

Preparing Quality Teachers for English Language Learners: An Overview of the Critical Issues

Kip Téllez

University of California, Santa Cruz

Hersh C. Waxman

University of Houston

Recent political imperatives have pushed the issue of teacher quality to the top of the reform agenda in U.S. education (e.g., Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002). Although the recent attention on teacher quality may give us the illusion that it is a new topic, questions about the preparation, recruitment, and retention of good teachers have been an ongoing concern (Urban, 1990). Nor is the topic limited to interest in the United States. Teacher quality has been and remains an international issue (Hopkins & Stern, 1996).

However, the interest in teacher quality has yet to yield research or policy studies examining specifically the quality of teacher preparation for English language learners (ELL). Indeed, up until the 1980s, the preparation of teachers for ELL was largely ignored in the teacher professional development literature. Even the advent of bilingual education in the late 1960s failed to foment much specific training in language instruction. Bilingual teachers were, by and large, simply told to teach their students in Spanish with little regard for the inevitable transition to English. Many programs devoted their curriculum to improving the Spanish skills of their future bilingual teachers. Similarly, English language development (ELD) teachers were simply told to speak as much English as possible to their ELL students and made to believe that “they’ll catch on.” This lack of attention to specific pedagogy for language learners has no doubt curtailed the academic growth of ELL students.

The issue of teacher quality for ELL was quickly underscored, however, when García (1990) made clear the pitiful state of teacher quality for ELL. Citing the results taken from several national reports, he concluded, "Such data continue to suggest that linguistic minority education programs are staffed by professionals not directly trained for such programs who might be acquiring their expertise on the job" (p. 719).

More recently, teacher education researchers have discovered that a great many ELD teachers, unprepared for conditions working with a culturally and linguistically diverse student population, fail to acquire much expertise "on the job" (Britzman, 1991). Instead, they grope for quick-fix strategies, often becoming stressed at their lack of success. Such teachers can "burn out" quickly, leaving the profession or, worse, remain in teaching but without the motivation to provide a quality education or the requisite skills.

García's report and other factors (e.g., the sheer growth in the ELL population) motivated teacher educators and policymakers to initiate improvements in the quality of ELD instruction, and the decade of the 1990s saw a host of new policies and programs for the preparation of ELD teachers. Many universities began specialized preparation for ELL students, although some needed state legislation to initiate such improvements. Even in states with relatively few ELL (e.g., Iowa), educators saw the need to provide special language teaching preparation. During the 1990s, such states were exporting the vast majority of their teachers to "growth" states (e.g., Texas, Arizona), where many of the new teaching positions were in bilingual or ELD classrooms. Consequently, teacher education programs with almost no local need for language educators developed a strong focus on ELL.

In addition, school districts nationwide now routinely provide in-service professional development for ELD teachers. Districts may develop their own in-service programs or they may rely upon the expertise of the many organizations providing such information. Although it is impossible to know how many professional development opportunities are offered to ELD teachers, it is clear that ELD instruction has become a growing professional development opportunity since the 1990s.

In spite of additional ELD coursework and field experiences with ELL required of newly licensed teachers, as well as the many opportunities for in-service teachers to learn more about language teaching, Lewis et al. (1999) found that most teachers who taught ELL and other culturally diverse students did not feel they were well prepared to meet their students' needs. Other reports corroborate this finding, suggesting that the current preparation for all ELD teachers is inadequate (Alexander, Heaviside, & Farris, 1999). Furthermore, the data documenting the academic underperformance by ELL (NCES, 1998) provide additional evidence that teacher quality for ELL is in need of a major reappraisal.

Who or what is to blame for the inadequate quality of teachers for ELL? We can certainly point to the general shortcomings in teacher education (both preservice and in-service) with regard to students outside the "mainstream." For instance, the quality of teachers for ELL students may be no better or worse than the quality of teachers who work with gifted children or those who have special instructional needs. Teachers have always been troubled by their lack of knowledge in dealing with students who represent special needs groups (McLesky & Waldon, 2002).

The continued low achievement among ELL and the prospect for continued growth in this population in U.S. schools, as well as the data reporting the lack of preparation for ELD teachers, suggests to us the immediate need for an appraisal of teacher quality for ELL. This chapter examines the research and policy constraints and opportunities that have contributed to the general lack of quality among ELD teachers. We begin by framing teacher quality around several important policy "levers." We follow this discussion by examining the structural factors central to teacher quality. As part of this effort, we briefly explore the role teacher education has played in the development of ELD teachers, moving next to recently developed standards for ELD teachers, and on to legislative and policy issues in licensing teachers for ELL. Finally, we move from the structural to the pedagogical, discussing the knowledge base in ELD instruction, considering—and speculating—on the specific kinds of knowledge ELD teachers need to provide high-quality instruction.

GENERAL STUDIES OF TEACHER QUALITY

In spite of the recent attention, teacher quality remains a construct with few agreed-upon characteristics. So, to begin our discussion of teacher quality issues for ELL, we propose that the four areas of opportunity and policy "levers" for teacher quality set forth by Reinhardt (2001) reflect well the issues and policies concerning teacher quality for ELL. For our review, we pay close attention to the Recruitment/Selection and In-service areas. Although we recognize the importance of initial teacher preparation, the primary interest of the book is the development and growth of practicing teachers, where teacher quality is most likely to affect student performance. The breadth and depth of the following sections reflect this emphasis.

PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

Recent research findings (Goldhaber & Brewer, 2000) and policy reports (Abell Foundation, 2001) have called into question the value of preservice teacher education. Of course, critiques of teacher education are not new;

TABLE 1.1
Areas of Opportunity and Policy Levers to Affect Teacher Quality

<i>Areas of Opportunity to Influence Teacher Quality</i>	<i>Policy Levers to Affect Teacher Quality</i>
Preservice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholarships, loans, and loan forgiveness as incentives to enter teaching • Licensure/certification requirements • Accreditation of teacher preparation programs
Recruitment & Selection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Models of exemplary practices and programs • Effective communication with applicants • Alternative approaches to entering teaching • Teacher mobility policies
In-Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional learning • Induction programs to help new teachers • Compensation to encourage gaining new skills • Re-certification requirements to support high quality professional learning
Retention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working conditions • Compensation

they appeared soon after the initiation of formal teacher preparation itself. In this chapter, we do not review the general attacks on teacher education. Instead, we explore the effects of teacher education on the quality of teachers for ELL.

Although none of the new attacks on preservice teacher education has specifically named preparation of teachers for ELL as a weakness, teacher educators themselves have been some of the most vocal critics of ELD teacher preparation. Tedick and Walker (1994) maintain that second language teacher education has failed in the following five areas. First, they argue, we have undervalued the interdependence between first and second languages and cultures; that is, prospective teachers are told that acquiring English subsumes all other language skills and that the acquisition of English should proceed more rapidly than the research suggests it can. Furthermore, teachers have not understood the importance of validating home culture and language for the development of additional language and culture understanding. Second, they argue that second language teacher education is too often fragmented. In most programs, bilingual, ELD, and foreign language teachers are separated for courses in language teaching principles and methods. This leads to an unhealthy dichotomy in which foreign language teaching is considered high-status teaching while bilingual and ELD teachers and their students are thought of as compensatory. Third, Tedick and Walker maintain that many teacher educators consider language as a content area, much like mathematics or science. This misun-

1. OVERVIEW OF THE CRITICAL ISSUES

derstanding suggests that teachers simply must know the language to teach it. In addition, when language becomes object we believe that second language teaching is teaching *about* language rather than teaching *with* language. Teacher education courses that emphasize only the linguistic features of a language (e.g., phonology, syntax) fail to imbue students with a communicative understanding of the language, that teaching language is nothing more than form, facts, and rules. Fourth, second language education has become paralyzed by its focus on effective teaching methods. Many of the textbooks used in second language teacher education amount only to a laundry list of strategies. The contexts in which such strategies may be effective is not addressed, and beginning teachers are left with teaching tools but no knowledge of when or where to use them. Finally, they maintain that the disconnect between language and culture has led to teachers who teach language without any consideration of home or target culture, or the ways in which these two may relate.

Several general critiques of language teacher education have emerged in recent years. For instance, Milk, Mercado, and Sapiens (1992) suggested that future ELD teachers have knowledge of the kinds of programs and other instructional services for ELL; an understanding of the principles of second language acquisition; how to use parents as an instructional resource in the classroom; and the ability to deliver an instructional program that provides many opportunities for listening, speaking, reading, and writing, preferably integrated into an instructional theme.

In one of the most scathing judgments of language teacher education, Ada (1986) endorsed new ELD/bilingual teachers' sharp criticism of their teacher education programs. In particular, she is sympathetic to the view that teacher educators failed to practice what they taught, expressed forcefully by one of the teachers in her study, "They preached to us to teach creatively, but we were never allowed any creativity. They encouraged us to be good communicators, but the classes they taught were deadly" (p. 393). From Ada's perspective, preservice ELD and bilingual teachers are not provided with the proper knowledge and experiences to best serve ELL students, and teacher educators are to blame. Ada concludes by suggesting that bilingual teachers have been marginalized like the students they serve and advocates for an approach to teacher education that validates students' lived experiences as linguistic and cultural outsiders. From this validation, Ada argues, will emerge a solidarity that bilingual teachers can use to transform their position from passivity to active leadership. In spite of her admonishments, Ada is not entirely clear on how to achieve such solidarity.

Preservice teacher preparation is undergoing nothing short of a major reappraisal (Tom, 1997). Researchers and policy analysts from both inside and outside the profession are calling into question the field's ability to enhance the quality of ELD teachers. And while preservice teacher education

is unlikely to disappear entirely, educators and policymakers are considering alternatives to traditional style programs. Many such reformers, armed with the belief that teachers learn best when they are teaching their own class(es), are focusing their attention on in-service teacher development, the topic of the next section.

IN-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

Given the troubling data on the underachievement of ELL, we might expect to find research documenting the federal and state in-service programs designed to raise teacher quality for ELL. But in our review of the literature, we could find no such research. Reviews of general in-service teacher preparation programs are somewhat common. For instance, Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) described features of successful in-service professional development. Their research suggests that the “one-shot” in-service programs are unlikely to alter teaching practice. Instead, they argue that teacher knowledge growth should build on what we know about human learning. Therefore, the most effective professional growth opportunities are those whose topics emerge from teacher interests, require a long-term commitment from all parties, and engage in clear measurement and evaluation of goals and teaching targets (Knight & Wiseman, chap. 4, this volume).

Professional growth for ELD teachers remains troubled by the general challenges of in-service teacher development (e.g., one-shot in-services, few connections to specific teaching contexts). Successful professional development programs require both additional time and resources many schools cannot afford. And we suspect that the vast majority of professional growth efforts are not as well received (see Penner, 1999, for a review of in-service programs).

The professional development of ELD teachers must be addressed in order to improve the education of ELL (Jiménez & Barrera, 2000). As Jackson and Davis (2000) put it, “teachers cannot come to expect more of their students until they come to expect more of their own capacity to teach them, and until they have the opportunity to witness their power to elicit dramatically better work from those groups of students who are today failing” (p. 14). Much more emphasis must be placed in providing high-quality professional learning experiences and opportunities for teachers serving ELL. While some professional development programs create a collaborative culture for the teachers, they are rarely enough to help teachers overcome some of the state, district, and school policies that limited their capacity for helping ELL in their classroom. For instance, high-stakes testing creates a sense of powerlessness and alienation which results in a weak sense of teacher self-efficacy and self-belief. When teachers have a strong

1. OVERVIEW OF THE CRITICAL ISSUES

sense of their own efficacy, they can make a real difference in the lives of their students (Ashton & Webb, 1986). On the other hand, when teachers lack hope, optimism, and self-belief, schools and classrooms will “become barren wastelands of boredom and routine” (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1998, p. 1).

Schools need to provide continuous, quality professional learning experiences for all teachers. These learning experiences need to help teachers become optimistic, hopeful, and empowered so that they believe they can help improve the education of all children. Professional development projects need to be developed, implemented, and tested that focus on “re-culturing” or changing the entire school climate so that teachers and administrators create more collaborative, supportive work cultures that enable them to be “out there” in ways that make a difference for all students (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1998).

In-service teacher professional development has some distance to go before it is worthy of the name. However, in-service teacher programs are often without a clear direction. We know that improving teacher quality requires clear goals and objectives, standards that guide the direction of the teacher development, and it is this topic we address next.

STANDARDS FOR ELD TEACHERS

Having reviewed the shortcomings and success in teacher education (both preservice and in-service), it might be tempting to lay the blame for low ELD teacher quality on those who plan and manage teacher development. However, even if we agree that those educators responsible for ELD teacher professional growth have not provided the proper training opportunities, we might justifiably ask, “What specific knowledge should ELD teachers possess?” Even if teacher educators provided ample time and resources for ELD teachers to learn the content they needed to provide quality instruction, would it be enough? In other words, is the knowledge base adequate to provide ELD teachers with the direction they need to conduct their work? If the lack of quality among ELD teachers is owing to a failing of the knowledge base, then perhaps the researchers and policymakers who work in this area have been remiss.

The knowledge base promoted by professional organizations concerned with ELD instruction must undergo considerable scrutiny. We know that each subject-oriented professional association has, at some point, been interested in the teacher knowledge base. For instance, the International Reading Association (IRA) has developed “standards” or recommendations for the reading teacher knowledge base. IRA standards include a focus on valuing and understanding linguistic diversity as it relates to the teaching of reading (http://www.reading.org/advocacy/standards/free_index.html).

The two professional organizations whose focus is squarely placed on the education of ELL students in the United States are the National Association of Bilingual Education (NABE) and the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). Between them, their U.S. membership totals more than 30,000. And while they are both primarily concerned with curriculum and instruction for practicing teachers, they are also devoted to the education of teachers (each has a special interest group for teacher education), and both have developed recommendations for the preparation of teachers for their respective disciplines. The guidelines from NABE (1994) suggest adherence to the general standards recommended by other teacher education organizations (e.g., NCATE) such as the requirement for institutional commitment to the teacher education program and extended supervised field experiences, in addition to standards specific to bilingual education. These specific standards include an understanding of the philosophy, theory, and history of bilingual education in the United States as well as processes of second language acquisition, the integration of language and content instruction, and first language acquisition processes.

TESOL, in conjunction with NCATE, recently developed standards for ELD teacher education (TESOL, 2003). Like those articulated by NABE, the TESOL standards are designed for initial teacher preparation, but we can look to them as guides for quality ELD teaching in the early career and beyond. The TESOL/NCATE program standards divide ELD instruction into five domains.

- *Language.* Teachers must understand language as a system, knowing components of language such as phonology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and writing conventions. They should also understand first and second language acquisition.
- *Culture.* Teachers must understand the nature of role of culture in language development and academic achievement. In addition, they must understand the nature of cultural groups and how students' cultural identifications affect language learning.
- *Planning, implementing, and managing instruction.* Teachers must understand how to teach to standards in ELD, as well as use resources effectively in both ELD and content instruction.
- *Assessment.* Teachers must understand how systematic biases in assessment may affect ELL. Further, they must know the proper methods and techniques for assessing student language growth.
- *Professionalism.* Teachers must know the research and history in the field of ELD. In addition, they must act as advocates for both their students and field, working in cooperation with colleagues when appropriate.

Teacher education programs are reviewed in site visits (common to NCATE) and given a rating on each. Thus far, we are not certain how many teacher preparation programs have been reviewed using the new ELD standards. No school system (e.g., a school district) to our knowledge has adopted the standards for use as a policy document.

In addition to both the NABE and TESOL standards, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) has developed ELD standards for the purpose of awarding board recognition for exemplary practicing teachers. The NBPTS standards for teachers of English as New Language represent a set of ideas similar to those articulated by the other professional organizations, but represent expert knowledge in teaching of ELL. Briefly, the 12 standards are (only those that relate particularly to the ELD knowledge base are explained further): (a) knowledge of students (how development, language and culture affects students' knowledge, skills, interests, aspirations, and values); (b) knowledge of language and language development (expert knowledge of the target language as well as processes by which students learn their native and new languages); (c) knowledge of culture and diversity (how to use culture to structure for successful academic experiences); (d) knowledge of subject matter (a comprehensive command of subject knowledge, as well as how to facilitate student learning); (e) meaningful learning; (f) multiple paths to knowledge; (g) instructional resources; (h) learning environment; (i) assessment; (j) reflective practice; (k) linkages with families; (l) professional leadership.

Like the TESOL standards, it is hard to disagree with the NPBTS criteria. The measurement of the criteria is far more troublesome, especially for the NPBTS assessors, who must distinguish between merely good ELD teachers and those who are truly exemplary. Nevertheless, educators vested in ELD should pay careful attention to the NPBTS process and the relationship between teachers who choose board certification and the achievement of their students.

Interestingly, the major teacher education organizations have been largely absent from the discussion on the preparation of quality teachers for ELL. The two primary teacher education organizations in the United States, the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) and the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), have devoted great attention to preparing teachers for culturally diverse students while paying little attention to teachers who will face language diversity. Indeed, AACTE has commissioned no less than six reports or books (e.g., Smith, 1998) on the preparation of teachers for cultural diversity, but not one focused on language diversity. AACTE only recently developed a resolution on the preparation of teachers for language minority students, encouraging the development of "programs that recruit, train, and support teachers of all subjects and grade levels who can meet the needs of second language learners." (http://www.aacte.org/Multicultural/bilingual_resolution.htm)

It is not clear why ATE and AACTE have largely neglected the preparation and professional growth of ELD teachers. One reason may be that the history of these organizations reveals a long and lasting interest in the education of African-American students and the development of teachers who view multicultural education as central to their work. Such a focus is, of course, warranted, given their respective missions, but we believe that both must soon devote more interest in the preparation and growth of ELD teachers.

We cannot be certain that the knowledge bases developed by various professional organizations are sufficient to produce high-quality teachers. However, it seems to us that these organizations have developed thoughtful and warranted goals for ELD teachers. Our concern regarding the knowledge base for developing high-quality ELD teachers is not the standards themselves, but the failure of the various professional groups to prioritize among their standards. We believe that teacher preparation at either the preservice or in-service level could address only a fraction of the standards they promote given the time and resources available for teacher development. Educators have known for many years that the challenge in developing instructional goals is not what knowledge to include but what knowledge can be thoughtfully excluded. Comprehensiveness in developing standards is a worthy goal, but prioritizing goals and considering the instructional space devoted to them is equally important.

LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY ISSUES

The shortcomings of language teacher quality may be owing to teacher educators and the failure of adequate standards or knowledge base, but the revealing data on legislated ELD teacher requirements and other initiatives sheds light on the neglect and misdirection policymakers have shown toward the preparation of teachers for ELD classrooms.

In a recent report, Menken and Antunez (2001) assessed the preparation and certification of teachers working with ELL students. Before surveying those universities and colleges that prepare bilingual teachers (the focus of their study), Menken and Antunez developed a matrix or knowledge set based on existing professional standards and interviews with experts. Their matrix, divided into three broad areas of knowledge, served as the categories for their survey:

- Knowledge of Pedagogy (e.g., native language literacy methods, assessment of English literacy, practicum in bilingual education setting)
- Knowledge of Linguistics (e.g., first language acquisition, structure/grammar of English, contrastive analysis)

1. OVERVIEW OF THE CRITICAL ISSUES

- Knowledge of Cultural and Linguistic Diversity (e.g., history of bilingual education, cross-cultural studies, parent involvement)

Based on 417 (out of 1,075 sent) surveys returned by schools, colleges, and departments of education in the United States, they found that only 93 of the institutions even offered the bilingual education credential and only 103 offered a program in ELD for teachers. But the most striking finding is how few states actually required classes for certification on any of the topics suggested by the matrix. Just six states consistently required courses on the areas of expertise; almost all others simply require a “competency” with only vague guidelines for assessing that competency. Still more shocking is the location of those states requiring coursework. Only Maine and Connecticut, whose total “LEP” population amounts to a fractional percentage of the nationwide total, consistently required courses for the ELD certificate. An earlier report by McKnight and Antunez (1999) confirmed states’ loose or nonexistent requirements for ELD and bilingual teachers. Of the 50 states, 37 offer ESL (ELD) teacher certification/endorsement, yet only 23 of these have a legal mandate to require ESL certification, leaving room for emergency teaching permits. As for bilingual/dual language certification/endorsement, just 19 states require such endorsement (only 17 of those have legal mandate to require such certification).

It is also important to note that even in the states requiring certification or endorsement, many allow emergency or “exam-only” credentials to teach both ELD and bilingual classrooms. In Texas, for instance, any teacher with a standard elementary certificate can request that bilingual or ESL “endorsement” be added by passing a single paper-and-pencil examination (and an oral test of Spanish in the case of the bilingual endorsement) and teaching in a classroom with at least one ELL student for 1 year. No field supervision is required for the exam-only option. Such a system, not surprisingly, promotes a climate in which teachers quickly receive their initial certificate to begin their careers and then simply take tests to add endorsements. The licensing shortcomings found in the states must certainly shoulder some of the responsibility for poor teacher quality for ELL.

Other possible causes of low teacher quality are the failure to retain expert ELD teachers and inadequate compensation for working with ELL. For instance, are schools and school systems doing enough to retain the strong ELD teachers they employ, or do many ELD teachers leave the profession just as they are becoming highly capable language teachers? Or perhaps the challenges of teaching ELL merits higher pay for teachers. It may also be the case that ELD teachers need resources (e.g., books, technology, instructional assistance) well beyond what the non-ELD teacher receives. When the extra resources needed are scarce, teachers may choose to work with native English-speaking students rather than struggle with under-resourced ELD classes.

The cause of low teacher quality for ELL is likely a complicated interaction of all the previous points. Teacher educators have not provided a strong enough focus on language instruction while state legislators and policymakers have generally failed to require the specialized knowledge needed for quality ELD teaching. The professional associations devoted to language teaching have only recently developed standards for teaching ELD, while the “major” teacher education professional organizations have given scant attention to the preparation of quality ELD teachers. Furthermore, several issues that likely impact the quality of teaching for ELL (e.g., inadequate resources) have not been studied.

If we agree that state policies for the development of ELD professional knowledge has been inadequate, what does the research recommend that may improve teacher quality for ELL? One study suggests that policymakers can increase teacher quality in high-poverty schools by requiring schools to report teachers’ credentials, including those who lack the proper license for the subject or students (Galston, 2000). For instance, perhaps a national proposal to report to parents those teachers working with ELL but who lack the required state certification may increase the quality of ELD in such schools. Of course, such a policy may have limited impact in immigrant communities where parents may have few opportunities to choose a different school or teacher who could better serve their ELL child. Additionally, Galston (2000) suggested that federal policymakers revisit the use of teacher aides, on the suspicion that high-poverty schools and, by extension, those with many ELL, rely on aides for instruction in the place of a credentialed teacher. We believe such proposals, although well-intentioned, may not be necessary. The teacher shortage in high-poverty schools is rarely the result of schools *choosing* to hire teachers who lack the required credentials. Rather, the lack of a credentialed teacher in nearly all cases is the result of (a) no new teachers with the proper qualifications applied for a teaching position, or (b) existing teachers who cannot be forced to add credentials or endorsements.

In place of mandating requirements to increase teacher quality, legislators and other policymakers have used the “tool” of additional compensation for teachers who perform well or teach in high-need areas. For instance, in the Houston Independent School District (the nation’s fourth largest, and behind only Los Angeles Unified School District in the number of ELL), the school board just approved a new stipend for ESL (ELD) Special Education teachers. Teachers with both the ESL and Special Education credentials will receive an additional \$2,000 annually. How such a stipend will affect teacher quality is unknown, primarily because the stipends are linked only to additional certifications and the willingness to work with special needs students.

More common are stipends for ELD teachers in the range of \$500 to \$1,000. Of course, many districts offer no stipend for ELD teaching, and in-

stead rely upon hiring only new teachers who hold the appropriate ELD license. Such a practice may indeed lower teacher quality because only the beginning teachers are invited to work with ELL. Gándara (chap. 5, this volume) puts incentive pay near the top of the list when considering ways to improve teacher quality for ELL.

At the preservice level, federal efforts to improve teacher quality at low-income schools or in high-need areas include the Perkins, Stafford, and private loan cancellation program. These programs reward preservice teachers who commit to working in certain schools or teaching certain subjects by forgiving loans (up to approximately \$20,000) a beginning teacher may have accrued either as an undergraduate or in pursuit of a teaching license. Because states are free to determine which subjects and schools qualify, variation is common. Currently in California, for instance, the following subjects and schools are included in the federal loan forgiveness program: Mathematics (Grades 7–12), Science (Life/Physical; Grades 7–12), Foreign Language, Special Education, Reading Specialist, Low-Income Area School, School Serving Rural Area, State Special School, School with a High Percentage of Emergency Permit Teachers, and Low-Performing School. ELD teaching is not included, nor is bilingual education. Of course, many schools with large ELL populations will be included as a qualifying school under another category (e.g., Low-Income Area School), but it is somewhat of a mystery why beginning teachers working only with ELD students would not qualify. We wonder whether an expansion of the loan forgiveness program to include schools with large proportions of ELL could improve teacher quality.

At the in-service level, the role of additional compensation for ELD teachers has received even less attention. The closest compensation policy we can analyze at this time are the stipends many school districts offer to bilingual teachers. The effects of such stipends on teacher quality are largely unknown. However, from our own experience, we have found that the stipends have typically served not to increase the number or quality of bilingual teachers but, rather, created a competition among school districts for *any* bilingual teacher. It stands to reason that districts that pay more for bilingual teachers will be able to compete more successfully for the highest quality teachers. While the shortage for bilingual teachers is less acute than in the 1990s (owing primarily to the passage of Proposition 227 in California), states that continue bilingual education still face shortages.

In practice, stipends for teaching ELD are rare. In spite of the legislative appeal of additional payment for ELD teachers, general studies of increasing salaries for teachers does not always result in the intended affects. For instance, Ballou and Podgursky (1995) have shown that increasing teacher salaries can have the counterintuitive effect of decreasing teacher quality. Two perverse actions may be at work: (a) Higher salaries may discourage

older teachers, whose teaching effectiveness may have diminished, from retiring, and (b) higher salaries may reduce a school system's overall resources, thus eliminating professional development opportunities for all teachers, both beginning and experienced. Whether higher salaries have a differential effect on ELD teachers remains an open question.

We should point out that higher salaries for teachers is a legislative goal we promote, and therefore call into question the results of the Ballou and Podgursky study, particularly because they analyzed data from a short-term salary increase. Raising teacher salaries over the long term would no doubt increase the talent of those choosing a career and encourage those who do teach to spend more time and resources improving their instruction. Increasing salaries over the long term in any profession tends to result in more productive and higher quality workers. It seems unlikely this would be true in every context but teaching.

Ingersoll (1999) suggested that teacher quality, specifically teacher knowledge of the subject they are teaching, is affected dramatically by building-level administrators. Ingersoll argues that principals have great latitude in assigning teachers to out-of-field assignments and thus greatly affecting the quality of teaching. For instance, if a school's administration cannot find a licensed math teacher, they may—and often must—use a teacher who is not licensed for the content area. Mathematics remains the teaching field where teachers are most likely working out-of-field and is co-incidentally mentioned as one of the subjects U.S. students find most difficult. Similarly, ELD remains a “shortage” teaching field. Are ELL failing disproportionately because their teachers are teaching out-of-field? We have to wait for a definitive answer from the research, but new programs such as those initiated by Reyes (chap. 7, this volume) and Suttmiller and Gonzáles (chap. 8, this volume) offer hope.

Policy-making does not, however, routinely employ the extant knowledge base in systematic ways. In an insightful paper, Hawley (1990) argued that the policies developed for preparing and maintaining quality teachers “are not burdened by their fit with available knowledge or systematically developed theory” (p. 136). One striking, recent example of the lack of fit between policy and education (particularly teacher development and testing theory) emerged from the “bubble” days in the California legislature. The Certificated Staff Performance Incentive Act (Assembly Bill 1114, 2000) was developed to provide cash payments to teachers at low-performing schools where test scores improved (many of these schools enrolled a large proportion of ELL). Fraught with challenges, the payments often went to schools whose scores went high in one year and then down to average the next. Furthermore, teachers at the awarded schools found themselves increasingly reluctant to accept the money, pointing out that their colleagues in other schools were teaching just as well and getting no award. Indeed, the largest

teacher association in the state suggested that teachers refuse to accept the money.

Another way policymakers have intended to raise teacher quality is by raising the so-called quality of those who enter the field. The inexpensive and quick way of ensuring quality by raising the “bar” on tests of pedagogy or subject matter holds enormous political potential (Téllez, 2003) but may also limit the teacher pool in ways that work against the achievement of certain groups of students (Memory, Coleman, & Watkins, 2003).

Teacher evaluation programs are common targets for policymakers hoping to raise teacher quality. And we found one study relevant to the teacher quality for ELL. Gallagher (2002) studied the relationship between teacher evaluation scores and student achievement in a school with an ELL majority. Using a teacher evaluation system based on the National Board on Professional Teaching Standards and standardized test scores, Gallagher found a positive and statistically significant correlation between teacher evaluation and student scores in literacy but not in mathematics. This finding is explained by the fact that the study took place in the aftermath of Proposition 227, in which native language instruction was eliminated in nearly all California schools. With the entirely new focus on English instruction, Gallagher speculates that the attention to preparing ELL students for the English standardized test pushed teachers to align their work with state content standards, thus linking teacher evaluation with student scores. We cannot be sure how such a finding might be used to enhance teacher quality, but we share the belief that strong instructional goals and offering teachers the means to achieve them strengthens teacher quality.

Policies developed to raise or reward teacher quality, though often well intentioned, can have unintended consequences. Two common policy practices for raising teacher quality, rewards for improved student test scores and raising the bar for entry to the field, have shown appeal in the policymaking community but less promise in actual practice.

Teacher Verbal Ability and Its Potential Relationship to Quality ELD Instruction

Our review thus far has avoided issues typically raised by the production/function research; we have preferred to explore those issues that yield to the development or growth of teachers. Production/function research, while important in some policy contexts, tends to focus on variables out of the control of school or university systems. In spite of our focus here, we mention one particular finding common to the findings in the production/function literature because it may relate particularly to the quality of ELD teachers; namely, the relationship between teacher verbal ability and student achievement.

Teacher verbal ability (as measured by SAT Verbal scores, for instance) is routinely associated with increased student achievement (see Verstegen & King, 1998, for a review of this research). To our knowledge, no studies to date have associated ELD teacher effectiveness with verbal ability. However, we might assume that for ELD teachers, who are responsible for teaching language, verbal capacity and flexibility may prove to be related to student achievement.

The measurement of verbal ability is, of course, a very controversial topic in psychometric research. Like all measures of ability, verbal ability is designed to assess how well a person can respond to novel uses of language in a testing condition. The test evidence is thought to then indicate the capacity for understanding and using verbal agility in other contexts. Our speculation is that ELD teachers who easily see patterns and relationships among words and sentences, as well as the coherence of text as a whole, may be able to “see” the ways that ELL are using or misusing English. Differences in verbal capacity and flexibility could mean that one teacher could find patterns in the ways ELL are using English, correct or endorse those patterns, while another teacher would be left wondering why the students continued to make the same error repeatedly. Interestingly, secondary students seem to be able to recognize verbal ability and identify it with effective teaching (Brosh, 1996).

Again, we admit that such an assertion is speculative, but the attention paid to the relationship between verbal ability and quality teaching warrants further consideration. This is especially true when, as some recent proposals suggest, it is believed that teacher quality is not a consequence of training but rather a matter of intellectual capacity and life experiences. In particular, those who argue for alternative credentialing favor careful selection over training to ensure teacher quality.

Pedagogical Strategies

The discipline of L2 teaching has produced a long and rich history of methods for teaching language. While some once-common methods of language teaching have now been rendered as ineffective, the discipline has had traditionally been receptive to the use of experimental research to uncover the most effective methods for language teaching in specific contexts for specific students.

In a recent review of effective instructional practices for ELL, Waxman and Téllez (2002) found seven instructional practices associated with high academic achievement for ELL.

1. Collaborative Learning/Community-Building Teaching Practices

1. OVERVIEW OF THE CRITICAL ISSUES

2. Multiple Representations Designed for Understanding Target Language
3. Building on Prior Knowledge
4. Instructional Conversation/Protracted Language Events
5. Culturally Responsive Instruction
6. Cognitively-Guided Instruction
7. Technology-Enriched Instruction

We refer readers to the earlier report for a discussion of these practices, as well as suggestions about how teachers can implement them. Unlike some researchers (e.g., Lakdawalla, 2001), we believe that innovations in pedagogy, based on sound research, can greatly improve the quality of ELD teaching.

The essence of our findings in the earlier report suggest that effective teachers of ELL distinguish themselves by their capacity to link academic and conceptual ideas with the everyday reasoning skills students already possess (Duran, Dugan, & Weffer, 1997). Accomplishing such a task, however, requires teachers to pay close attention to the culture of the students. Furthermore, quality ELD teachers must understand how the home culture of the students interacts with the instruction of English. The complexity of this task suggested to us a section addressing the cultural knowledge needed by ELD teachers.

Cultural Knowledge

Teaching ELL almost always implies teaching immigrant children or the children of immigrants. For this reason, ELD teachers must have specialized knowledge of how students’ home culture interacts with the formal school curriculum. So it comes as no surprise to find that each of the professional organizations in ELD have developed goals related to teacher knowledge of student culture. But as with the other categories we have discussed, the question is not *whether* such knowledge is important, but rather *how much* knowledge is needed to provide quality instruction. In addition, we must also address the best methods for developing such knowledge in practicing ELD teachers.

Like ELL’s native languages, the culture of ELL can vary widely, and in some instances, it may be impossible for ELD teachers to have a complete and coherent knowledge of all the cultures represented by their students. For example, in one year, an ELD teacher might find an Armenian student in the class, whereas the next year a Hmong student may enroll in her place.

We recognize that ELD teachers should know the culture of the ELL in their class deeply enough to develop curriculum relevant to students' lived experiences, but we also are aware of the extraordinary challenge such a mandate implies.

In response to the challenge of creating culturally relevant teaching, teacher educators, policymakers, and school district administrators have created two different, though not exclusive, paths to quality cultural instruction for ELL.

The two fundamental strategies thought to create culturally consistent teaching are (a) recruit teachers who represent the culture of the ELL, or (b) recruit well-prepared and motivated teachers, irrespective of their home culture, and provide professional development opportunities so that they can learn the culture of the students and link it to schooling activities (see Téllez, 2004/2005, for a discussion of the merits of each strategy).

The first strategy is primarily a recruitment effort designed to improve teacher quality (cf. Reinhardt, 2001). One of the more recent challenges in the study of culture in schools—and one that appears to be long lasting—is the relationship between the culture of the teacher and the culture of the students. For many years, this relationship was of little concern to anyone. It was simply assumed that teachers, as representatives of the dominant culture, would impart their cultural values and beliefs to the students, irrespective of how those beliefs may conflict with those of the students. We regarded the culture of the teacher and the students as a single flowing river, making its predictable path to the ocean. But more recently, we have, with good reason, come to question our earlier neglect of this relationship, asking perhaps if the cultural mismatch between the teacher and the students could prevent ELL from achieving to their capabilities.

Teachers who are representatives of the culture of the students have a distinct advantage when creating instruction based on their shared culture. Such an advantage doubles when the teacher and students share a common language. Recruitment may appear to be a simple, straightforward strategy for matching culture to instruction, but several research studies have demonstrated that many university students who represent the language and culture background of ELL often choose other professions (Gordon, 1994; Heninger, 1989). Further, researchers have raised questions about just how obvious it is for teachers of a certain ethnicity to develop curriculum based on their own culture when the school is promoting a different set of ideas (Téllez, 1999), implying that irrespective of the culture of teachers, they still require new pedagogical understandings to create culturally unified instruction. In addition to the challenges already described, we find that in the case of many ELL, their cultural groups are not well represented among those preparing to teach, and a challenging puzzle emerges. For instance, the data reveal that as the number of Mexican-American students increase,

the number of Mexican-American teachers is decreasing, both proportionate to the student population and in number (Lewis, 1996). With fewer Mexican-American teachers to connect home culture to schooling for Mexican-American ELL, fewer ELL will be successful in school and less likely to attend postsecondary education, required for a career as a teacher. Thus, the cycle produces fewer Mexican-American teachers.

We can believe no longer that ELD teaching is “merely” language instruction. Teachers must understand how culture and language interact in the development of youth as active participants in a democracy as well as the learning of English.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

In spite of state mandates and recent “mini” reforms promoting teacher quality, many teachers remain unsure about their capacity to teach ELL. The wholesale improvement of teacher education in the interests of ELL students is, of course, the goal, but the issues are diverse and often complicated. We must keep in mind the complexity of raising teacher quality and not be tempted by simple functionalist views of teaching and learning. We agree with Jere Brophy, one of the leaders in the quality teacher research, who cautions against the misuse of such a view, arguing against rigid guidelines such as “Behavior X correlates with student achievement gain, so teachers should always do Behavior X.” A straightforward recommendation derived from the production/function research literature, while alluring to those looking for quick ways to improve student learning, fails to capture the varied contexts of a specific instructional context (Brophy, 1987). We argue that ELD is clearly such a specific context.

But the desire for a quick fix is compelling. The achievement gap between native English-speaking children and ELL must be addressed. Capability in English is becoming a worldwide necessity for professional employment. And while the United States has always been tolerant of those who speak multiple languages, one of those languages must be English. In spite of the importance of English, we share Edwards' (1994) view that the goal of language education is the multi-glossic culture, in which most members use two or more languages for varying purposes. High-quality ELD teachers can balance the need for English with a respect and encouragement for students' native languages. But again, ELL must learn to speak, read, and write English quickly and accurately. Although language educators may disagree on the proper role of students' native languages in ELD (e.g., McCarty, 2003), each of us recognizes that with a strong command of English, our children and youth can all become full participants in U.S. economic, political, and cultural life. High-quality ELD teachers represent our best hope for achieving this goal.

OVERVIEW OF THIS BOOK

One of this nation's greatest educational challenges is improving the education of ELL—students whose first language is not English and are either beginning to learn English or have demonstrated some proficiency in English. Hispanic students constitute the largest group of ELL, but they have the lowest levels of education and the highest dropout rate. Hispanic students' educational aspirations and academic performance in science, mathematics, and reading is significantly lower than White students. In addition, approximately 40% of Hispanic students are one grade or more below expected achievement levels by the eighth grade and only about 50% graduate "on time." These facts and reports are especially problematic, given that Hispanic children primarily reside in urban cities and are immersed in neighborhoods of concentrated poverty where the most serious dropout problems exist. Furthermore, Hispanic ELL students are more than twice as likely to attend a "low-performing" school than White students.

This book brings together a broad range of authors, all of whom are interested in the underperformance of English Language Learners (ELL) in U.S. schools. Their particular interest is in the quality of the preparation and development of educators (both preservice and in-service) who will work with ELL. They recognize that instructional improvements cannot be met via curriculum alone; that educators are the focal point for improving the education of this large and growing population of students. Their recommendations range from radical changes in current state and federal policy to promising new practices in teacher education.

The chapters in this book were all presented as papers at a conference that was convened by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Laboratory for Student Success in Washington, DC, in November of 2003. The conference was designed to facilitate the input of the participants and the participants were chosen to be representative of a variety of fields such as teachers, administrators, and policymakers. Our conclusion chapter summarizes some of the key findings from all the chapters, as well as the conference discussion. Our nation faces very serious challenges in serving ELL and we think this book addresses some of these important concerns and some solutions to these problems. We welcome and encourage further development of the ideas of this chapter and book.

REFERENCES

- Abell Foundation. (2001). *Teacher certification reconsidered: Struggling for quality*. Baltimore, MD: Author.
- Ada, A. F. (1986). Creative education for bilingual teachers. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(4), 386–393.

1. OVERVIEW OF THE CRITICAL ISSUES

- Alexander, D., Heaviside, S., & Farris, E. (1999). *Status of education reform in public elementary and secondary schools: Teachers' perspectives*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Ashton, P., & Webb, R. (1986). *Making a difference: Teacher's sense of efficacy*. New York: Longman.
- Ballou, D., & Podgursky, M. (1995). Recruiting smarter teachers. *Journal of Human Resources*, 30(2), 326–338.
- Britzman, D. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Brophy, J. (1987). *Research on teacher effects: Uses and abuses*. East Lansing, MI: The Institute for Research on Teaching.
- Brosh, H. (1996). Perceived characteristics of the effective language teacher. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(2), 121–139.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, M. K. (2001). Sticks, stones, and ideology: The discourse of reform in teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 30(8), 3–15.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77, 597–604.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining "highly qualified teachers": What does "scientifically-based research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher*, 31(9), 13–25.
- Duran, B. J., Dugan, T., & Weffer, R. E. (1997). Increasing teacher effectiveness with language minority students. *The High School Journal*, 80(4), 238–246.
- Edwards, J. (1994). *Multilingualism*. London: Routledge.
- Gallagher, H. A. (2002). *The relationship between measures of teacher quality and student achievement: The case of Vaughn Elementary*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin–Madison.
- Galston, W. A. (2000). *Federal policies to improve teacher quality for low-income students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.
- García, E. (1990). Educating teachers for language minority students. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 712–729). New York: Macmillan.
- Goldhaber, D., & Brewer, D. J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2), 129–145.
- Gordon, J. A. (1994). Why students of color are not entering teaching: Reflections from minority teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(5), 346–353.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (1998). *What's worth fighting for out there*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hawley, W. D. (1990). Systematic analysis, public policy-making, and teacher education. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research in teacher education* (pp. 136–156). New York: Macmillan.
- Heninger, M. L. (1989). Recruiting minority teachers: Issues and options. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(6), 35–39.
- Hopkins, D., & Stern, D. (1996). Quality teachers, quality schools: International perspectives and policy implications. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 12(5), 501–517.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (1999). The problem of underqualified teachers in American secondary schools. *Educational Researcher*, 28(2), 26–37.
- Jackson, A. W., & Davis, G. A. (2000). *Turning points 2000: Educating adolescents in the 21st century*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Jiménez, R. T., & Barrera, R. (2000). How will bilingual/ESL programs in literacy change in the next millennium? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35, 522–523.
- Lakdawalla, D. (2001). *The declining quality of teachers* (Working Paper 8263). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

- Lewis, L., Parsad, B., Carey, N., Bartfai, N., Farris, E., & Smerdon, B. (1999). *Teacher quality: A report on the preparation and qualifications of public school teachers*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Lewis, M. (1996). *Supply and demand of teachers of color* (Digest 94/8). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education.
- McCarty, T. L. (2003). Revitalising indigenous languages in homogenising times. *Comparative Education, 39*(2), 147–163.
- McKnight, A., & Antunez, B. (1999). *State survey of legislative requirements for educating limited English proficient students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- McLesky, J., & Waldron, N. L. (2002). Professional development and inclusive schools: Reflections on effective practice. *The Teacher Educator, 37*(3), 159–172.
- Memory, D. M., Coleman, C. L., & Watkins, S. D. (2003). Possible tradeoffs in raising basic skills cutoff scores for teacher licensure: A study with implications for participation of African Americans in teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(3), 217–227.
- Menken, K., & Antunez, B. (2001). *An overview of the preparation and certification of teachers working with Limited English Proficient (LEP) students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Milk, R., Mercado, D., & Sapiens, A. (1992). *Re-thinking the education of teachers of language minority children: Developing reflective teachers for changing schools*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). *Mini-digest of education statistics 1997*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Penner, J. (1999). *Teacher and principal perceptions of factors influencing teachers' decisions to participate in professional development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Houston.
- Reinhardt, R. (2001). *Toward a comprehensive approach to teacher quality*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Educational Research for Education and Learning.
- Smith, G. P. (1998). *Common sense about uncommon knowledge: The knowledge bases for diversity*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Tedick, D. J., & Walker, C. L. (1994). Second language teacher education: The problems that plague us. *Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 300–312.
- Téllez, K. (1999). Mexican-American preservice teachers and the intransigency of the elementary school curriculum. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15*(5), 555–570.
- Téllez, K. (2003). Three themes on standards in teacher education: Legislative expediency, the role of external review, and test bias in the assessment of pedagogical knowledge. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 30*(1), 9–18.
- Téllez, K. (2004/2005). Preparing teachers for Latino children and youth: Policies and practice. *The High School Journal, 88*(2), 43–54.
- TESOL. (2003). *Standards for the accreditation of initial programs in P–2 ESL teacher education*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Tom, A. (1997). *Redesigning teacher education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Urban, W. J. (1990). Historical studies of teacher education. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 59–71). New York: Macmillan.
- Verstegen, D. A., & King, R. A. (1998). The relationship between school spending and student achievement: A review and analysis of 35 years of production function research. *Journal of Education Finance, 24*(2), 243–262.
- Waxman, H., & Téllez, K. (2002). *Research synthesis on effective teaching practices for English language learners*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University, Laboratory for Student Success.

Training Teachers Through Their Students' First Language

Liliana Minaya-Rowe
University of Connecticut

This chapter examines recent effective approaches and programs to train teachers how to teach English language learners (ELLs). In doing so, it draws from experiences of recent and ongoing collaborations with four university training programs at pre-service and in-service levels and with teachers of ELLs in several urban school districts enrolled in graduate teacher training programs. It illustrates both the approach and its usefulness in the professional development of all teachers of ELLs. The approach involves selected training courses designed to meet both the Spanish language proficiency needs of mainstream, bilingual and English as a second language teachers, and their common professional development needs to teach ELLs English, their second language, reading and the standards-based curriculum. The overarching goal of the training programs is to encourage teachers of ELLs to analyze the constraints and opportunities they perceive in teaching ELLs. Real-life experience takes the place of simulation, since teachers experience firsthand the difficulties and challenges faced by their own students when having to attend to new language and content at the same time. For most program students the language of instruction in selected courses is Spanish, their second language and the weekly or biweekly course meetings are conducted almost exclusively in this language guided by the theoretical framework for learning both language and content through sheltered instruction (SI) and the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). Students benefit from the courses and demonstrate command of the second language to the extent that they can