professional Development- Impact of PD Participation

- “So because of all the professional development that I’ve received, I have more toolboxes, more tools in my toolbox to try different things.”
4. Instances: 3; Positive: 2, Negative: 1
Sub-Code: Instructional Change-Trying New Strategies

- “So we were trying to do games and stuff that she saw from her other colleagues in her class. That was really helpful.”

5. Instances: 3; Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: The Teaching Profession-Teaching Experience

- “The more times you get to practice it, the better off you are. After so many years of teaching, you can see, ‘Okay, that kid probably needs this strategy to reach them’.”

6. Instances: 3; Positive: 1, Negative: 2
Sub-Code: Instructional Change-Time to Implement Practices

- “When you have 36 kids in everyone of your lab classes, it’s really hard to give them individualized feedback and immediate feedback.”

Code: Null
Total Instances: 21

Sub-Code

Vague Response to a Direct/Leading Question-Instances: 14

Focus Group Quotes: Ms. Tuscano

Beliefs

Perceptions of ELs-“You get around people in your department who are like, ‘Oh, they can’t do this because they’re English language learners and this is their limit’. It’s like, ‘No that’s not their limit.’”

Practices

Assessment-“It’s a second pair of eyes to grade every essay, every lab report, every conclusion paragraph, every exit ticket. Like, I graded them this way, why did you grade them so hard? Or why did you grade them easier? And we can have that discussion and like, I’m going to try to do that with my department more.

Self-Efficacy

Using Assessment-“Now I’m able to go back and change things and use assessment as it should be used, which is to guide future instruction.”
Teacher #3: Ms. Johnson, English Teacher  
Goodger High School  
Survey Trends

Beliefs
Strong positive beliefs toward…
- Teachers being capable of adapting instruction for ELs, increased EL success w/ prior knowledge activation, teacher creation of a collaborative classroom, helping ELs feel important in classroom

Positive beliefs toward…
- Increasing EL learning through use of cultural background, increased teacher/student connections, collaboration with EL and EO, curriculum design matching needs of ELs, EL inclusion creates positive atmosphere for all
- Teachers do not having enough time to address needs of ELs

Disagreement with…
- Simplifying work for ELs, lessen coursework for ELs, more time on assignments for ELs
- Increased workload with EL inclusion (believes it done not increase workload)

Practices
Positive opinion toward…
- Cycle of inquiry, mentoring, co-teaching, co-planning, PLC, working with consultant, participation in *The AL Project* and positive impact on practices

Disagreement toward…
- *The AL Project* impacting beliefs toward ELs (always believed in EL abilities, but not sure how to accommodate in a college prep class)

Self-Efficacy
Strong feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Assessing ELs, using ELs culture for meaningful learning, creating collaborative atmosphere, making ELs feel important

Positive feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Capable of adapting instruction for ELs, providing supports for ELs, using information on ELs (struggles with how to get info to use)
- Addressing EL needs with increased resources
- *The AL Project* participation led to increased confidence

Strong disagreement with…
- Addressing EL needs with current resources

Thoughts on Mainstreaming
**Benefits:** Classrooms reflect diversity of communities  
**Challenges:** Supporting EL rigor in college prep course if student has low levels of English

One-on-One Interview Trends: Ms. Johnson
**Code: Beliefs**

**Total Instances: 35**

1. **Instances: 6; Positive: 3, Negative: 3**
   **Sub-Code:** English Learners-Rigor

   - “I struggle very much with the accommodations. With how to establish a balance between the needs of the students who are not yet working at the level according to the standards, whichever standards you want to use, California State, Common Core, whatever. How do you accommodate their needs and still maintain, the rigor that in my mind, needs to exist for a college prep class?”

   - My paradigm is if you are getting an A in my class, you should be able to succeed academically, with the English skills in any university. If you’re getting a B, you can handle the UC’s, it’ll be a little more challenging. If you’re getting a C, CSU is where you can find success. If you’re getting a D, community college, you need to build up some basic skills. That really drives my expectations.”

   - “I really don’t think having kids draw posters is the best approach to critical thinking. I really don’t.”

   - “I don’t think that it does anybody any favors to make things so simple that there’s no growth, but I don’t know where the line is.”

2. **Instances: 4; Positive: 0, Negative: 4**
   **Sub-Code:** Instructional Changes-Unwillingness to Change

   - “I’m probably the worst person to talk to about change, just because it’s not my happy place.”

   - “If you’re going to do something new, that means something old has to go away. If I’m going to replace something old with something new, it really better be good.”

   - “I’m a little stubborn, but I think more importantly I want to believe that what I’m doing is legitimate, is authentic. I don’t want to do something just because somebody else says it is a good idea. I need to understand why it’s a good idea. So if I don’t appreciate the value of it, I’m not doing it, unless you make me, but even if you make me, I might not do it.”

3. **Instances: 3; Positive: 3, Negative: 0**
   **Sub-Code:** All Students- Supporting Students

   - “My goal isn’t every student will get an A. My goal is every student will improve.”

**Code: Practices**

**Total Instances: 38**

1. **Instances: 4; Positive: 4, Negative: 0**
   **Sub-Code:** The AL Project- Observations
- “Observing someone take a different approach probably helps me either evaluate and reinforce my reasons for doing what I do, or evaluate and reconsider what I do.”

- “I suppose seeing the same lesson as an observer, because she’s actually been lead teaching for most of the semester and it’s kind of fantastic. It gives me the opportunity to observe what I can’t observe when I’m the lead teacher.”

2. Instances: 3; Positive: 2, Negative: 1
Sub-Code: Changes in Practice- Breaking Routines

- “If I see that become a meaningful activity, then I would consider adding that to mine as well.”

3. Instances: 3; Positive: 2, Negative: 1

- “I do change things. I know it sounds like I don’t, but I do change things.”

- “I don’t want to do something just because somebody else says it is a good idea. I need to understand why it’s a good idea. So if I don’t appreciate the value of it, I’m not doing it, unless you make me, but even if you make me, I might not do it.”

4. Instances: 3; Positive, 3 Negative: 0
Sub-Code: The AL Project- Reflection

- “Self-reflection, I’m always reflecting, but doing something about it is more likely to happen with a witness.”

| Code: Self-Efficacy |
| Total Instances: 29 |

1. Instances: 8; Positive: 4, Negative: 4
Sub-Code: Instructional Change-Trying New Strategies

- “When I work with teacher candidates, then I do think it makes me more aware of the big steps I tend to take.”

- “I do think it has helped me to consider breaking things down into smaller bits. I’m that’s not a strength of mine. I’m better at big steps. So I do think working with the teacher candidates has pushed me to think about breaking things down into component parts and I’m not good at that yet, but I’m definitely better than I used to be.”

2. Instances: 6; Positive: 1, Negative: 5
Sub-Code: Supporting All Students: Perceived Impact of Supports

- “I do have a concern that it may be limiting for kids who want to go in a different direction with the response.”
3. Instances: 4; Positive: 0, Negative: 4
Sub-Code: Instructional Change- Time to Implement Practices

- “I really like the idea of the inquiry cycle. Although, I have to admit that I end up focusing more on the cycle for the student teacher and not doing it myself. I’m thinking maybe I should be doing it myself. But you know, time. Having the time.”

4. Instances: 3; Positive: 0, Negative: 3
Sub-Code: Supporting ELs-Ability to Academically Support ELs

- “I struggle with how to establish a balance between, the needs of students who are not ready for the language I’m using, and the need to continue to build that language.”

**Code: Null**
**Total Instances: 24**

**Sub-Code**

Vague Response to a Direct/Leading Question- Instances: 12
Casual Dialogue During Question Transitions- Instances: 5

**Focus Group Quotes: Ms. Johnson**

**Practices**

Reflecting on Practice- “I do think the program forces you to be, more thoughtful about what you’re doing, more explicit about your rationale and that can only lead to either clarity of purpose or the understanding that there are things that need to be revisited and revised.”

Reflecting on Practice- “Hearing someone who is an adult, even, not understand what I’m trying to say, made me revisit my approach with the students and think about how maybe I took some big steps where I needed to take, maybe, a step back, even.”

**Self-Efficacy**

Two Teachers in the Room- “One of the best things about working with another person is that I have another individual in the room to help zero in on those quieter students, those less obvious issues. And so, just being able to hear somebody else say, “Hey, have you noticed so-and-so struggling?” It’s invaluable.”

Understanding Needs of ELs- “I think, instead of maybe changing my views, helping me consider more broadly how I need to approach my EL students.”
**Teacher #4: Ms. Barbera, English Teacher**  
**Carlson High School**

### Survey Trends

#### Beliefs
Stronng positive beliefs toward…
- Teachers capabilities to adapt instruction for ELs, create academic success for ELs, using elements of students’ cultural backgrounds, use prior knowledge of students in lessons, facilitate a collaborative classroom, modeling classroom tasks for ELs, help all students to feel important
- ELs create a positive education atmosphere

Positive beliefs toward…
- Giving more coursework time for ELs

Disagreement toward…
- Idea that teachers don't have enough time to support ELs
- Simplifying coursework, lessen coursework, modify assignments

Strong disagreement toward…
- Giving ELs less coursework than Eos
- ELs increase workload of teacher

#### Practices
Strong positive feelings toward…
- Positive impact of cycle of inquiry, mentoring, co-teaching, co-planning, PLC, working with consultant
- *The AL Project* had positive impact on teacher practices

Positive feelings toward…
- *The AL Project*’s impact on beliefs (always believed in ELs…nice to be with “like minds”)

#### Self-Efficacy
Strong feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Capable of meeting needs of ELs, adapt lessons for ELs, use ELs’ cultural backgrounds, connect with ELs, have a collaborative classroom, help ELs feel important
- Address needs of ELs with increased resources
- *The AL Project* increased confidence in supporting ELs

Positive feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Assess ELs
- Address needs of ELs with current resources

Strong disagreement with…

#### Thoughts on Mainstreaming
**Benefits:** ELs valued as part of learning community, not separated
**Challenges:** Increasing student confidence (shy and quiet)
## One-on-One Interview Trends: Ms. Barbera

### Code: Beliefs

**Total Instances:** 66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instances</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Code:</strong></td>
<td>Professional Development- The AL Project- Views of PD- Effective PD/Trainings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I can’t do staff development when I’m doing like, so many other things during my day, I’m drained. And it has to be my, what I want, what I need as a teacher.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I really like being a part of the AL program. I like knowing that I’m going to be at the university a couple of times through the year. I leave the work behind, I get to focus, and I get to plan. We get to focus versus, ‘Okay, so I’ve had my work day, I’ve had to get grades in, now you want me over there doing two hours or two and a half hours of staff development?’ My mind’s not there.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “It (PD) has to be a topic I’m interested in. Something I can see in my classroom, that’s meaningful to me.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Everything (PD at site) is rushed and I feel like sometimes it’s just a check mark. ‘Oh, we did that for the staff. We did that.’”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Code:</strong></td>
<td>Teacher Candidate- Teacher Candidate as a Resource</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “It’s cool to know about current practices, what’s happening now in 2016.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Having that time just to talk with her (about new lesson ideas) and then bringing that idea into the class the next day.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Code:</strong></td>
<td>All Students- Supporting Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Even though I only have twenty-two designated EL and a lot of them re-designated, I feel like, you know, anything can help benefit the kids.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “We want to meet everybody. Not one person’s going to fall behind.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Code:</strong></td>
<td>The Teaching Profession- Supplementary Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “This book, [book title], doesn’t teach writing. You can’t rely on one thing to do everything.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “The textbook writers would give you a guide or, ‘Do this first and then this second’ and I’m like, ‘Well, it doesn’t thematically match’. It’s kind of bits and pieces, and it wasn’t enough.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Code:</strong></td>
<td>The Teaching Profession- Views of Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“It’s more than just a job, it’s your career and it’s always on your mind. Even in the summer, it’s always on your mind.”

6. Instances: 4: Positive: 4, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Professional Development- PD Elements- Co-Teaching

- “I decided I think the only way to teach English is with another English teacher in the classroom. That was my conclusion. We really need two teachers in the room.”

- “Two teachers in the room are most effective.”

7. Instances: 3: Positive: 1, Negative: 2
Sub-Code: English Learners- Perceived Skills/Abilities of ELs- AP/Advanced vs. EL

- “I try to be, yeah, very visual with the kids and I’ve changed, this year, how I approach vocabulary with all of my students, except for AP.”

8. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: English Learners- Perspectives of ELs- Views on EL Writing

- “They need to see good writing.”

Code: Practices
Total Instances: 87

1. Instances: 8: Positive: 8, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Working with All Students- Supporting Students in Classroom

- “I take into consideration, you know, their individual needs. I use lots of graphic organizers, and just in terms of strategies, I try to be very clear, doing lots of check for understandings, walking around, and talking to the kids. You know, questions up on the board, visuals, I try to be very visual with the kids. I’ve changed, this year on how I approach vocabulary with all of my students.”

- “Pulling somebody aside in that moment while the rest of the kids are not waiting or being lost and there’s no pause in class, and the class can still keep moving.”

2. Instances: 8: Positive: 8, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: The AL Project- Reflection

- “Just reflecting with some students in mind. I used to reflect by myself at the end of each day, but it was never about students, it was about me.”

- “It’s always on your mind (teaching). You’re, you know, shopping, “Oh, I can do that for my classroom, I can bring that in. How cool would that be?” It’s always there.”
3. Instances: 7: Positive: 7, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Co-Teaching Model- Co-Teaching

- “There is a two-teacher presence in opposite sides of the room. I’m like, ‘Oh yeah, and also this’. So you’ve got the kids engaged and kind of looking back and forth, they’re raising their hands, and I felt it was just a very natural conversation.”

4. Instances: 7: Positive: 7, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Assessment Practices- Assessment

- “I remember just getting this really wise insight of, you know, why don’t you have, you know, grade for two different things? Have the written communication grade and then have your knowledge grade, the content.”

- “I give students the chance to revise (tests/writing).”

- “I will officially grade them on the rubric and then we make time for writing conferences.”

5. Instances: 5: Positive: 5, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Co-Teaching Model- Co-Planning

- “Co-planning, sometimes I’ll, she’s like, ‘Oh, we can, you know, bring this in’ and I’m like, ‘Oh, I didn’t think about that’.”

6. Instances: 4: Positive: 2, Negative: 0 Neutral: 2
Sub-Code: Working with All Students- Supporting Students in Classroom: Technology Use

- “I’m going to make it a point to use the Smart Board more by putting more information there, especially instructions.”

7. Instances: 3: Positive: 1, Negative: 1, Neutral: 1
Sub-Code: School District- District Supports

- “We have an instructional coach here, he’s new to the position, and so he’ll come in and observe class, so I’ve been working with him about once a month and he’ll come and observe and give me some feedback. You know, using, we’ve been using, you know, videos to enhance our reading.”

8. Instances: 3: Positive: 1, Negative: 0, Neutral: 2

- “More think, pair-shares.”

9. Instances: 3: Positive: 1, Negative: 0, Neutral: 2
Sub-Code: Changes in Practice- New Practices: Vocabulary

- “So the students have a notebook and in the back of their notebook is their vocabulary work, where they write down the word, where they got it from, they write down the sentence where
they saw it or where they heard it, they provide the definition and they do some kind of illustrations, so it’s the back of their book, and I will give them quizzes on words they found.”

10. Instances: 3: Positive: 1, Negative: 1, Neutral: 0
Sub-Code: School Supports- School Supports for ELs- Support Programs
- “I also deviated a little bit from the, this program that we were forced to teach.”

11. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: The AL Project- Reflective Dialogue
- “The reflective dialogue, it helps, for me, with self-reflection.”

12. Instances: 3: Positive: 2, Negative:0 Neutral: 1
Sub-Code: Working with All Students- Supporting Students in Classroom-Writing Strategies
- “Give them a lower sample and have them turn it into that A or turn it into that four on the rubric. Giving them opportunities to fix their writing. I do a lot of modeling aloud.”

13. Instances: 3: Positive: 0, Negative: 3
Sub-Code: Professional Development- School Mandated PD
- “I get, at my school, specified professional development, whatever they say, I do.”
- “I feel, sometimes, things are forced on us.”

Code: Self-Efficacy
Total Instances: 71

1. Instances: 8: Positive: 2, Negative: 6
Sub-Code: Professional Development- Time for PD
- “There’s just too much going on in the day and I can’t. You have to compartmentalize all of these different experiences you have (during the day), and now you want me to sit and focus?”
- “Our last professional development was Special Ed training and discussed resources to use. I just didn’t have enough time to look at something in depth because all of this information was thrown at me, ‘You can do this, this, this’ and I’m like, ‘Wait, step back’.”

2. Instances: 7: Positive: 7, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Instructional Change- Trying New Strategies
- “This is, this year, this is my fifteenth year of teaching, I’m like, ‘You know what, I’m going to do something different’.”

3. Instances: 7: Positive: 7, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Co-Teaching-2 Teachers in Room
- “Two teachers in the room is most effective.”
- “Having that ability to just sit and talk to the teacher, ‘Tell me what you understand and now tell me what you don’t understand’. Just fostering, communication, not with just one individual in the room, a second individual too. You have help when you need it.”

4. Instances: 6: Positive: 0, Negative: 6
Sub-Code: Instructional Change- Time to Implement Practices

- “It’s hard. I wish I had more time.”

5. Instances: 6: Positive: 6, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Current Abilities- Classroom Management

- “I don’t have discipline problems.”

- “Sometimes you can just totally misinterpret something, you think you’ve seen this before, you already know in your head, versus talking to them or, ‘Hey, what’s going on? Let’s talk outside. Here, tell me what’s going on’. Just having that ability to, you know, kind of, again, meet their needs in the moment.”

6. Instances: 6: Positive: 6, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Supporting All Students- Confidence in Supporting Students

- “There’s so many kids and I could easily let a couple of them fall behind, and I’m not going to do that.”

7. Instances: 4: Positive: 3, Negative: 0 Neutral: 1
Sub-Code: Professional Development- Impact of PD Participation

- “Wow, all of my students can use this.”

- “I felt empowered that other people are seeing that things weren’t perfect and I felt as if I was getting more experience.”

8. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Co-Teaching- Analysis of Assessments with Teacher Candidate

- “Splitting the grading, then going through it, getting our feedback, and handing it back faster. So, getting students the feedback they need in a more timely manner.”

9. Instances: 3: Positive: 2, Negative: 1
Sub-Code: Supporting All Students- Teaching Writing

- “What my struggles were, it was with the writing.”

- “I wasn’t devaluing their ideas because they have this huge run-on sentence.”
**Focus Group Quotes: Ms. Barbera**

**Beliefs**

**Perceptions of ELs** - “I’ve always had, you know, faith in my EL students, but this experience has really impacted my, you know, positive views of the students.”

**PLC** - “It’s nice having support outside your school district by working with smart, intelligent, like-minded people.”

**Self-Efficacy**

**Two Teachers in Room** - “There’s this different source of comfort in the room knowing the students can come to one of two teachers. Just having another set of eyes in the room to zone in and if there’s a student of concern, you can deal with it right away.”

**Teacher #5: Ms. Margaret, Science Teacher**  
**Leadbetter High School**

**Survey Trends**

**Beliefs**

Strong positive beliefs toward…
- Teachers can create EL academic success when teacher uses students’ prior knowledge, helping, make ELs feel important member of class
- Develop lesson to increase EL learning

Positive beliefs toward…
- Teacher capabilities of adapting instruction (requires training/coaching)
- Teachers are capable of creating success with ELs
- Increased learning with student/teacher connection, creating collaborative classrooms, facilitate collaboration with ELs and EOs
- Not enough time for teachers to meet needs of ELs
- ELs increase workload

Disagreement toward…
- Creating student success using students’ cultural backgrounds (not important in science compared to other content areas)
- ELs inclusion creates positive learning environment (depends of CELDT level)
- Simplifying coursework for ELs, lesson quantity of coursework for ELs, modify assignments for ELs, give less coursework
Practices
Strong positive feelings toward...
- Cycle of inquiry

Positive feelings toward...
- Mentoring, co-teaching, co-planning, *The AL Project* has positive impact on practices

Disagreement with...
- PLC (not change what already doing), work with consultant (duplication of current practices), *The AL Project* changed beliefs (already believed)

Self-Efficacy
Strong feelings of self-efficacy toward...
- Language supports lead to increased EL learning

Positive feelings of self-efficacy toward...
- Adapting instruction for ELs, use data on ELs for more success, assessing ELs
- Help ELs feel important
- Address needs of ELs with current resources and increased resources

Disagreement with...
- Connect with all ELs (only some)
- *The AL Project* impacted confidence with ELs (Already in place)

Thoughts on Mainstreaming
Benefits: Same environment as the world outside the classroom
Challenges: Engaging students and preventing EL frustration, especially with large class sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-on-One Interview Trends: <em>Ms. Margaret</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Code:</strong> Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Instances:</strong> 74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Instances:** 6: **Positive:** 6, **Negative:** 0  
Sub-Code: Teacher Candidate- Teacher Candidate as Resource

- “My student teacher will be better at some things than I am, and that’s awesome. I want to celebrate that, I’m going to learn the heck out of that, and take it with me.”

2. **Instances:** 6: **Positive:** 4, **Negative:** 1, **Neutral:** 1  
Sub-Code: All Students- Supporting Students

- “Again I think it’s more of an overall need, that students have, they need to be individualized and listened to and we need to figure out where each one of them needs a little bit of tweaking. Its pretty Utopian to say that you can do that.”

- “It’s my job to teach you to understand that you’re right. Instead of giving you an answer and a pat on the head.”
3. **Instances: 6**  
**Positive: 5, Negative: 1**  
**Sub-Code:** English Learners- Perceived Skills/Abilities of ELs

- “(EL student said) ‘They (teachers) think I (EL student) am stupid because I can not tell them things, and because my accent is very thick.’ And I thought ‘You know, that’s, that’s a little bit of a heartbreak, let’s see if we can’t work something out so that you are valued for what you can do’. I may not be able to control it everywhere else, but I can control that in my own class. I can control that, ‘you are not stupid children because you don’t speak English, you just need a different avenue to get there’.”

- “I think sometimes we over support and then we don’t realize we’re over supporting. They (EL students) will tell you because they’re smart, especially high schoolers, ‘I purposefully do not do well on the CELDT so I can be in a sheltered class because they’re easier.’ They know that a sheltered class is going to go slower; it’s going to be much easier for them to understand. They don’t need the language support, they just want an easier class.”

- “Having taught in two languages, having taught different things, I have to still come back to, is it just really good instruction? Versus, is it focused on EL? If I am just showing word origins, and all those kinds of things, isn’t that good for everybody? Learning how to do syntax, teenagers need syntax badly. They need to know how to put words together, because have you heard them talk? They are not credible in their speech patterns. So it’s not a bad idea to give it to them, to everybody.”

4. **Instances: 5**  
**Positive: 5, Negative: 0**  
**Sub-Code:** Personal and/or Professional Growth- Teaching Experiences

- “I think you learn from every experience.”

- “I do know that I’m lucky to have had elementary school experience because that has really taught sheltered.”

- “So when you come from that environment, that’s your first experience, those tend to stick. And so I’m really fortunate because I’ve had, I went from preschool up.”

5. **Instances: 5**  
**Positive: 4, Negative: 1**  
**Sub-Code:** Professional Development- PD Elements- Instructional Observations

- “We’re always a little bit on our, you know we may comb our hair a little bit better, we may be a little bit better behaved, just because someone’s watching. And so when someone’s watching you tend to do your best.”

6. **Instances: 5**  
**Positive: 3, Negative: 2**  
**Sub-Code:** Professional Development- PD Elements- Opportunities for Reflection

- “When you’re mentoring, you have to be transparent about what you’re doing and in fact if you have a good student teacher they’re questioning, ‘Well why did you do that? What was that about?’ It makes you much more reflective about your own practice.”
“Mentoring is a reflective process not only for the students that you’re mentoring.”

“I think we are, we’re forcing reflections these days. I think they’re much more forced than they used to be. Where while I think it’s a really good idea to look at your practice. Making it so formal, makes it not a very friendly thing.”

7. Instances: 5: Positive: 3, Negative: 2
Sub-Code: Professional Development- The AL Project-Views of PD- Effective PD/Trainings

“A lot of times when I go to PDs, the instructors are where I am. These guys were light years above where I am, so I had something to lookup at and across. So they weren’t just colleagues. They really just became instructors. It gets really collegial right now to do PD.”

“Please don't make me do something that I will feel like rolling my eyes at, because I don’t want to be an eye-roller in a PD. I don't want to have to sit there and go, ‘Oh my god, really, you are going to make us do that’?”

8. Instances: 4: Positive: 4, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: All Students- EL Strategies for All Students

“I think sheltered teaching in some respects is just really good teaching. No one, no English language child, has ever been harmed by sheltered instruction. If anything it’s been enhanced.”

9. Instances: 4: Positive: 4, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Teacher Candidate- Instructional Transparency

“Well I think it’s always a transparency piece. I will continue to do mentoring and modeling, because that’s just, because I enjoy doing it. You know you have to like it and you have to be willing to fumble the ball.”

“When you’re mentoring, you have to be transparent about what you’re doing.”

10. Instances: Positive: 4, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Professional Development- PD Elements- The Mentoring Process

“You become much more reflective when you’re mentoring.”

11. Instances: 3: Positive: 2, Negative: 1
Sub-Code: English Learners- Supporting ELs

“(Asking ELs) ‘How are you feeling about this? How are you learning this?’ Then put some supports in when it’s needed. Not starting off with those supports, because, ‘oh you’re an English language learner, so here’s several more sentence frames that you must use....’”

12. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Personal and/or Professional Growth- Teacher Learning
- “It doesn’t stop, the learning never stops. The reflecting never stops. You always can get better. I don’t think anybody can say they’re there.”

- “There’s always stuff to learn…I’ve got pie in the sky and can find something out of everything. I always do.”

13. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: The Teaching Profession- Views of Teaching

- “Everything that you plan has to be about them (students).”

14. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Professional Development- PD Elements- Co-Teaching

- “When someone comes into your classroom, it’s like, you’re sharing closet space. So it’s a little humbling.”

- “It’s much more of a gradual release, the student teacher that comes in and takes over two classes, boom, like here’s two classes, good luck, and I’ll be in the back when you need me, is a little bit more abrupt. It’s too abrupt for the kids.”

15. Instances: 3: Positive: 2, Negative: 1
Sub-Code: English Learners- Perceived Skills/Abilities of ELs- AP/Advanced vs. EL

- “I worked a lot with the gifted kids, and realized that that differentiation piece isn’t just for gifted kids, it’s for any kind of different learner.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Practices</th>
<th>Total Instances: 61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instances: 4: Positive: 4, Negative: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub-Code: The AL Project- Reflection

- “You become much more reflective when you’re mentoring.”

- “When you’re mentoring, you have to be transparent about what you’re doing and in fact if you have a good student teacher they’re questioning, ‘Well why did you do that? What was that about?’ It makes you much more reflective about your own practice.”

2. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Changes in Practice- New Practices- Vocabulary

- “I pace it differently. I annunciate different. I do more vocabulary development because I don’t have a choice. But most of the vocabulary is embedded.”

3. Instances: 3: Positive: 2, Negative: 1
Sub-Code: Changes in Practice- Early Career Practices
“My first experience teaching English language learners was in a “sheltered” class. They had mainstreamed all of the ELD 1s, 2s and 3s, so about one third of the class spoke no English at all, that was my very first experience with it.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Self-Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Instances: 46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Instances: 8: Positive: 8, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: The Teaching Profession- Teaching Experience

- “I know pretty much where they’re (students) going at this point, because I’ve been doing this for a long time.”

- “Every experience puts more in my toolbox.”

- “The nice thing about being in this part of my career is I can try it and fail miserably at it and know that I can pick it up the next day. That didn’t work, here’s another, let’s try something else, and know that that’s not going to be the end. When you first start out, you know some of the first lessons that I did, I’m still remembering dirt flying all over the place, and there were worms and there were all these crazy things that I thought were really important. And it was a nightmare because I didn’t know how to control it. Now I can go back and do that same lesson again and do it well, and not have the chaos that. The chaos that took away from the learning. So that comes with just years and learning to do it over again differently.”

2. Instances: 6: Positive: 6, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Supporting All Students- Confidence Supporting All Students

- “There’s certain things that we’re aware of, and there’s certain questions that you’ve developed over the years to, learn where was that kids misperception.”

3. Instances: 5: Positive: 5, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Co-Teaching- 2 Teachers in Room

- “When we do a release to class, so if I’m doing directions and I do a release to class, there’s an extra set of eyes, an extra set of people to ask or to redirect or to also find.”

- “Because and another adult’s perspective, or sometimes they’ll catch what you miss and you’ve just been doing it so long, you don’t even know you’re missing it.”

4. Instances: 4: Positive: 3, Negative: 1
Sub-Code: Supporting ELs- Early Career Struggles with EL Instruction

- “So the most difficult thing, was trying to figure out, I taught some elementary, at the very beginning of my career, I taught pull out elementary. It was the only way I knew how to teach. And I found out that that translated very easily to sheltered English teaching.”

- “I couldn’t figure out why the kids were quiet, like not responding, until I code switched and did something in Spanish and then discovered that, ‘oh, I now have a responsive bunch of kids,”
so perhaps I should be trying this in two languages’.”

5. Instances: 3  Positive: 3, Negative: 0  
**Sub-Code:** The AL Project - Working with Expert/Consultant

- “They said, ‘From your point of view, you are looking at this.’ So they were able to go where I was, and take me up. They went to me and went up. So they took me where I was and moved me up the scale” (Discussing a previous PD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Null</th>
<th>Total Instances: 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question/Response Clarification Dialogue- Instances: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Quotes: Ms. Margaret</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentoring</strong>—“So, I think one of the, any time you’re working with mentors and co-teachers, they bring a sense of what you may have forgotten about your own practice.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Perceptions of ELs—“I think you’d be hard pressed to say that it changed my mind about how I thought about my students. This is decades of rodeos going on here in terms of my beliefs that they can do things. They constantly surprise you.” |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automatized Practices</strong>—“You know, you get to a point in this profession, I’m speaking for me. I’ve come to a point where I’m starting to do things just because they’re there, they’re almost innate at this point.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Transparency of Practice—“I think the transparency of our practice when you’re working as a mentor teacher, because there’s a lot of things that I’ve never been challenged on. “Why did you do that?” And I’m thinking, “Huh?” You know, “Why did you work with that student that way and this student that way?” And so, I might’ve done something a little bit different in terms of; you know, piecing language for an EL student or pushing another student harder and being really transparent about why I’m doing that.” |

| Mentoring—“As we age, or as we twilight in our careers, looking to give back and to kind of go viral with the strong feelings, the strong, positive feelings we have about what kids really can do.” |

---

**Teacher #6: Ms. Douglas, Math Teacher  
Elise Middle School**

**Survey Trends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong positive beliefs toward…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teachers can create academic success in classes with ELs, using students cultural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
backgrounds to increase learning, increase learning with student prior knowledge, increase student/teacher connections increases student learning, create collaborative classroom
- Classroom collaboration with ELs, make ELs feel important in class, design instruction that matches needs of EL
- ELs create positive education atmosphere

Positive beliefs toward…
- Teachers area capable of adapting instruction to support ELs
- Believes ELs increase teacher work load ("That's just how it is.")

Disagreement toward…
- Simplifying work for ELs, lessen quantity of work, give less coursework for ELs
- Teachers do not have enough time to teach ELs (Believes teachers do have time)

Practices
Strong positive feelings toward…
- Impact of PLC

Positive feelings toward…
- Cycle of inquiry, mentoring, co-teaching, co-planning, working with consultant

Disagreement with…
- The AL Project impact on beliefs ("Already had the belief")

Self-Efficacy
Strong feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Adapt instruction for language support, Assess EL learning, use EL backgrounds for learning, connect with ELs
- Create collaborative classroom environment, help ELs feel important

Positive feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Capable of adapting instruction to meet ELs, use data on ELs to improve learning
- Address needs of ELs with current resources and increased resources
- The AL Project improved confidence with ELs

Thoughts on Mainstreaming
Benefits: ELs benefit from being around students fluent in English and FEP students benefit from SDAIE strategies
Challenges: Language levels may lead to translation issues

---

One-on-One Interview Trends: Ms. Douglas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Instances: 35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Instances: 6: Positive: 2, Negative: 4

Sub-Code: All Students- Supporting Students
- “I think we’re very limited.”
- “I believe that what we need to do to support English learners, is good teaching, it’s what we need to do to support everybody. So I mean I think if you’re doing a good job teaching your EL students, everybody benefits.”

3. **Instances: 3**  
**Positive: 0, Negative: 2, Neutral: 1**  
**Sub-Code:** All Students - Student Abilities in Math

- “So that’s really hard for kids who have language issues. I definitely think that’s [Common Core] been a big change over time. It used to be that everybody could do math, because there’s no words in it. Now there are more words than anything else.”

4. **Instances: 3**  
**Positive: 3, Negative: 0**  
**Sub-Code:** The Teaching Profession - Collaboration

- “An opportunity at a professional level, to talk to other people who are in the same place, is you know, it’s priceless.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Practices</th>
<th>Total Instances: 61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> <strong>Instances: 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive: 5, Negative: 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Code:</strong> The AL Project - Cycle of Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “The inquiry cycles I think have been really useful in giving us that opportunity to try something, test it and reflect on it. That just doesn’t happen in daily teaching.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> <strong>Instances: 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive: 3, Negative: 0, Neutral: 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Code:</strong> Co-Teaching Model - Co-Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “As we’re planning lessons, or as we’re debriefing what she’s done, talking about the way that her lesson is working or not working with the different students. I think, just having to be aware of that and having to talk through that with her, brings that awareness for me, in my head, brings it to a higher level.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> <strong>Instances: 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive: 3, Negative: 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Code:</strong> Working with All Students-Supporting Students in Classroom - Claims/Evidence/Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “It has become part of their vocabulary about how we work. And so that’s certainly something that is permanent in my lexicon of teaching.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Total Instances: 46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> <strong>Instances: 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive: 5, Negative: 0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sub-Code: Reflection- Impact of Reflection**

- “I think it makes it much more likely that I’m going to put my attention there and that I’m going to do a better job.”

2. **Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0**

**Sub-Code: Co-Teaching- Impacts of Planning Dialogue**

- “Having the time to talk about what exactly would constitute success and how are we going to get there, what’s the pathway? I think that’s really been beneficial, and that’s certainly something that’s going to stick, regardless of whether I have a student teacher or not.”

4. **Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0**

**Sub-Code: Reflection- Time for Reflection**

- “I think we have so little time to reflect and have conversations in education. I think anytime we have the opportunity to do that, it helps.”

**Code: Null**

**Total Instances: 5**

**Sub-Code**

**Short/Vague Response to a Direct/Leading Question: 3**

---

**Focus Group Quotes: Ms. Douglas**

**Beliefs**

**Existing Positive Perceptions of ELs-** “I think we’re all saying the same thing, that we all had the belief, like our beliefs haven’t changed.”

**Practices**

**Automated Practices-** “I think it is easy to be lazy, it’s easy to just phone it in, and so anytime we push ourselves to really focus on something, I think we do so much better. ”

**Lack of Professional Growth-** “I think the reason that’s happening is because nobody ever talks to us. We don’t ever get coached, right? We have language arts and math coaches, they don’t talk to us, they talk to the people that need that. But, we need it too.”

**Self-Efficacy**

**Increased Ability to Support ELs-** “Maybe helping us to actually achieve more, like get to where we believed we could, we always knew we could get there, we weren’t sure how.”

**Teacher #7: Mr. Lorenzo, English Teacher**

**Noelle High School**

**Survey Trends**

**Beliefs**

Strong positive beliefs toward…
- Teachers are capable of adapting instruction for ELs, teachers can create academic
success for all students, teachers can use student backgrounds for increased learning, using students’ prior knowledge to help ELs learn
- Increased student/teacher connections increases student learning, teacher creation of collaborative classrooms, increased collaboration with ELs and Eos, teachers modeling increases student learning
- Teachers can help all students feel important, design instruction to meet needs of ELs

Positive beliefs toward…
- ELs create positive learning atmosphere

Disagreement toward…
- Simplifying work for ELs, lessen quantity of work for ELs, modify assignments, allow more time to complete coursework

Strong disagreement toward…
- Teachers don't have time to support ELs (“There is nothing more important.”)
- Giving ELs less coursework than Eos
- ELs increase teacher workload

Practices
Strong positive feelings toward…
- Cycle of inquiry, mentoring, co-teaching, co-planning

Positive feelings toward…
- Participation in PLC, working with consultant
- The AL Project had positive impact on practices with ELs

Disagreement with…
- The AL Project has impacted beliefs on ELs (It has validated existing beliefs)

Self-Efficacy
Strong feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Adapting instructions for ELs, include language supports for ELs, using data to support ELs, use students’ cultures to make learning meaningful
- Make ELs feel important in class

Positive feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Establish personal connection with ELs, create collaborative classroom with ELs and EOs
- Support ELs with increased resources

Disagreement with…
- Support ELs with current resources
- The AL Project’s impact confidence with ELs (validated existing beliefs)

Thoughts on Mainstreaming
Benefits: ELs are reality of education in America. Effective EL strategies good for all
Challenges: Differentiating instruction for different ability levels
One-on-One Interview Trends: Mr. Lorenzo

**Code: Beliefs**  
**Total Instances: 40**

1. **Instances: 7: Positive: 7, Negative: 0**  
   **Sub-Code:** Professional Development- PD Elements- Co-Teaching
   
   - “Co-teaching is by far is the most successful strategy that we implement to reach kids.”
   
   - “Co-teaching promotes self-reflection. I know that as a mentor, I always want to show everybody my best. It keeps me on my toes and it makes me accountable to, formally or informally, to somebody else, to myself, to the kids, so I think that brings out the best in what we do.”
   
   - “I don’t get to learn a whole lot from others, and so it’s been an opportunity for me to learn and to teach. It’s invigorating to me as an adult to be able to work with somebody else. I have no doubt, it’s just a more effective way of teaching anybody.”

2. **Instances: 5: Positive: 4, Negative: 1**  
   **Sub-Code:** All Students- Supporting Students
   
   - “One of our agreements in the department is that we’re, we do what’s right for kids. Kids come first, and we do what’s best for kids. Often times that means that, everybody (teachers) gets a full range of classes. It just seems fair. For other teachers in the department, and it seems fair for kids.”
   
   - “My instruction for, and not just ELs, but for all kids is predicated on the belief that that scaffolds need to be built in at every point. That we need to be able to differentiate and I can’t differentiate unless I know what a kids needs are.”

3. **Instances: 4: Positive: 2, Negative: 2**  
   **Sub-Code:** English Learners- Equity
   
   - “This year as department chair, I wanted to, sort of spread the wealth, and figure that the kids that need the most, too often get the least.”
   
   - “It’s working out great for those four kids that are in that class. It’s not working out so great for those 100 seniors that really need those skills in order to make their way through college.”

4. **Instances: 4: Positive: 2, Negative: 1, Neutral: 1**  
   **Sub-Code:** English Learners- Perceived Skills/Abilities of ELs
   
   - “Just maybe that idea that kids come with all, a wealth of experience, or that school doesn’t recognize and that tapping into that is key to engaging them and opening them up to other more academically minded. You know, ways of engaging with the curriculum.”

5. **Instances: 3: Positive: 1, Negative: 0, Neutral: 2**
**Sub-Code:** The Teaching Profession - *Instructional Changes in the Education System*

- “It’s no longer about the literature. It’s about teaching skills to kids.”

**6. Instances:** 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0

**Sub-Code:** All Students - *Connecting with Students*

- “In my experience, kids will often work for teachers. (Student says) ‘I’m not willing to engage because I’m interested in the subject matter or whatever it is, but I like you and so I’m going to give you my best’. For a 14 or 15 year old kid, that’s got to be good enough for me.”

**7. Instances:** 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0

**Sub-Code:** Professional Development - *PD Elements - The Mentoring Process*

- “As a mentor, I always want to show everybody my best.”

**8. Instances:** 3: Positive: 1, Negative: 2

**Sub-Code:** The Teaching Profession - *Views of Teaching*

- “Too much of what we do, is in isolation as teachers. You know, the good and the bad. I don’t get to share what I’m super good at.”
1. **Instances: 8; Positive: 7, Negative: 0, Neutral: 1**  
**Sub-Code:** Co-Teaching Model- Co-Planning

- “I probably don’t put as much thought or I wouldn’t be putting as much thought into it if I didn’t have to articulate, why it is that we’re doing what we’re doing everyday. As a result, lessons get tweaked or changed and I think that’s good.”

2. ** Instances: 4; Positive: 4, Negative: 0**  
**Sub-Code:** Co-Teaching Model- Co-Teaching

- “Well there are two of us in the classroom and so we’ve got to double up on kids these days.”

3. **Instances: 4; Positive: 2, Negative: 0, Neutral: 2**  
**Sub-Code:** Working with ELs- Data Analysis Use (CELDT)

- “The [AL] Project has forced me into the standards, into the research, and into databases of what’s available in terms of data of my students. I probably wouldn’t be digging for all of that stuff if I didn’t have to.”

4. **Instances: 3; Positive: 2, Negative: 1, Neutral: 1**  
**Sub-Code:** School Supports- School Supports for ELs- Staff Supports

- “So some of our more veteran teachers are teaching some of the, the lower level courses.”

5. **Instances: 3; Positive: 0, Negative: 2, Neutral: 1**  
**Sub-Code:** School Supports- School Supports for ELs- Support Courses

- “I feel like I am that support.”

6. **Instances: 3; Positive: 2, Negative: 0, Neutral: 1**  
**Sub-Code:** The Teaching Profession- Teaching Skills, Not Content

- “Now, we teach skills and content is absolutely secondary. That’s been a big shift, paradigm shift for the profession that new teachers are coming in with that mindset.”

---

**Code: Self-Efficacy**  
**Total Instances: 37**

1. **Instances: 5; Positive: 5, Negative: 0**  
**Sub-Code:** Co-Teaching- Collaboration with Teacher Candidate

- “It makes me more intentional about planning instruction, assessment.”

- “It just forces me to be, both of us to be sort of reflective and intentional in what we’re doing.”

2. **Instances: 5; Positive: 5, Negative: 0**
**Sub-Code: Co-Teaching - Two Teachers in Room**

- “There’s another person in the room, you’re almost forced to be reflective. At the end of the day, as you sort of debrief, what went wrong, what didn’t. It leads to reflective dialogue and then to co-planning. That’s always the next step.”

3. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0

**Sub-Code: Co-Teaching - Trust in Co-Teacher**

- “It’s just, it’s nice to know that somebody’s always got your back.”

**Code: Null**

Total Instances: 10

**Sub-Code**

Short/Vague Response to a Direct/Leading Question - Instances: 4

Question/Response Clarification Dialogue: 3

**Focus Group Quotes: Mr. Lorenzo**

**Beliefs**

**Mentoring**- “I’m wondering if I’m sabotaging myself by saying this, but I should be spreading the word to my co-workers that this [mentoring] is an impactful thing and that maybe you should be taking a student teacher or become a mentor yourself. I appreciate the opportunity to do this over and over and over and over again, but more teachers should get the opportunity to do this as well, or take the opportunity to do this as well.”

**Supporting All Students**- “Good EL teaching is just good teaching.”

**Practices**

**Reflective Dialogue**- “The whole experience has necessitated that I be more thoughtful, intentional about what it is that I do and why I do it. In doing so, it leads to that dialogue with the other adult in the classroom.”

**Refining Practices**- “Any cycle of inquiry that we engage with is generally done inside our own heads. So, this has given me the opportunity or has challenged me to run through that cycle and now I’m getting new voices beyond just my own. So, some of my practices have changed drastically, for the better.”

**Leadership**- “So my other role on campus is the English department chair and, in trying to affect school wide change as department chair, is trying to get veteran teachers to change their practices.”

**Self-Efficacy**

**Previously Existing Self-Efficacy**- “The self-efficacy impact question? Maybe mine hasn’t changed that much because I’ve been doing this for a while.”

**Leadership**- “It’s given me a new framework to think about the work that I do with other adults on campus. And it’s also making me think about the work that I do with kids and it sort
Teacher #8: Ms. Barnes, English Teacher
Haylee High School
Survey Trends

Beliefs
Strong positive beliefs toward…
- Teacher use of EL prior knowledge for increased learning, student/teacher connections increases EL learning, teachers can create collaborative classrooms with ELs and EOs
- Increased learning with teacher modeling, help ELs to feel important in class, design instruction that meets needs of ELs

Positive beliefs toward…
- Teacher capabilities of adapting instruction for ELs, create academic success for ELs, use cultural backgrounds of ELs for increased learning
- Inclusion of ELs creates positive education atmosphere
- Teachers do not have enough time to meet needs of ELs (Class size impacts this)
- Modify assignments for ELs, extra time for ELs to complete assignments

Disagreement toward…
- Simplify coursework for ELs, lessen quantity of coursework for ELs, give less coursework than EOs

Practices
Strong positive feelings toward…
- Mentoring

Positive feelings toward…
- Cycle of inquiry, co-teaching, co-planning, working with consultant
- The AL Project impacted practices toward ELs

Disagreement with…
- The AL Project impact beliefs (other PD from district changed beliefs)

Self-Efficacy
Strong feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Connect with ELs, create a collaborative class for ELs, help ELs feel important in class

Positive feelings of self-efficacy toward…
- Adapting instruction for ELs, including language supports, using Data for EL learning, assessing ELs, using cultural backgrounds of ELs
- Address needs of ELs with increased resources

Disagreement with…
- Address EL need with current resources
- Increased confidence with ELs due to The AL Project (Already know that strategies will increase learning for ELs)
**Thoughts on Mainstreaming**

**Benefits:** Forces Ms. Barnes to be a better teacher. Increased scaffolding

**Challenges:** Having time and resources to support ELs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Instances:</strong> 59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. Instances: 8: Positive: 4, Negative: 4 |
| **Sub-Code:** Supporting ELs - Extra Support for ELs |
| - For me, it’s been a focus because I feel like it’s an area of weakness. I feel like, as a teacher in California, it’s bizarre that I haven’t had that experience, and I realize that. I feel like it’s my responsibility to get up to speed.” |
| - “I wanted to know, as English department chair, were all our students appropriately placed? So, I had all our teachers in English go through their rosters and identify who their EL students were.” |
| - “Now, whether or not that’s happening (extra support), whether they’re (ELs) getting the appropriate support, you never know unless you’re in somebody’s class.” |

| 2. Instances: 5: Positive: 5, Negative: 0 |
| **Sub-Code:** Teacher Candidate - Teacher Candidate as a Resource |
| - “It’s nice having him because he has more access to sort of maybe updated techniques and data. And so, it allows me to kind of learn from him.” |
| - “It’s been a while since I’ve been in credential school or been in an education class, so he’s got access to newer pedagogy than I probably do.” |
| - “I’ve stolen stuff that he’s done and I’ve adapted it for AP, and I’ll tell him, “I stole that thing you did”.” |

| 3. Instances: 4: Positive: 2, Negative: 2 |
| **Sub-Code:** All Students - Perceived Skills/Abilities of All Students |
| - “A lot of times teachers assume students can’t do things, and so they don’t ask them to. They don’t give them the opportunity to.” |
| - “I always, I think where I underestimate kids’ abilities is not what they cognitively can do, but what they maybe, organizationally can do and handle.” |

| 4. Instances: 4: Positive: 4, Negative: 0 |
| **Sub-Code:** All Students - EL Strategies for All Students |
| - “I just think that, you know, just the idea that, it’s what I said, it’s just the strategies that work |
with EL’s are just good strategies. They’re just good strategies. It’s the idea that you scaffold things appropriately, right, for your students.”

5. Instances: 4: Positive: 4, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Teacher Candidate- New Practices from Teacher Candidate

- “It forces me to be focused on those students (ELs), maybe more than I normally would be.”

6. Instances: 4: Positive: 4, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Professional Development- PD Elements- Co-Teaching

- “We’ve got like, thirty kids, technically, we have a fifteen to one ratio, and that makes it a whole lot easier to serve these kids needs.”

- “I really feel like the co-instruction is huge, right? It makes a huge difference when you’re fifteen to one.”

7. Instances: 4: Positive: 2, Negative: 2
Sub-Code: English Learners- Perceived Skills/Abilities of ELs

- “I have three (ELs) in my English one class. I have two in my AVID class, and I don’t have any in my AP literature class, which would make sense.”

- “We’ve actually been surprised that the things that we do have not been crashing and burning and that the kids pretty much are able to step up and do it. Maybe have been underestimating for a long time what it is they can do. And that’s true of all kids, but especially of English learners.”

8. Instances: 4: Positive: 2, Negative: 2
Sub-Code: English Learners- Perceived Skills/Abilities of ELs- AP/Advanced vs. EL

- “I’ve used it with my AP kids, but it works with EL’s.”

9. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: English Learners- Supporting ELs

- “We need to be part of the solution going forward. So, on the one hand, maybe we (teachers at site) don’t have bad habits to break, but on the other hand, we also don’t have teachers (at school site) that are used to working with English language learners.”

10. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Professional Development- PD Elements- The Mentoring Process

- “I don’t know, I think it makes me think more minutely about them (ELs). And part of it is that it (mentoring) alleviates some of the burden of the day-to-day tasks, so you have the mental space to do it.”
1. **Instances: 6, Positive: 5, Negative: 0, Neutral: 1**  
**Sub-Code:** Co-Teaching Model- Co-Teaching

- “When we’re teaching, we just sort of talk it out as we’re doing it. If something’s not working or if I think something needs to be more scaffolded, he sends me those slides the night before of what we’re going to do that day.”

- “Sometimes we’ll split up the class and one of us will take half and be doing one thing and while the other people are taking another half. Co-planning we do co-plan everything.”

2. **Instances: 5, Positive: 4, Negative: 1**  
**Sub-Code:** School District- Districts Supports

- “The district’s been pushing it. I mean, they’ve been pushing the change as well because they’ve been looking at data about long term English learners in the district, and their data has shown that we, our LTEL numbers, our long term English learners don’t become proficient.”

3. **Instances: 5, Positive: 2, Negative: 0, Neutral: 3**  
**Sub-Code:** New Practices-Trying New Practices

- “I don’t know that anything’s brand new. I’m pretty open to trying most things.”

4. **Instances: 5, Positive: 2, Negative: 1, Neutral: 2**  
**Sub-Code:** School Supports-School Supports for ELs- Support Courses

- “The EL learners that I have actually should be also in an English workshop and are currently not. This is a problem that we are working on.”

5. **Instances: 4, Positive: 4, Negative: 0**  
**Sub-Code:** Co-Teaching Model-Co-Planning

- “Co-planning helps a great deal. It’s so much easier when you have someone to bounce ideas off of and it’s somebody else’s brain and not just yours. I mean, we all have blind spots instructionally or pedagogically, and we have strengths and weaknesses.”

6. **Instances: 4, Positive: 3, Negative: 0, Neutral: 1**  
**Sub-Code:** Working with ELs- Data Analysis/Use (CELDT)

- “The department went through and each of us identified our English language learners on our roster so that we were aware of them. As department chair, I went through and crosschecked by looking them up in our grade programs, which allows me to see any kids schedule. I went through and looked are they in workshop.”

- “I’m trying to make people aware, you’ve identified this kid, you know what the strategies are to help, make sure, you know, you’re trying to use these strategies. So, I don’t know, it’s a small step, but it was a step.”
7. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Collaborative Practices- Department Collaboration

- “We know who the EL’s are, we talked to the workshop teacher. The workshop teacher says to us, ‘Hey, you need to watch so-and-so because she tends to try to avoid and writing. You need to watch this kid because he does such and such.’ So, we will tag team.”

8. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
Sub-Code: Working with All Students- Supporting Students in the Classroom- Scaffolds

- “It’s the idea that you scaffold things appropriately, for your students.”

- “It was, here he had given them basically sentence stems, he had given them a scaffolded script. We had gone through and given them, basically, a pretty sophisticated essential question.”

9. Instances: 3: Positive: 1, Negative: 0, Neutral: 2
Sub-Code: School Supports- School Supports for ELs

- “We’ve got one counselor, who works with special populations. So, she works with our EL population and our at risk population.”

10. Instances: 3: Positive: 2, Negative: 1
Sub-Code: Working with ELs- Practices Supporting ELs

- “I have changed and adapted all of them (EL support strategies) because I had none.”

Code: Self-Efficacy
Total Instances: 47

1. Instances: 11: Positive: 10, Negative: 1
Sub-Code: Instructional Change- Trying New Strategies

- “I figured that out when I tried it (EL support strategies) in AP, I realized it was the best response I’d ever had with that particular poem, which is a challenging poem. They had the best understanding of the poem that I’d ever had with them. So that was the moment it went, ‘Click’.”

- “We’ve actually been surprised that the things that we do have not been crashing and burning and that the kids pretty much are able to step up and do it. Maybe we have been underestimating for a long time what it is they can do. And that’s true of all kids, but especially of English learners.”

- “It just reinforces that idea to not be afraid (to try a new strategy). Like, why are you afraid that it won’t work? Okay, so it didn’t. Who cares? Then do something else. What’s the big deal?”
2. Instances: 6: Positive: 5, Negative: 1
**Sub-Code:** Supporting English Learners - Ability to Academically Support ELs

- “It’s (AL Project) continuing to train me on what it means to work with English learners because I’m as brand new with it as (teacher candidate) is. So, I’m learning as he’s learning and I mean, literally, I have as much experience with EL’s as he does. So, I’m learning as much as he has, and anything I can learn is important, yeah.”

3. Instances: 6: Positive: 6, Negative: 0
**Sub-Code:** Instructional Change - Time to Implement Practices

- “I don’t have to grade all of their papers. I don’t have to create all of their lessons. I’ve got someone else to split the thinking. It makes it easier to just even have the headspace to talk about it [supporting students]. And also, I have someone to, ‘Hey, I saw this in class, did you see this? What do you think?’”

- “You don’t have the time, you don’t have the head space to do the things that you can do when there’s someone else in the room who’s carrying the load with you.”

4. Instances: 5: Positive: 5, Negative: 0
**Sub-Code:** Co-Teaching - Two Teachers in Room

- “It makes it so much easier when there’s two of us in the room. I only have three EL learners in English one, but if it was just me, you know, when you’ve got everybody else in a class of thirty something and three EL’s and who know how many 504’s and stuff, it’s really hard. So it’s easier when you can divide and conquer and there’s two of you.”

- “It makes it a lot easier when there are two of you in the room. You can always be targeting certain students when there’s two of you as opposed to one.”

5. Instances: 4: Positive: 3, Negative: 1
**Sub-Code:** Supporting All Students - Confidence in Supporting Students

- “If there’s a specific group or a specific student that’s having an issue, one of us can take charge of that specific group or that specific student and help while the other person moves ahead.”

- “You cannot appropriately serve thirty-four kids in a class. And five of them are EL’s and another ten of them have IEP.”

6. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
**Sub-Code:** Reflection - Time for Reflection

- “I think it (co-teaching) makes me think more minutely about them (ELs). Part of it is that it alleviates some of the burden of the day-to-day tasks, so I have the mental space to do it (reflect).”

7. Instances: 3: Positive: 3, Negative: 0
**Sub-Code: Co-Teaching- Co-Teaching General**

- “It’s so much easier when you have someone to bounce ideas off of and it’s somebody else’s brain and not just yours. We all have blind spots instructionally or pedagogically, and we have strengths and weaknesses.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Null</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Instances: 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Code**

| Question/Response Clarification Dialogue- Instances: 5 |
| Casual Dialogue During Question Transitions- 3 |
| Short/Vague Response to a Direct/Leading Question- 3 |

**Focus Group Quotes: Ms. Barnes**

**Beliefs**

**Leadership**- “I’m a department chair and what you were saying about bringing in new people, new blood, right? I think I’m at the place you are at in that I’m starting to realize that my future in education is not necessarily in the classroom anymore.”

**Practices**

N/A

**Self-Efficacy**

**Two Teachers in Room/Understanding Needs of ELs-** “Divide and conquer, right? And it’s been really great for the students because it’s allowed us to give that extra attention and really focus on it and I think it’s made me hyper vigilant and hyper aware of the EL’s in my classroom and thinking about them more consciously, which is nothing but a benefit to them, I think, and to me. And more aware going forward, I think, in my practice with other EL’s that I’ll have in the future.”

**Overcoming Negative Attitudes-** “There’s always those people on campus who are negative and undercut these things (EL strategies) and they don’t believe they’re going to work and then you go, ‘Oh, but let me show you.’ So, you can tune out those negative voices because you’ve got some actual proof and some data that this stuff actually works. That felt satisfying, empowering.”

**Positive Results from New Practices-** “Seeing kids get excited and that they have growth, gives you the confidence to continue doing what you’re doing and to continue implementing those strategies.”