IN TESOL JOURNAL

INTESOL 2022
Volume 19, Issue 1

ISSN:2373-8936
INTESOL Journal

A Journal for Indiana Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages
Volume 19, Number 1
2022

In This Issue…
A Message from the Editor

The theme of the 2022 INTESOL conference is *The Power of Story.* Our keynote speaker is Nahid Sharifi, who taught English language for 10 years and is currently a graduate student at Indiana University. Sharifi's story covers her experience as a refugee in Iran, her efforts for women's rights in Afghanistan, and her arrival and life in Indiana. Sharifi's story is a window into the experiences of many multilingual students in Indiana, and an example of the power of voice and action in making positive change in the world. Concurrent sessions at the conference will look at the stories of English language teachers and learners, as well as presenting on the latest teaching practices, research, and contextual conditions in Indiana and beyond.

In our 2022 Fall issue features two feature articles and three peer-reviewed articles. First, this issue introduces two new feature non-refereed articles that are meant to advance the accessibility and relevance of the INTESOL Journal. We are committed to providing space for annual INTESOL keynote speakers moving forward. We inaugurate this with text of Nahid Sharifi's 2022 keynote speech. The second new feature is "Voices from the Field", which will highlight perspectives from Indiana English language teaching professionals. The first instance of this ongoing series features a discussion between Rachel Sever, ENL Coordinator for MSD Washington Township, and Susan Adams.

The issue also features three peer reviewed articles. In the first article, Kyongson Park explores the co-teaching collaboration of university multilingual learner graduate students and local K-12 teachers. Park highlights the ways in which this collaboration benefitted the teachers, students, and graduate students, particularly in terms of cultural diversity. Second, Xin Chen presents a case study of the writing practice and learning transfer of international undergraduate multilingual learners. Chen's study provides insight and new perspectives on the writing

development of international multilingual learners. Finally, Trish Morita Mullaney provides a discussion of the history and policy environment surrounding the legal requirements dictating multilingual learner support in Indiana, particularly policies around ENL Specialist licensure and Teachers of Record. The Editors of the INTESOL Journal and the INTESOL Board would like to thank all our authors and reviewers for their contributions to the 2022 issue.

This issue is the first under Editor-in-Chief Brandon Sherman and Associate Editor Dr. Beth Samuelson. We thank outgoing Editor-in-Chief Trish Morita Mullaney for her years of stewardship of the journal. Dr. Morita Mullaney will stay involved with the journal as a member of the newly convened Editorial Board. She is joined by Susan Adams, Huseyin Uysal, and Haiyan Li. The Editorial Board will aid in the endeavors of the journal, including oversight, publicity, and direction. The INTESOL advisory board will continue providing oversight.

We remind readers that INTESOL Journal accepts manuscripts year-round. Manuscripts may be pertinent to the Indiana context specifically, or may be about language teaching and learning in general. We accept both research and practitioner-focused pieces. Individuals presenting at the annual conference are strongly encouraged to reach out about publishing a manuscript based on their presentation. We also invite author organized special issues.

This issue of the INTESOL journal features the artwork of Natalie Nevarez. Natalie is originally from Mexico, and is currently a 10th grader at Portage High School. She was nominated by her teacher, Allison Mendez-Morphis.

Editor in Chief:
Brandon Sherman, Ph.D.,
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Associate Editor:
Beth Samuelson, Ph.D.,
Indiana University, Bloomington

A Message from the Editor

INTESOL Annual Conference Spotlight

This section will highlight one perspective from the annual INTESOL conference. This will generally be a contribution by the year's keynote speaker. This year, we feature the text of the keynote speech given by Nahid Sharifi. An advocate for women's rights in Afghanistan, Nahid Sharifi has taught university-level English since 2011. She has been a voice for breaking taboos about gender. She has been a role model for getting women more involved, supporting them to understand their important role in the future of Afghanistan. She left Afghanistan in 2021 when the Afghan government fell and US forces withdrew. Having grown up in a refugee family in Iran and experienced displacement to the United States, Nahid will share the power of her story and offer her reflections on teaching and learning through extraordinary change.

Nahid's story

In the name of Allah, the most merciful and the most beneficent.

Dear INTESOL board, educators, researchers, scholars, and dear ladies and gentlemen. Today is a great happiness to me that I have been invited to the INTESOL conference which gave me this opportunity to speak up about my story not because it is my story but because is the story of many Afghan women who are suffering a lot nowadays.

I thank every one of my IU professors who through their continued support, love, and words inspired me to follow my dreams. I thank every volunteer who helped Afghans to resettle in different States. We will never forget their kindness and support.

I am grateful for two men and one woman in my life. The first two men are my father and my husband who have encouraged and supported me and have never clipped my wings, but they let me fly and follow my dreams. I thank my mother who taught me to be patient, never give up, and fight for my dream.

About me and my Family

I was a lecturer at Kabul Teacher Training College in Afghanistan for 10 years and learned many things from students and tried to empower my students to learn and search for whatever they are interested to learn. For me, the obstacles didn't have any meaning because I learned this skill from my father. I was a teenager when for the first time Taliban invaded Afghanistan. They had turned the country to ruin. They were, as like today, against any progress and contribution of Afghanistan and people suffered a lot because of their extremist ideologies, like today. When they banned girls from schooling my father never let us be disappointed and we fled to the neighboring country Iran, when we graduated from Iran high school because we were refugees and couldn't pursue our education at a higher level in Iran again my father didn't give up and encourage us to pursue our education in Afghanistan. So, we returned to Afghanistan, and I could progress a lot and even could help other Afghan women to follow their dreams.

Why did you become a teacher?

Being a teacher was my and my father's wish because of the lack of female teachers in schools all Afghan children suffer a lot. Many female teachers were abducted, terrorized, and killed by insurgents over two decades. I became a teacher and encouraged my students to be a teacher because we have a lack of female teachers still in Afghanistan. My paradise has always been to

be a lifelong learner and learn new concepts and transfer whatever I learned to my students who were enthusiastic to learn.

What makes you so passionate?

I loved my job because I was strongly inspired by Martin Luther King Jr.'s quote: "Everybody can be great because anybody can serve. You only need a heart full of grace".

I participated in some national and international programs to develop my capacities. I had a good feeling when I could do anything for my students and help them, especially those who had big dreams for their future. I really wanted to bring some positive changes into the lives of my students. I liked my students to know **why they are valued** in this world, **what matters to them** and **how they could make difference in the world** by contributing to the development of their country. I recall that the first time I held a leadership course voluntarily for my students, I started with five students without any female students because their perspective about leadership wasn't broad. But after a week the number of my participants changed from 5 to 30.

Have you had to make a decision in a few minutes that would have a huge impact on your future?

On August 19, 2021, overnight my beautiful dream turned into a nightmare. Education, and being educated became a crime for most people, especially women. I recall when I burned most of the documents and appreciation letters that I received through different programs.

When my world changed with this nightmare, my priority changed. I had two choices.

- **My first choice was to stay like many other educators who could never go back to their work and follow their dreams because since 2021 they were killed or arrested.**

- **My second choice was to leave the country, speak up and fight for the dreams of my people, even though I might be killed for speaking up.**

I chose the second one in a few minutes. I left Afghanistan last year. It was a tragedy for me but didn't mean a disaster, it means in a few minutes I had to make a decision for myself.

I knew that starting this journey will be with many challenges and difficulties, but I accepted all these challenges. I left my hometown (Herat) one day after it was surrounded by the Taliban. I couldn't take a flight ticket because all flights were stopped, and I have to go to Kabul by bus. Moving to Kabul wasn't easy and it was another challenge for me because I was a government employee and some of our official documents were with me.

Kabul still was under the control of the previous government. For me still, there was a hope that government will take over the Herat from the Taliban and I will see my city again, but I have never thought Kabul would be taken over by the Taliban just in 3 days. I was a teacher for 10 years and I loved my students, but I left behind all these memories. I left behind my family, my students, my profession, my background, my love, and my passion. I need time to bring back all these gifts. It is not easy starting from scratch, but I have to be stronger and more purposeful than before because of my students, because of those who are banned from schooling and going to work, and because of all Afghan women, today all their **rights** are eradicated by the Taliban.

What did we have before?

Before we had teachers, educators, pilots, athletes, women's activities, ministers, lawyers, journalists, robotic teams, female musicians, and some female entrepreneurs but now some of them had left the country, and some others are still in Afghanistan and are living secretly because they contributed to the development of Afghanistan. Before people were happy and enjoyed their

life and they hung out with their families on weekends and could go to picnics, restaurants, and parks with their families. But now they can't hang out with their families outdoors.

What do we have today?

Afghanistan is the only Islamic country where girls can't go to secondary school or even follow their dreams. Since the Taliban have taken over, the rate of early and forced marriage of girls before the age of 18 again has increased. All Afghans who are living in Afghanistan feel powerless because of the tough and suffocating conditions that the Taliban has created for people. My mom's house was searched for the third time, and I am wondering how many times it is going to happen again.

I am wondering what teachers have that scares the Taliban. Teachers just have pens and words, and these are their weapons. The Taliban don't like conscious and awake people but they like the walking dead.

In Afghanistan 3.7 million children are out of school and 60 percent of those are females. Taliban claimed they will bring peace to Afghanistan but today after passing more than a year in power they couldn't make an inclusive government or even bring some positive changes in Afghanistan. Women are banned from going to public places, they have to cover their faces and be accompanied by one of the men of the family.

No one has a peaceful life in Afghanistan not in their home and not in the outdoors. Last month more than 23 girl students were killed by a suicide bomber while they were in their classroom. **Now women protesters are the heroes of this story, although they are beaten with batons, they don't give up they gather in offices and homes to produce photos and videos. They**

demand justice by sharing their voices through Facebook, Twitter, and WhatsApp. Because they are women who don't have a place in the Taliban halls of power.

Taliban want recognition but at first, they have to safeguard human rights. They have to give back women's rights to them. Women tackled a lot for their rights for 2 decades with all insecurities and obstacles. They almost succeeded but unfortunately, Afghanistan fell. Still, Afghan women defy the Taliban and their rules because they fought for their dreams for many years, and it is not easy for them to go back home.

Afghan women and people now need the support of the international community because of the humanitarian disaster going on in Afghanistan. Half of Afghanistan's population is experiencing food insecurity.

In the chapter of the history of Afghanistan, this is the darkest moment for Afghan women, but this chapter won't be the final chapter. I believe that Afghan women one day like the phoenix would obtain new life by arising from the ashes of their predecessors and fighting for their future dreams. I hope I can continue the path of Afghan women and be the voice of those who are confined now in their homes in Afghanistan**.**

I believe that Afghan women will prove to these misogynists the real notion of peace is "Women, Life, Freedom".

I would like to conclude my speech with a famous poem by Saadi (Persian poet) that explain the relation of people to each other resembling the human body. Social harmony, compassion, and respect for others enable us to thrive.

" Human beings are members of a whole, in the creation of one essence and soul,

If one member is afflicted with pain, other members uneasy will remain.

If you have no sympathy for human pain, The name of human you can’t retain".

Voices from the Field

SUSAN R. ADAMS

Butler University

RACHEL SEVER

MSD Washington Township

INTRODUCTION TO VOICES FROM THE FIELD

Welcome to a new feature in *INTESOL Journal*: Voices from the Field. The purpose of this new feature is to spotlight practitioners from the Indiana education community who are serving English learners of all ages and purposes. In addition to providing insights into current practices, challenges, and opportunities, this column will also create an archive or a time capsule in which we can capture snapshots of educators, promising practices, advocacy, and responses to policies over time.

Voices From the Field: A Conversation with Dr. Rachel Sever

In this inaugural article, we will begin by introducing a district leader from Central Indiana, Dr. Rachel Sever. Rachel currently serves as the ENL Coordinator for MSD Washington Township. During her travels in college, she became interested in the role of languages and culture in schools. During her graduate studies, she examined the ways power dynamics in society relate to how people use literacy in- and out-of-school. Her research (Sever, 2013) has focused on how young people, particularly multilingual learners, read the world and use literacies to transform their communities and generate liberation, as described by Paulo Freire (2000).

As a teacher, researcher, and administrator, Rachel seeks opportunities to collaboratively explore ways the educational system can be more inclusive and equitable. Being the ENL Coordinator in a diverse, urban school district provides the opportunity to work with her colleagues on the challenging, but rewarding, work of providing spaces for multilingual learners to engage in meaningful learning experiences that value their assets and challenge the status quo practices of tracking, excessive testing, and the pressure to teach to standardized tests.

I sat down recently with Rachel to find out more about her perspectives on her role and on current initiatives connected to multilingual K-12 learners and educators in MSD Washington Township. Our conversation ranged far and wide, but ultimately focused on the responses she provided to the questions posed below. The interview questions will be presented in **bold,** and Rachel's responses are presented in *italics.*

What opportunities are you discovering in your role? What has surprised you most about these opportunities? Where do these opportunities seem to be leading right now?

I experience opportunities every day where I am able to learn from people in our school community. I have learned from the resilience of our teachers, students, administrators, liaisons, and parents. I've had the opportunity to observe great diversity in the ways people have been able to thrive against all odds through the pandemic. For some people on some days, collaboration and connection has helped most, for others it's a quiet, reflective space.

Some teachers and students have found successful results following curriculum with fidelity while others are finding joy and growth when accelerating learning, slowing down, and/or integrating new technologies depending on the unique dynamics of their classroom. Some staff and students had found their niche in the hybrid learning environment, while others

are SO HAPPY to be back to a consistent in-person learning routine. These opportunities lead me to continue thinking about ways we can personalize teaching and learning experiences as well as cultivate a sense of belonging for all students and staff. From the role of district administration, my observation of the vast array of "what works" is challenging me to mull over the balance of system-wide expectations and opportunities for agency in our schools, grade levels, content areas, and classrooms.

What challenges are you discovering in your role? What are the implications of these challenges for students, teachers and families in your district?

For as long as I have been an educator, I've witnessed initiative fatigue, but it seems to be more of a challenge than ever before. Various federal, state, and local initiatives (such as multi-tiered system of supports, professional learning communities, social-emotional learning, trauma-informed teaching, identification of priority standards, equitable grading practices) connect, but they can sometimes compete, and many teachers are tired of balancing all the things. In addition to the K-12 initiatives listed, at the elementary level, many schools are refining early intervention practices and dyslexia screening; meanwhile many secondary schools are broadening Career and Technical Education programs, work-based learning opportunities, and more. These initiatives provide opportunities, but also challenges related to communication, alignment and capacity.

From the lens of serving multilingual learners, many of these initiatives were developed without much, if any, consideration of the research or expertise from the fields of second language acquisition or teaching for biliteracy. Practically every aspect of our educational system, including the vast array of current initiatives, has been built from a monolinguistic

perspective. Many state departments of education are unsure where EL fits, so DOE EL staff can be marginalized, which shows up in state policy and guidance, which trickles all the way down to the marginalization of multilingual kids in classrooms. Multilingual educator teams are often managing all the initiatives as well as carrying the weight of explaining how the initiatives can fit the students we serve, even though they were not built with our students in mind.

What trends or patterns in ELL enrollment have you observed in MSDWT in the past six months?

Approximately 30% of the current multilingual student population continues to consist of students born in the United States. In the past year as a result of political and economic upheaval in the world, MSD Washington has experienced an increase in students arriving from Venezuela, Mexico, Honduras, Haiti, and Afghanistan. There are some similarities among the needs we are seeing of the current influx of students and the influx of Burmese refugees that our community welcomed in 2007 and 2008.

We are seeing an increased need for our ENL teachers to collaborate with our student support services teams to meet students' and families' basic needs related to safety, social-emotional well-being, food security, housing stability, transportation, internet access, health care, and more. Although our schools can provide some resources, our student support teams also coordinate newcomer student and family support with our community partners. These new populations have prompted us to revisit our system of support for newcomer students, particularly our high school age students with limited or interrupted formal education. We are developing new opportunities for our high school newcomer students to learn English and earn the credits needed for graduation.

What are some promising practices you have observed, championed, or brought about in MSDWT? What makes these promising practices so promising?

Three promising practices that are emerging in MSDWT related to multilingual learners are: the growth of our Dual Language Immersion (DLI) program, implementation of specialized programming for students who have not exited the ENL program within five years, and capacity building among our instructional coaching team.

Our district's DLI program opened in August of the 2019-20 school year at Willow Lake Elementary with two kindergarten classrooms. We have added two classes in subsequent grades each year. The language allocation plan for these classrooms follows an 80/20 model (80% of instruction occurs in Spanish and 20% occurs in English). The classrooms are comprised of a balance between native English and Spanish speakers. The DLI program is especially promising because it disrupts historical privileges and creates a space that values the heritage language and cultures of our Heritage Spanish speakers. Thus far, our students in the DLI program are outperforming students in monolingual classrooms district wide on math and reading assessments. Additionally, administrators throughout the district have benefited from observing the ways in which our DLI teachers have created a language-rich environment that embraces translanguaging, interdisciplinary learning, and multiple ways of knowing and understanding the content and concepts being studied.

In the fall of 2019, our fastest growing EL population was students who had been in U.S. schooling for five or more years, many of whom were born here in Indianapolis. Our ENL team recognized a need to flip the negative trajectory and deficit-based systems impacting this group of students. Our middle school EL teachers examined the research on long-term English

learners and reviewed achievement and graduation rate data of these students, which resulted in a new, asset based EL elective course for 7th and 8th graders that launched in the fall of 2020. The course, AVID Excel, is a branch of the AVID framework and is focused on accelerating academic language development and leveraging linguistic giftedness to address the opportunity gaps in our system (https://www.avid.org/avid-excel). Since we launched the course in the middle of the pandemic, we are still evaluating its impact and outcomes. We have seen an increase in the number of multilingual learners enrolled in our high school AVID elective courses, which have a long-standing tradition of supporting high levels of academic achievement as well as college and career readiness.

We are also excited about the opportunity we launched in the fall of 2021, wherein our instructional coaches can earn their EL license through a paid tuition cohort partnership with local universities. The graduate school coursework required for coaches to earn their EL license has led them to a deeper understanding of English language development instruction to effectively serve our increasingly diverse student body. Over 10 of our instructional coaches have participated in our licensure cohort so far and they have begun integrating their new knowledge and understanding into their everyday collaboration with teachers.

At the district level and within many schools, we are seeing more collaboration between our EL staff and our instructional coaching teams as well as a higher level of awareness related to considerations for multilingual learners in our coaches' learning facilitation, co-planning sessions, peer coaching, and co-teaching.

What state and/or federal policies are uppermost on your mind these days? Why? What do you wish policymakers knew about the impact of these policies on families, teachers and students?

Funding is an ongoing challenge. Federal funds allocated to supplemental programming for English learners have decreased every year since I joined MSDWT in 2019. Our main source of funding from the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) is the Non-English-Speaking Program (NESP) grant, which is approved every two years. Currently in the Fall of 2022, we do not know how much funding will be provided for the 2023-2024 school year. This creates tremendous challenges for timely program planning and for hiring. Although the IDOE recommendation of 30-1 English Learner to Teacher of Record ratio is a great idea, to this point IDOE has not yet provided adequate funds for districts to make this vision a reality.

What is something happening in MSDWT of which you are particularly proud that connects to your role as a district leader?

I am proud of our district's dedication to ongoing improvement and being more willing in our reflections to name practices and policies which need to be changed. In my role as a district leader, I own the responsibility to develop my personal competencies related to brave engagement in critical conversations about race and inequitable opportunities provided to Black and Brown students. In my role as district ENL Coordinator, I try to make the conscious decision every day to show love for students, staff, and families, even if it means I am personally marginalized for creating a disequilibrium. I am inspired by my colleague, Dr. Buchanan-Rivera's (2022) scholarship on identity-affirming classrooms. I apply her work to find ways to use my position to create relational ties that result in greater human solidarity in our schools

and community. I am still learning how to skillfully navigate the tensions which arise when I attempt to disrupt oppressive, entrenched systems while I also seek to cultivate unity in our district.

What is MSDWT learning about refugees at this time? What opportunities and challenges do these students and families bring to the district? What success stories can you tell?

Receiving new refugee populations is certainly not to MSDWT, but we still have work to do in supporting newcomer students, particularly at the high school level, with navigating American schooling, learning English, getting acclimated in the community, staying "on track" for graduation, and more. Learning from the Minnesota Department of Human Services' support system for their refugee students and families, we partnered with the University of Minnesota to provide professional development to our EL Coaches and Liaisons on a version of the "Check and Connect" mentorship program to better serve our newcomers as well as other multilingual learners who were identified by their ENL teacher or their schools' student support team. We are entering year 2 of these mentoring partnerships and we've found that in some cases, mentoring relationships have improved student attendance, self-advocacy, and access to community and school resources.

What DEI initiatives in the district are making positive changes for ELLs in MSDWT?

Under the direction of Dr. Erica Buchanan-Rivera, our Director of Equity and Inclusion, each school in the district has a resiliency team working to elevate learning and practices that center equity. These teams facilitate learning that intersects culturally responsive teaching practices, educational neuroscience, ABAR (anti-bias and antiracist work), and social emotional

learning. Each team is responsible for supporting school improvement goals and utilizing the 'systems work' plan as a strategy to address the barriers that hinder progress.

All resiliency members work in a leadership role to engage in the transformative work of creating equitable systems that support all learners. This work is making a positive difference for multilingual learners through the analysis of English learner subgroup data and through teachers' and administrators' focus on critical consciousness to make changes in their personal practices as well as their school's practices. Through our work with Courageous Conversations about Race (Singleton & Linton, 2006) and Interrupting Racism for Children (Child Advocates, Indianapolis), we understand that racism and white privilege are obstacles to overcoming marginalization of multilingual learners. In many cases, what is commonly referred to as a "language barrier" is really systemic racism.

If you could wave a magic wand, what would you wish for MSDWT ELLs?

I wish that all of our multilingual learners could have the opportunity to participate in a language development program that honored their heritage language(s) and culture as well as the brilliance of their multilingual brain. Ideally all of our students would be able to achieve our DLI program goals, which are based on the Teaching for Biliteracy (Beeman & Urow, 2013) framework, which include sociocultural competency, a high degree of bilingualism and biliteracy, high academic achievement, and the long-term benefits of being better prepared to participate in the global workforce and better able to navigate cross-cultural relationships in our community.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dr. Susan R. Adams, PhD., is Faculty Director of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and Associate Professor for the College of Education, Butler University. A former ESL teacher and instructional coach, her work is featured in such publications as *Theory into Practice, English Journal, The New Educator*, and the *Currere Exchange Journal*.

Inquiries should be directed to: sradams@butler.edu

Dr. Rachel Sever, PhD. is English as a New Language Coordinator for the Metropolitan School District of Washington Township and Adjunct Instructor for the College of Education, Butler University. As a teacher and administrator in the Indianapolis area, she has worked collaboratively to break down the silos in education to support inclusion and evidence-based practices for special populations.

Inquiries should be directed to: rsever@msdwt.k12,in.us

REFERENCES

Beeman, K. and Urow, C. (2013). Teaching for biliteracy: Strengthening bridges between languages. Caslon Publishing.

Buchanan-Rivera, E. (2022). Identity affirming classrooms: Spaces that center humanity. Routledge.

Freire, P. (2000). Pedagogy of the oppressed. Continuum.

Sever, R. (2013). English language learners and project-based learning: Creating a space for transformative literacy experiences. ProQuest: 3745631.

Singleton, G. and Linton, C. (2006). Courageous conversations about race: A field guide for educators. Corwin Press.

The Power of Collaboration: Learning Language and Culture by Teaching

KYONGSON PARK

University of Michigan-Dearborn

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to present a means for international college students in higher education to apply their academic knowledge and language (Cummins, 2008) to increase their local knowledge of school culture and intercultural competence (Neuliep, 2020) by working with teachers and students in a local K-12 school community. This was accomplished through a co-teaching K-12 program sponsored by a large public university that provides international college students of any major an opportunity to have a cultural and language learning experience through student teaching in a public middle school. The researcher, an ESL major doctoral student, along with a fellow international college graduate student teacher pursuing a degree in food science, was partnered with two middle school teachers, observed an ESL and a science classroom, co-designed new lesson plans, and co-taught a full day of lessons weekly over one semester. These collaborative experiences benefited local students and teachers, as the ESL college students were able to provide linguistic, sensory, cultural, and interactive supports for content matter (Gibbons, 2009), along with innovative ideas and resources funded by grants. As a result, the ESL graduate students had an immersive learning experience on communicating more effectively in a school setting, both academically and interculturally. In conclusion, this collaboration program benefits international college students by developing their language proficiency, broadening their cultural perspective, and achieving their educational goals by teaching local middle school students.

Key words: *Collaboration, intercultural competence, academic language, International (ESL) college students*

Introduction

In the US, the population of international students has exponentially increased within the last decade (Institute of International Education, 2019). This phenomenon might be seen as internationalization of higher education. However, as De Wit (2017) mentioned in nine misconceptions of internationalization, a high number of international students does not guarantee or is not equivalent to internationalization. Still, the argument can be made that the prevalence of international students does matter, as it influences universities to prepare for internationalization. In this way, the increase in international students has brought about a change in higher education. The weight of the responsibility to adapt has not been left to individual foreign students; rather, the increase in international students has led to change initiatives in universities.

Hudzik (2014) uses different vocabulary to define 'higher education internationalization'. Hudzik points out that this term is a more comprehensive, strategic, and embedded institutionalization than 'globalization or international education' which were used in two decades ago. Many universities in the US have developed strategic internationalization plans, including a Midwestern public university. For example, one large public university has implemented the plan, new synergies which involves global leadership to meet the challenges of the future. This university community recognizes diverse global perspectives and promote collaborations.

Previously, it is commonly believed that internationalization only realized through traveling or occurred being abroad. However, the era of the internet and mobility, along with the

ease of international travel and communication, has lifted time and place restrictions. Thus, internationalization at home as well as abroad is plausible (Knight, 2014; Beelen & Jones, 2015). For instance, the population of international students in the US has been increased and the local (domestic) students have more opportunities to meet culturally and linguistically diverse students and interact with them in their home country, which is a new phenomenon across the world.

Knight describes internationalization at home as college students being able to develop intercultural competence and comprehension, while internationalization abroad encompasses the mobility of students, faculty, and programs. This ideal distinction means that international students in the US can improve their skills and intercultural competence while domestic students in the US can do the same through active interaction with each other. It is not that simple for interaction doesn't occur naturally. Due to the large number of international students on campuses, there are many other factors which affect internationalization. One the one hand, some students who are technically studying abroad are virtually at home when it comes to their social circle and receive their social support for their culture shock and homesickness. For example, a Chinese graduate student may come to the US to study but still work with an advisor from China, have lab mates from China, and roommates from China speaking Chinese most of the time except the lectures in English. On the other hand, other international students actively join in communities and have some chances to meet domestic students.

De Wit, Gacel-Ávila, & Jones (2017) emphasize the role of universities and conclude that the core role of universities needs to be redefined. They argue that universities need to create an environment, with sustainability and equity, for college students to understand the world as a global community and to develop into global citizens. International students should be able to get support systematically from the university level instead of needing to seek help individually.

However, achieving internationalization in higher education is not a goal itself, but means to a goal as De Wit mentioned. Helping college students be prepared for global citizens would be the goal of higher education internationalization.

Many universities have newly developed programs to help international students improve their language proficiency. One such program at Purdue University is a community service opportunity for international college students to collaborate with teachers at a local middle school and experience the local K-12 culture. This program allows international students to play an active and useful role in the local community, to share their knowledge and culture, and improve their language skills and cultural understanding.

The purpose of this study is to present this means for ESL college students in higher education to apply their academic knowledge and *academic language* (Cummins, 1979; 1981a; 2008) while increasing their local knowledge of K-12 school culture and their *intercultural competence.* Cummins' two terms such as social language called basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and academic language called cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) are crucial for students' academic success. It is not uncommon to have an intercultural classroom at a university and for international students to need to adjust to a US campus (Neuliep, 2020). Through the experience of working together, international college students, local K-12 teachers, and middle school students increased their cultural understanding of each other and what it means to be part of an internationalized campus and a globalized community.

Issues and Challenges that Motivated the Research

In the 21st century, the international student population in higher education in the US has increased dramatically (IIE, 2019). While universities have prepared programs to meet the needs

of this international population, international graduate students still face challenges when it comes to teaching both native English-speaking students and international students or working solely as a research assistant (Akanwa, 2015).

One problem is that, due to the high population of international students and professors, it is far too easy for international graduate students to immerse themselves in social groups made up primarily of people from their own country, leading them to have fewer opportunities to interact or communicate with local domestic students or students from countries other than their own (Trice, 2003). Many international college students live with students from their home country or those that have the same first language (L1) or home language; unless these students make the effort to make friends outside this bubble or to participate in extra-curricular activities or student organizations, they tend to primarily hang out with same L1 students. This behavior is typical when it comes to studying abroad (Atkinson, 2011). Then, while international students are abroad, they may still feel like they are in their home country due to lack of interaction with local students and lack of opportunities to directly experience local culture. In addition, the structure of most language and culture programs further reinforces the tendency for international students to interact only with other international students. This research tapped into this issue, show how both international students and domestic students can develop intercultural competence and contribute to the field.

Foreign students were used interchangeably with international students; however, international students are more neutral term. Foreign students were gaining an unintentional negative connotation in academic fields such as second language studies and international education (Hann, 2009). Foreign students who are non-native speakers need to learn English as a second language were distinguished from the domestic students who are native English speakers.

In this reason, the term English as a Second Language (ESL) has been stigmatized as foreign students are not good at English in deficit model. Recently, the language and culture of international students started to be recognized as asset and resources to share, not to be ignored or to be fixed as problems (Wright, 2017).

Another topic is learning by teaching (Aslan 2015). The issue is that many graduate student programs focus on research and do not have mandatory practicums for teaching, and if they do, they involve working in a university setting with college students, made up of either domestic students, international students, or a mix of both. In addition, most international graduate students have not had prior teaching experience, contributing to the difficulty in dealing with diverse students' needs and an unfamiliar school culture while trying to adapt to a new environment. In contrast, graduate students whose focus is on research assistantships or writing dissertations have greatest challenges in developing their oral English proficiency (Akanwa 2015). For instance, during the time I participated in the ESL program for graduate students at a large public university, the teaching practicum was not mandatory for ESL students, whose focus is more on the theoretical background of ESL than teaching. Unless a graduate program is in the field of education, this is not uncommon.

Thus, I as a participant researcher was fascinated to learn of a special community a large public university offered for teaching practicum. I first heard about it from a visiting international scholar who decided to join the program while doing a postdoc at the university. She was a great writer and researcher, but her oral English proficiency was not fluent. She shared details with me of the challenging but rewarding experience she had teaching middle school students and working with teachers in a K-12 school setting. This program was just what I had been looking for, so I gladly joined and started my study to examine how teachers and students

interact in a local K-12 school setting and to better understand the local community culture. In my report, participant researcher perspective allows me to research, observe, and take part in the rituals, interactions, and activities of the group (Musante & DeWalt, 2010)

Local Context

The research involved the partnership of two educational institutions, a large, public university, and a local middle school in the Midwest. A large public university offers the Graduate School GK-12 Program as part of their curriculum. This GK-12 program was developed over a decade ago. The program was started in the College of Science and was initially open only for science major students. At first, only science students had opportunities to work with middle school teachers; however, it has been expanded to include any interested graduate student, post-doc, or visiting scholar in different disciplines. GK-12 fellows can even earn either college credit for participating in this practicum course or receive a certificate for voluntary work. A teacher representative from the middle school has worked with Purdue on this program since it was started, and she has recruited volunteer teachers to participate in the program as well. Once the first meeting is held to match up GK-12 fellows with middle school teachers, the practicum structure consists primarily of one-on-one co-teaching and workshops with other participants.

Participating GK-12 fellows need to complete the following: First, they are required to attend regular training workshops provided by the program. Second, GK-12 fellows are required to spend one full academic day a week for 10 weeks in a classroom working with a mainstream teacher at the partnering middle school. If they cannot stay for an entire school day, they may split their time into two days per week to complete their hours. Third, GK-12 fellows are required to develop a standards-based lesson plan aligned with their own research theme and

implement it. While they are preparing the lesson and hands-on activities, they may apply for a service-learning grant from the university to support the classroom. Finally, at the end of the program, GK-12 fellows must submit their finalized lesson plan, weekly reflections, and a final essay reflecting on their experiences at the middle school. During the time of this research, the GK-12 program director was a professor in a science department; the program director, along with a graduate student coordinator, held the workshops, monitored the fellows' teaching at the middle school, and collected the lesson plans and reflective essays.

Table 1. Roles of Graduate Students (Pre-scholars) in the GK-12 Program

Roles at the University	**Roles at the Middle School**
Apply for the GK-12 Program	Partner with middle school teachers
Participate in regular workshops	Spend one full day per week in the classroom
Apply for a service learning (research) grant	Assist the mainstream teachers
Submit the lesson plan	Create a lesson plan based on their own research
Submit the weekly reflections	Send the lesson to the partner teacher
Attend final meeting and survey	Deliver the lesson for middle school students

I, the researcher, did this program twice and it was interesting to witness a change in participant demographics in the program as it also reflects a part of internationalized campus. When I first join the program, the program coordinator and most participants were domestic students. However, the second time I participated in the program, the program coordinator and most participants were international students. The director at the time of this writing is a native English speaking science professor who is not from the US.

Research Questions

Three research questions were addressed in this study:

1) How can international students improve their language proficiency and experience other cultures through this program?

2) What kind of academic competence and social-cultural competence do college students get through this co-teaching program?

Research Methods and Theoretical Approach

Data Collection Procedures

This study is a single case study with qualitative data. Data was collected over two academic semesters, throughout the Fall 2016 and Fall 2017 semesters, as I, the researcher, participated in this program twice. Date collection included classroom observation notes, reflection journals, lesson plans, teaching reflections, meeting observation notes, and a survey completed by the middle school students after the lessons were delivered.

In the Fall 2016 semester, I, as a Ph.D. student in ESL, worked with a mainstream teacher and 7th grade students in an English Language Arts classroom, and in the Fall 2017 semester, I worked with two mainstream teachers at a local middle school along with another graduate student, as we were both assigned the same classrooms. The program director was the same both times, but the first program coordinator was a domestic science major graduate student and the second an international technology education graduate student. There were seven and 10 diverse graduate student participants respectively in the program with majors in a variety of colleges, including science, engineering, education, and liberal arts.

During each semester I participated, I took notes and submitted my reflection journals to the coordinator once a week. The coordinator sent it back to me with comments. After consulting with the mainstream teacher whom I was paired with, I wrote the lesson plan and sent it to the mainstream teacher and to the coordinator via email. I got feedback from both the mainstream teachers and the other participants in the program. After approval from the mainstream teacher, I revised the lesson and prepared it to be delivered. The coordinator visited the classroom to observe on each participant's teaching day and later provided his notes. He also recorded some parts of the lessons and took some photos. Some of the middle school students' work was preserved via photos. The week after I gave the lesson, I distributed a paper copy of a short questionnaire I had prepared and collected the students' responses with help from the mainstream teacher. In the last meeting workshop at a university, the co-teaching program college student participants also filled out a short questionnaire about the program and celebrated their successful completion.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data I collected in 2016 and 2017 was analyzed as a single qualitative case study. NVivo 12, a software tool, was used to analyze and code the whole files. Data included my reflection journals, lesson plan preparation process, emails, meeting notes, personal communications with the mainstream teachers, and the survey of the middle school students. The survey questions were evaluated by the main teachers. Students' responses were analyzed using a quantitative data analysis in Qualtrics; the rest of the data was analyzed using categorized coding schemes (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996).

The data was reviewed several times to look for patterns and revisited the research questions to identify themes to provide answers. I used the method of narrative analysis for observations and

notes and the method of discourse analysis for personal communications in a typical school environment.

Results and Discussion

In this study, I participated the program as a participant researcher and a participant observer (Musante & DeWalt, 2010) and could describe the findings from my reflections and observations through two semesters. Based on research context and data, the reflections on collaboration with middle school teachers and students and observation experiences on working with college student are presented. The findings and discussion would be presented, and two research questions would be answered based on the data analysis.

1) How can this program help international students to improve their language proficiency and experience other cultures?

International students who participated in this program had the opportunity to improve their language proficiency through regular real-life practice in a K-12 school setting. Depending on the audience, they also had the opportunity to develop their academic language (Cummins, 1981). Additionally, they gained intercultural competence through new cultural experiences and by sharing their own experiences.

Active language users: just keep talking. In my experience, international college students who are more focused on writing research papers have fewer opportunities to speak in English in social and academic contexts. In contrast, before, during, and after this program, participants are required to use all four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Program participants had many opportunities to experience different genres of language. School settings can be defined as workplaces with multiple genres of spoken and written language. According to Koester (2006)'s workplace spoken language genres, college students

were supposed to use *unidirectional* (lecturing, service encounters, procedural and directive, discourse, and reporting), *collaborative* (arrangement, decision-making, discussion, evaluating, and liminal talk), and *non-transactional* (office gossip and small talk) spoken language (pp. 33-34). In addition, college students are required to use a variety of written genres, such as emails, technical reports, progress reports/updates, reflections, schedules, lesson plans, observation notes, and activity directions. This is relevant as the GK-12 program participants experienced a variety of different genres that were used in a specific fluid context, not just in linguistic static text (Flowerdew, 2011). Program participants were socializing while receiving written feedback on their writing (Tim, 2020), and they experienced "co-learning" through co-teaching.

Students who did not feel confident about their spoken or written English were still able to participate meaningfully in the community, as there were no grammar-focused evaluations on English accuracy but on English fluency for communication. Rather, the regular workshops for teaching were held on campus and in the workshops, college students could focus on talking a lot using academic language and discuss how to speak differently by changing the audiences from other college students to middle school students. There was a strong emphasis on peer review, peer support, constructive criticism, and collaboration in a safe and unintimidating learning space in both a university and a middle school setting.

Program workshops: A flipped classroom. Although the workshops were set up as a kind of flipped classroom, program participants needed to read and learn the materials prior to attending. Schoology, a social networking service and online learning environment, was used as platform to share materials and assignments. At the workshop, program participants did not have to listen to a long lecture, but rather participated in active discussions with each other, asked questions and received responses, engaged in activities, and checked in about their progress in

the program. During the workshops, participants were required to give oral presentations, engage in discussions, and verbalize their opinions to fellow participants. They also needed to read emails and other materials such as Power Point slides and other interactive home assignments before and after the workshops. Additionally, each workshop ended with social conversation over dinner and menu was selected by participants.

Workshop meetings provided a variety of different speaking and listening opportunities, with fun activities such as "body relax," (physical movement) a game called "Icebreaker," a riddle-based Bingo game, jokes, dramatization, magic tricks, and role playing, all of which effectively promote oral language development for ELL students (Peregoy & Boyle, 2017, p. 179). Meetings started with a warm-up which first emphasized social language, i.e., Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills, and then moved on to academic language, i.e., Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (Cummins, 1981a).

The workshops also provided GK-12 program participants with a foundational background in teaching and gave them the opportunity to discuss how to apply these in the middle school classroom. The following topics were discussed: "What are learning objectives?" "Absorb-Do-Connect model" (Horton, 2012, p.12), "How to use a 5E-instructional model" (Atkin & Karplus, 1962; Tayler et al., 2007), "What is a lesson plan?" and "How to create effective lesson plans."

At the end of each meeting, participants had dinner together and talked freely in a relaxed environment. Over the course of the three workshops, international students got to know each other, shared their concerns, supported each other, and prepared for teaching.

In the middle school, program fellows also had many opportunities to practice their English skills. They needed to listen to the mainstream teachers, make comments, and receive

oral feedback from teachers and students. They had one-on-one communications with the mainstream teachers who were partnered with them, either via email or orally during breaks or lunch time. In addition, program fellows wrote reflection journals and lesson plans, got feedback, and then revised them in English.

For their first three weeks at the middle school, program fellows were primarily required to use their listening skills. As time went on, they needed to use their speaking skills more frequently while co-teaching for a full school day, about 7.5 hours. This time commitment is a salient feature of this program, as international college students are not usually exposed to English for extended periods of time on a daily basis. In contrast, ELL students in K-12 are regularly exposed to English during the school day. College students were experiencing the same amount of time of long school day and listened to the repeated lessons in several different periods.

Program fellows primarily exercised their academic English while observing classes, assisting main teachers, and co-teaching; fellows had opportunities to practice their social English during casual chats with students and teachers during breaks or lunch time. Perhaps less importantly, since most college students are already familiar with different genres of written communication, they also got to practice their academic and social reading and writing skills through journaling and email correspondence.

Through participation in this program, international college students had ample opportunities to use different language modes, both oral and written English and formal and informal language, in a university as well as a middle school setting. They were regularly required to speak on specific teaching-related topics and given corrective feedback but did not have to worry about being graded (Peregoy & Boyle, 2017). In this way, they were able to

improve their oral communication skills. By the definition of Krashen (1982), this program provided a low-affective filter area for international college students, where they could learn in an emotional safe space. In addition, the context-embedded context (Cummins, 1980) of the middle school environment allowed the international program fellows to learn language rapidly (Peregoy & Boyle, 2017, p.22).

Active culture learners: Intercultural competence. The demographics of the participants in the program was more diverse in 2017 than in 2016. Of the 10 participants in 2017, there were four students from China, two from India, two from Korea, one from Turkey, and one from the US. Of the seven participants in 2016, there were three from the US, two from China, and two from Korea. The coordinator in 2016 was an US American domestic graduate student who received his K-12 education in the US, and the coordinator in 2017 was a Chinese international graduate student who received his K-12 education in China. Both years, the teachers at the partnered middle school were all L1 English speakers. More ESL international college students received benefits from this program.

Teacher Training. Teaching training took place based on a needs analysis of the program participants, curriculum support, and financial support. Before the first training workshop, program fellows were asked to share their anticipated concerns and read Power Point materials via email communication. Then during the first workshop, they were introduced to details about the program, the middle school, and the K-12 students. A representative teacher from the middle school attended the first workshop to explain the logistics. She addressed several important topics: weather check, test schedule, office visit, how to reschedule a visit to the middle school, how to email and communicate with the middle school teachers, and the dress code (business casual). It was interesting for me to learn there is a dress code for teachers in

middle schools, as there was no specific dress code for teaching at a university setting. It seems like that there are more rules for teachers at middle schools. There were 27 questions and concerns brought up by the 10 participants, and all were discussed in the first workshop. They could be categorized into three themes: K-12 school culture, teaching work, and program inquiries.

K-12 school culture questions. Although program participants received basic information on the program, they had many inquiries about working in a public middle school. For instance, they inquired about the class size, lesson times, what classroom they would be in, and what partner teachers would they have.

Cultural Difference

School setting	K-12 School culture vs. University culture
Teachers	Teacher at a middle school vs. TA/RA at a university
Language	Domestic vs. International
Content	Different subjects: English Language Arts (ELA), Science, and English as a Second Language (ESL)
Academic Language	Language use in each classroom

Teaching work concerns. Program participants had the most questions (13 total) about teaching, mostly concerns about how to teach middle school students. Since program fellows were already familiar with working and learning at the university level, they wanted to know how to scaffold or differentiate their teaching for younger students. Their concerns included: what to teach, how to teach, how in depth they can teach, what are lesson plans and can they get a sample, how to interact with students, what strategies they can use, how they can implement their research in teaching, what their roles are, how to draw students' interest and attention,

research possibilities, how to deal with cultural differences in classrooms, and what are the rules and expectations of the mainstream teachers.

Program inquires. Students also had technical questions regarding the reflection journal due date, what to do when needing to reschedule their visit to the middle school, how to collaborate with teachers inside and/or outside of the classroom, how to do classroom management, getting course credit, and program particularization.

Table 2. Language & Culture Learning at Workshops

	Workshop Agenda
Oral Language	• Engagement Activities: Oral language practice
Academic Language	• Learning Objectives/ Lesson Plan: K-12 / Assessment & Evaluation / Teaching Rehearsal
Culture	• Middle school logistics • Talk with Dinner
Writing	• Weekly reflection Journal / Lesson plan

2) What kind of academic competence and social-cultural competence do college students get through this co-teaching program?

Co-teaching training at the middle school. All the international participants spent their K-12 years in their home country. Thus, they were not familiar with the culture of a US public middle school. Through this intensive 10-week experience teaching at a middle school, they got to know the community and learned how to teach middle school students, including some ELL students. As an example, I have reported the following findings from my case study of both semesters in the program.

Phase I: Adapting to a New Cultural Environment as an Observer & Assistant Teacher

Cultural Differences. College students learned as an apprentice from the expert teachers how to adjust cultural difference between university and middle school through either explicit teaching from main teachers or careful observations. When college students prepared for their teaching materials, they revised the content to fit for the proper target audience in middle school. In ELA class, samples of grammar exercises about adjectives and nouns from a university writing center were revised and used. For instance, the word like "drunk" (he was drunk) in a sentence was omitted due to inappropriate for middle school age students. The vague pronouns such as 'he/she' in the sentence were changed into students' real names to draw their interests (e.g., He measured the floor → Tom measured the floor). While college students worked more as observers in the ELA class, they assisted the main science teacher more actively in the science class. In the science class, safety issue and classroom management are more important especially when students do the experiments in the class. For example, each student received one goggle and learned the safety rules. College students move around and monitor if each group of students are focusing on doing experiments, how they are managing it and reminded them of collaborative work and report.

Unlike college students' typically flexible course schedules, the middle school started early at 7:30 am and ended at 3:30 pm every day. Class size was about 17-23 students, whereas college students have class sizes that can vary from less than 10 to several hundred students. Thus, college students shared their physical exhaustion after this practice and admiration for the K-12 teachers.

Challenges in Classroom Management. A surprising finding was that teaching K-12 students is not only about teaching content itself but also about classroom management.

Classroom management plays an important role in a public middle school as teachers have different students in each period and each period created a different atmosphere. Some periods in science classes were easy for teachers to discipline students; however, other periods in the science class were difficult to manage the classroom.

The international program participants adapting to this new workplace faced many challenges. First, there were students who did not behave well in the classroom. The main teachers generally had good control over these students. But the program participants as student teachers sometimes did not know what to do if they met these cases. We learned that it is not a good idea to try to solve any issues among students but to instead inform the main teacher and have the teacher deal with it. The main classroom teacher has the main authority over the students. The program participants needed to be aware of the basic rules of the specific classroom they were working in, as teachers have different teaching styles and rules. If the program fellows did not communicate well with the main teacher, there might be tension between them. As time went on, participants could gain authority over students, which helped them successfully deliver their lesson later.

Academic interactions with teachers. The ELA teacher, Ms. Amy I worked with was stricter than the second science teacher, Ms. Carol I worked with in the following year. The stricter teacher made it easy for me to manage the classroom. However, she did not request any help from me at first. Rather, she passively accepted my offer when I volunteered to help with grading, to pass the materials, and to teach together. She seemed very cautious, as this was her first time participating in the GK-12 program and working with a college student. On the other hand, the second Science teacher I worked with, who had been the liaison with the university for 10 years, was an expert on training novice teachers. She actively suggested that my colleague,

the program participant cohort 1 and I, paired with, participate in her teaching from the start. Thus, we had frequent opportunities to talk and lead some parts of her lessons and be involved with her instructions and experiments.

Social interactions with teachers. The best part of the day with my first ELA teacher, Ms. Amy occurred during lunch time. She packed her lunch, as had two other teachers. I had no idea what to do at my lunch time, so I joined them, and we ate lunch together while chatting. I got a taste of the life of middle school teachers, and we became friends. I got to know the main teachers better personally, such as their favorite snack or tv show, and saw the difficulties they had amid a teacher shortage and the reality of relationships between administration and parents and students. Unlike my first ELA teacher, Ms. Amy, the new teacher, Ms. Carol just drank a cup of coffee or had a snack rather than eat lunch. As participants, we could observe and learn how other teachers spend lunch time. So, the second time I joined in the program, I sat in the middle school cafeteria with my colleague at lunch time. This led us to have a chance to take a look at cafeteria at a middle school and watch how middle school students are doing in other places. Sometimes, we brought our lunch from the cafeteria and ate it with the main teacher, Ms. Carol together in the classroom. We could get to know each other more in detail by asking questions including personal questions. I learned that she is from Europe, is very interested in sports, and visited Korea one time. Other English speakers praised her British accent, but she doesn't take it as a compliment. It was interesting to see that she felt the same way I do even if she is an English native speaker. Other times, we ate in the cafeteria just talking to each other while watching other students eating. This time, I could ask my cohort, a science college student about his background in China, and build our collegial relationship. For example, science graduate student had a hard time learning students' names in the classroom and I gave him some

tips how to pronounce their names with vowels and stress. We could recognize our different cultures, learn the values, and understand each other better and work more effectively.

Phase II: Joining the Community as a Co-Teacher

The best part of this program for participants is that we were not just learning but also contributing and feeling connected to the community. One misconception about international students or ESL students is that they are always "receivers" of knowledge as learners of a new language and culture. But this co-teaching experience in a real-life setting has shown that international students can also be providers of knowledge, giving of their time, sharing their cultures, while simultaneously expanding their horizons and networking (see Table 3). Students consistently showed their interest in other cultures. For instance, they asked me if I know K-Pop, BTS, Korean pop singer or K-Drama, and how he can write his name in Korean. Middle school students talked to me that they think "bilingual is a cool thing". Many students asked about North Korea, not from political way but out of curiosity by asking if I ever visited North Korea. It was surprisingly interesting to find out that some English-only students are learning Korean and their willingness to have international teachers. The survey result support this as 74% of students were satisfied with the student teachers' (college students) lessons.

Table 3. Three level mutual learning/ support and advocacy of ESL College students
(See Appendix 1 for details)

	Individual	Institutional (University)	Community (Middle School)
Language	Limited language use	Balanced language use	English for specific purpose

Socio-Culture	Limited networking	Well-rounded networking	Expanding networking: Local community member

Implications for Policy, Practice, and Future Research

The following are some suggestions regarding the GK-12 co-teaching program. Because participants need to commit at least one full day a week over a whole semester to complete this program, some interested graduate students cannot join the program due to the time it requires. Although the long duration of the program benefits participants greatly in achieving their language goals, other opportunities of shorter duration might allow more participants to join the program. For example, graduate students could be given the opportunity to provide two or three invited lectures or shadow a teacher in the middle school for a shorter period of time.

When matching up teachers with program participants, fellows are generally placed in the classes that are most similar to their majors. However, my experience suggests that ESL students need more support in content classes. Thus, more ESL fellows should be placed in ESL classrooms to promote their English literacy or in other disciplines selected to expand their learning of language and culture.

The teacher training program for participants in this program is very effective. However, to improve communication between K-12 teachers and program participants, it would be helpful to also offer the partnered middle school teachers a workshop on how to work with ESL graduate students.

A service-learning grant is used to purchase any instructional materials for the lessons that program fellows prepare with their main teachers. There might be other options such as

monetary funding to provide incentives to K-12 teachers to recruit more participants from K-12 schools.

My future research plans include using a practicum course in an undergraduate and graduate-level ESL program as a co-teaching opportunity. Placement will be flexibly set up and graduate students will be assigned an ESL classroom or a STEM classroom that includes ELL students. The purpose is to investigate how college students in STEM or education can beneficially work with ESL students in STEM classrooms, not just in ELA or ESL classrooms.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Kyongson Park is an assistant professor in the department of education at University of Michigan-Dearborn. Dr. Park's research interests include PreK-12 teacher education for English Learners (ESL), teacher collaboration for STEM literacy, and language assessment for linguistically and culturally diverse students. Her work can be found in *English for Specific Purposes* and *Journal of Studies in International Education*.

kyongson@umich.edu

References

Akanwa, E. E. (2015). International students in western developed countries: History, challenges, and prospects. *Journal of International Students*, *5*(3), 271–284. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v5i3.421

Algren, M. S. (2016, October 26). *How intensive English programs contribute to campus internationalization*. The EvoLLLution. Retrieved November 9, 2022, from https://evolllution.com/revenue-streams/global_learning/how-intensive-english-program-contribute-to-campus-internationalization/

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3-4), 290–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542

Anderson, T. (2021). The socialization of L2 doctoral students through written feedback. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *20*(2), 134-149.

Aslan, S. (2015). Is learning by teaching effective in gaining 21st century skills? the views of pre-service science teachers. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2016.1.0019

Atkin, J. M., & Karplus, R (1962). Discovery or Invention, *The Science Teacher*, 29 (2), 121-143.

Atkinson, D. (Ed.). (2011). *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition.* Taylor & Francis.

Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2013). Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction. Guilford Press.

Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015). Redefining internationalization at home. In *The European higher education area* (pp. 59-72). Springer, Cham.

Bybee, R. W. (1997). *Achieving Scientific Literacy: From purposes to practices*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Bybee, R. W., Taylor, J. A., Gardner, A., Van Scotter, P., Powell, J. C., Westbrook, A., & Landes, N. (2006). The BSCS 5E instructional model: Origins and effectiveness. *Colorado Springs, Co: BSCS*, 5, 88-98.

Castro, P., Woodin, J., Lundgren, U., & Byram, M. (2016). Student mobility and internationalization in higher education: Perspectives from practitioners. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *16*(3), 418–436. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2016.1168052

Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 487–499. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_36

Cummins, J.: 1979, 'Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters', *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 19, 121–129.

Cummins, J.: 1981a, 'The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students', in California State Department of Education (ed.), *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework*, Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center California State University, Los Angeles.

De Wit, H. (2017). Global: Internationalization of higher education: Nine misconceptions. *Understanding Higher Education Internationalization*, 9–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6351-161-2_2

De Wit, H., Gacel-Ávila, J., & Jones, E. (2017). Voices and perspectives on internationalization from the emerging and developing world: Where are we heading?. In *The globalization of internationalization* (pp. 245-257). Routledge.

Flowerdew, J. (2011). Reconciling contrasting approaches to genre analysis: The whole can equal more than the sum of the parts. *New directions in English for specific purposes research*, 119-44.

Freire, P. (2020). Pedagogy of the oppressed. In *Toward a Sociology of Education* (pp. 374-386). Routledge.

Gibbons, P. (2009). *English learners, academic literacy, and thinking: Learning in the challenge zone* (Vol. 361). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hansen-Thomas, H., Stewart, M. A., Flint, P., & Dollar, T. (2020). Co-learning in the high school English class through translanguaging: Emergent bilingual newcomers and monolingual teachers. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *20*(3), 151–166. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1726759

Honigsfeld & Cohen, (2008). The Power of Two: Lesson Study and SIOP Help Teachers Instruct ELLs. *Journal of Staff Development*. 29 (1), 24-28.

Horton, W. (2012). *E-Learning by Design*. San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

Hudzik, J. K. (2014). *Comprehensive internationalization: Institutional pathways to success*. Routledge.

Knight, J. (2014). Three generations of crossborder higher education: New developments, issues and challenges. *Internationalisation of higher education and global mobility*, *23*, 43-58.

Koester, A. (2006). *Investigating workplace discourse*. Routledge.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Lantz-Deaton, C. (2017). Internationalization and the development of students' intercultural competence. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 22(5), 532–550. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2016.1273209

Musante, K., & DeWalt, B. R. (2010). *Participant observation: A guide for fieldworkers*. Rowman Altamira.

Neuliep, J. W. (2020). *Intercultural communication: A contextual approach*. Sage Publications.

Number of international students in the United States hits all-time high. The Power of International Education. (n.d.). Retrieved November 9, 2022, from https://www.iie.org/en/Why-IIE/Announcements/2019/11/Number-of-International-Students-in-the-United-States-Hits-All-Time-High

Paige, R. M., & Vande Berg, M. (2012). Why students are and are not learning abroad: A review of recent research. In *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it* (pp. 29–58). Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F.(2017). Reading, Writing, and Learning in ESL: A Resource Book for Teaching K-12 English Learners.

Ralph, M., Sexton, C., Wagner, K., & Gerlovich, J. (1998). Science for all children: Methods for constructing understanding. *Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon Company*.

Rendón, L. I. (2012). *Sentipensante (sensing/thinking) pedagogy: Educating for wholeness, social justice and liberation*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Rendón, L., & Kanagala, V. (2017). Embracing contemplative pedagogy in a culturally diverse classroom. *ICEA Journal*, *1*(1), 15-25.

Taylor, J. A., Van Scotter, P., & Coulson, D. (2007). Bridging Research on Learning and Student Achievement: The Role of Instructional Materials. *Science Educator*, 16(2), 44-50.

Tim Anderson (2020): The Socialization of L2 Doctoral Students through Written Feedback, *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*. DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2020.1726758

Trice, A. G. (2003). Faculty perceptions of graduate international students: The benefits and challenges. *Journal of studies in International Education*, 7(4), 379-403.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher mental processes. Cambridge.* MA: Harvard University Press.

Wright, W. E. (2010). *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy, and practice.* Caslon Pub.

Appendix

Appendix A.

Three level mutual learning/ support and advocacy of ESL College students in details

	Individual	Institutional (University)	Community (Middle School)
Language	Limited language use as international graduate students: -academic language learner. -writing/reading focused.	Balanced language use: -Four language skills (focused talking /speaking) -discussion.	English for specific purpose: -Academic language teacher -Social language learner -Instructional language user

	-non-linguistic work (lab work)	-colloquial & academic conversation -a variety of new genres	
Socio-Culture	-limited networking: one department member.	-well rounded networking: member across multi-disciplines (e.g., science, engineering, liberal arts, education)	Expanding networking: Local community member -K-12 classroom culture -teacher's culture -students' culture (classroom management, reward, disciplines) -coworker as a professional -learn American culture -share their L1 language & home culture (e.g., Korean language, Chinese, K-Pop culture, BTS, North Korea, university) -university culture

L2 Students' Adaptive Transfer Beyond First-Year Writing

XIN CHEN
Indiana University Bloomington

ABSTRACT

Learning transfer with regard to academic literacy in higher education has drawn more and more researchers' attention in recent years (Baik & Greig, 2009). However, only a small number of transfer studies are pertinent to international and multilingual students or second language (L2) writing instruction. Situated in the area of English for Academic Purposes (EAP), this research investigates L2 undergraduate students' writing practice and development within and across the disciplines. Specifically, it looks into six Chinese international students' learning transfer from their First-Year Writing (FYW) course to disciplinary writing in the college years. Drawing upon the theoretical framework of adaptive transfer proposed by Depalma and Ringer (2011), this study redefines transfer in L2 writing and expands the research scope of transfer studies. It examines writing transfer from a new vantage point by including writers' creative and/or strategic transformation of learned knowledge.

Using the case study methodology, this research documents detailed processes of how international and multilingual students adapt and transform prior writing knowledge and experiences to construct discipline-specific literacy. The findings have captured a series of writing practices cutting across those students' approach to language, rhetoric, and genre and identified the factors that contextualize their writing practices.

Keywords: L2 students, learning transfer, writing across the curriculum

Introduction

For an 18-year-old Chinese international student who flies thousands of miles to study at a U.S. university, what waits for him/her upon entering college is probably an English language proficiency test and then an (or a series of) English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course(s) including the First-Year Writing (FYW) course, all aiming to ensure the student's readiness to participate in an academic environment where the language and culture are totally different from what they come with. Indeed, language barrier is considered the greatest challenge that faculty members in higher education face in teaching international and multilingual students whose first language (L1) is not English (Sawir, 2011; Trice, 2003). (Those students are also considered L2 students since they speak English as a second language.) Hence, western Anglophone universities have invested heavily in developing language and literacy programs to help those students improve academic language proficiency and prepare them with sufficient academic skills to achieve success in their degree program (Terraschke & Wahid, 2011). While most universities in the U.S. have EAP and/or FYW programs, the connections between students' experiences in the EAP and/or FYW courses and other disciplinary content courses are still ambiguous to educators. In other words, if we agree that EAP courses (to some extent) serve the preparatory purpose for international and multilingual students' study in American higher education institutions, it merits full consideration what students learn in those courses and how they transfer the learning from those courses to fulfill other academic requirements throughout the college.

A great deal of research has been conducted to explore the nature of learning transfer (e.g., Barnett & Ceci, 2002; Beech, 1999; Butler, Godbole, & Marsh, 2013; Detterman, 1993; Foley & Kaiser, 2013; MacRae & Skinner, 2011), but with the increasing knowledge about how

and why learning transfer occurs or not, new questions and topics also keep emerging in this area (Day & Goldstone, 2012; Larsen-Freeman, 2013). Recently, more and more studies have been carried out on learning transfer with regard to academic literacy in higher education (Baik & Greig, 2009), but only a small number of them are pertinent to international and multilingual students' learning of advanced academic language in classrooms across the disciplines. Moreover, language and literacy education research to a great extent represents international and multilingual students as disadvantage and examines their academic discourse socialization through a "deficit" lens (Grimshaw, 2011; Ryan, 2011). However, it is critical for educators to realize that academic language and literacy is highly contextualized and it needs to be gradually acquired by students through actively engaging with the materials they study in different courses, making sense of the texts they read, and generating ideas and interpretations. This acquisition process is embedded in each classroom which provides opportunities for them to "experiment with unfamiliar language and literacy practices, and construct new knowledge" (Zamel & Spack, 2006, p. 138).

In addition, international and multilingual students can be regarded as transnationals living between worlds, connected to both their home and host countries, and working towards future academic mobility (Gargano, 2012). Their sociocultural histories and shifting identities will also influence how they respond to the learning context and the assigned work in a certain classroom. As a heterogeneous group of learners, those students "do not begin from the same starting point, do not follow the same process of socialization, and do not end with identical outcomes" (Vasilopoulos, 2016, p. 20). Therefore, any attempt to simply generalize this group of learners (even some of them share the same linguistic and cultural background) or predict an individual learner should be given a second thought.

Literature Review

Considering that undergraduate students in the U.S. will likely engage in various writing tasks throughout their academic life, educators in EAP and composition studies find it crucial to explore different levels and types of expertise required for academic writing across the curriculum and to observe the ways in which students switch writing practices for specific purposes in diverse disciplinary contexts (Herrington & Curtis, 2000; Prior, 1991; Russell, 1991). A large amount of research had been conducted to investigate students' writing practices across the curriculum at university with a focus on how they cope with institutional and sociocultural demands in different academic contexts (Currie, 1993; Harklau, 2000; Leki, 2001, 2003, 2007; Leki & Carson, 1994, 1997; Spack, 1997). More recently, scholars have started to pay particular attention to whether and how prior knowledge facilitates learning of a new writing task across contexts.

Some of them look at the transition from high-school writing to college writing (e.g., Artemeva & Fox, 2010; Reiff & Bawarshi, 2011); others work on the development of college writing regarding the extent to which students adopt the composition knowledge and skills learned from EAP writing instructions to take on other writing tasks in the disciplines (e.g., Hansen, 2000; James, 2008, 2009). In these studies, learning transfer presented in students' textual features is taken as a sign of the development of writing expertise, and the extent of students' transferring writing practice beyond EAP courses is a criterion for the instructional efficacy of the course. Nonetheless, the construct of transfer in those studies seemed to be operationalized on students' survival strategies for varying writing tasks and the challenges involved in those tasks. Such a narrow view of transfer actually has limited the possibilities for researchers to detect students' active use of their prior composition knowledge and skills to

reconstruct the rhetorical situation in different writing contexts.

Rethinking EAP writing instructions and the FYW course

Studies focusing on international and multilingual students' learning transfer (Casanave, 1990; Currie, 1993; Leki, 1995, 2001, 2007; Leki & Carson, 1994, 1997) had illustrated the students' perception of different writing demands across the curriculum and the strategies they developed to meet those needs as well as expectations in disciplinary writing. For example, Leki (1995) identified various writing strategies that international and multilingual students employed for writing tasks across contexts, e.g., relying on past writing experience, taking advantage of first language/culture, looking for models, using feedback, and accommodating teachers' demands. Nevertheless, the study also revealed that EAP writing instructions, such as the FYW course, was limited in regard to predicting students' writing experiences in different disciplinary courses because those writing experiences were both individualized and contextualized, encompassing more than a set of skills or a range of knowledge taught in EAP courses.

Undoubtedly, different kinds of expertise are demanded to perform writing tasks in the disciplines, and it is difficult for EAP writing instructions such as the FYW course to predict and cover all of them. In order to investigate learning transfer from FYW to disciplinary writing, it is necessary to gain a better understanding of students' writing tasks as well as practices in the disciplines. Such tasks and practices, depending on different disciplinary expectations and specific ways of knowing, take shape as genres in the disciplines (Bazerman, 1992, 1994; Bazerman & Russell, 2003; Russell, 1991, 1997). The role of genre as mediating social actions in disciplinary discourse and its impact on the development of academic literacy makes genre analysis an appropriate approach to examine student's disciplinary writing. In recent years, there has been a call for a reexamination of the role of genre in learning transfer in writing across the

curriculum, but scant research has been conducted to explore the process of students' development of genre-awareness in transferring prior composition knowledge and skills to new disciplinary contexts, especially international and multilingual students at undergraduate level. Since the dynamic view of writing recognizes that genres are open to change and rhetorical situations are constructed by both readers and the writer, the process of developing of genre awareness in response to discipline-specific needs along with international and multilingual students' agency in reshaping what was learned from the FYW course to fit the new tasks in disciplinary writing is the main interest of this research.

Casanave (2002) suggested that academic writing is a game-like practice organized by a set of conventionalized rules. It is shaped by interactions with other participants in the game, and transformed by a series of conflicting experiences that do not correspond to game rules. In fact, the transformation part entailed in academic writing indicates the room for change. If students are game players, the way they position themselves in writing determines whether they will simply follow the rules or try to modify them to meet their own needs. Such awareness of agency and the possibility of making changes is critical in the studies of international and multilingual students' writing experience. It is also compatible with a dynamic view of academic writing and learning transfer in writing instruction. As Canagrajah (2006) pointed out, multilingual writers are likely to utilize their language resources and learned composition knowledge in creative ways to achieve rhetorical purposes strategically.

Literature from the translingualism school has shifted the paradigm of L2 writing research and provided writing scholars as well as instructors with new theoretical frameworks to rethink multilingual writers' work. Meanwhile, they also shed light on transfer studies in EAP education and generated significant implications for writing instruction to international and

multilingual students. In particular, DePalma and Ringer (2011) proposed a theory of adaptive transfer to expand disciplinary discussions of transfer in L2 writing and composition studies.

The construct of adaptive transfer involves the processes that learners form relations of similarities and generalizations across different contexts (Lobato, 2003). Especially in multilingual writing, adaptive transfer depicts how writers become strategic composers (Carroll, 2002) as their meta-knowledge of language, genre and rhetorical form develops further, no matter in EAP writing courses or in other content courses in their disciplines. Furthermore, it recognizes international and multilingual students' L1 and native culture as resources, while not assuming that all instances of reformulation are appropriate or intentional. In short, the theory highlights the dynamic nature of composition knowledge and rhetorical contexts, and also emphasizes the idiosyncratic ways that individuals are aware of and interact with genres. This research adopted adaptive transfer as its theoretical framework and focused the analysis on students' genre practices.

Methodology

Research Questions

Adaptive transfer attempts to account for the reformulation of composition knowledge and skills that writers make to produce new ways of knowing and doing. It reveals an important point that transfer of learning can also be indirect and adjusted to serve the learners' new context of practice. However, more empirical studies are needed to delineate the issue of adaptive transfer and further develop the theory, and many fundamental questions in writing transfer such as when and how students reshape prior composition knowledge in new contexts remain to be answered. DePalma and Ringer (2014) had suggested a list of questions for adaptive transfer in writing. Based on that, this research attempts to address the following questions pertinent to

international and multilingual students' writing transfer:

1. *What kinds of composition knowledge and skills from EAP writing instructions (especially the FYW course) do international and multilingual undergraduate students identify as helpful?*
2. *What do those students' idiosyncratic processes of applying prior knowledge and experience to writing in the disciplines indicate about the nature of transfer? How does such transfer influence their learning of disciplinary discourse conventions?*

The author conducted multiple case studies to closely examine individual students' transfer of composition knowledge and skills across contexts to fulfill the requirements of writing and studying in the college years. Since the research questions are contextually specific and are addressing contemporary issues, they comply with the conditions of choosing a case study method proposed by Yin (2009). Besides, case study research can also be used to understand a larger population of similar units (Gerring, 2007), which enables this research to generate insights for more writing programs involving international and multilingual students.

Data Collection and Analysis

The research was conducted at Midwestern University (pseudonym), a research university in the Midwest U.S. With a growing population of international students, the institution is linguistically and culturally diverse. Undergraduate students at Midwestern University are required to complete a 16-week FYW course – Writing 101 (pseudonym) before they get enrolled in their major studies. International students whose core educational backgrounds occurred in languages other than English will be recommended to take the multilingual version of the course – Writing 101 ML (pseudonym). The course objective of Writing 101 ML includes fundamental proficiencies in writing, which is considered to contribute

to students' readiness to enter into advanced study in their chosen disciplines.

In total, this research has six participants recruited from the FYW program. Four of them study in the Business School at Midwestern University with different majors including Finance, Accounting, and Entrepreneurship. The other two participants major in Psychology and Early Childhood Education respectively. The participants' major disciplines are considered a variable in this research which investigates the students' writing transfer from EAP instructions to disciplinary courses and how the transfer influences their learning of the disciplinary discourse conventions. Appendix A provides a profile of each participant. The author had recruited eight participants but decided to focus on the six Chinese international students with whom the author shared the same L1. In the informal individual meeting with the potential participants who responded to the recruiting material, the author had sensed the difficulties that L2 students had in explaining their own thinking and writing process in English, because they were not given the specific English language in composition studies that could accurately describe their writing experiences. However, all the participants – Michael, Sally, Roger, Rebeca, Steve, and Zoe (pseudonyms used for all) are from China and able to speak Chinese in the individual interviews with the author or in the focus group discussions with other participants. The interview data was collected in Chinese as it allowed the participants to express their thoughts more easily and freely. Then the interview recordings were transcribed and translated them into English. The original transcripts together with the translated copies were sent to a Chinese English professor in China for review to make sure that the translations captured the spirit of the original transcripts without distortion of meaning. In addition, the translated transcriptions were shared with the participants for member checking, since they were also proficient in English.

The participants' writing samples were collected from both the FYW course and other

disciplinary courses and then individual interviews were conducted based on the writing samples to discuss with the participants their writing process as well as individualized engagement in academic writing. To triangulate the findings, focus group discussions were held to inquire about the participants' understanding of different college genres and experiences of writing in the disciplines. The participants were also asked to submit a written reflection on their process of completing the writing task in a disciplinary course (the one that they shared with the author). Content analysis of the interview transcripts as well as students' written work had enabled the author to look into their writing practices through the lens of adaptive transfer and determine what kind of composition knowledge and skills the students consider helpful in EAP writing instructions (especially the FYW course) and how they adapt them to write across the curriculum.

For the purpose of this study, special attention was given to the signs of adaptive transfer, i.e., the evidence demonstrating students' transformation of their composition knowledge and skills as adapted to disciplinary expectations (Dannels, 2000; DePalma & Ringer, 2011). In particular, the author explored the ways in which international and multilingual students learn and develop a set of composition knowledge as well as skills to switch their genre practices between one writing context and another. Additionally, the contextual factors that come into play in students' genre practices was traced to generate curricular and pedagogical implications for instructors of both EAP and disciplinary courses to promote and facilitate those L2 students' adaptive transfer in academic writing.

Findings and Discussion

In general, transfer refers to "how previous learning influences current and future learning, and how past or current learning is applied or adapted to similar or novel situations.

Transfer, then, isn't so much an instructional and learning technique as a way of thinking, perceiving, and processing information" (Haskell, 2001, p. 23). Therefore, when looking for the evidence of transfer in the participants' writing practice in and outside the FYW course, the author concentrated on how FYW instructions influence those student writers' thinking of writing itself, perceiving of the writing tasks and contexts, and processing of their prior knowledge as well as current information.

According to James (2010), four broader categories of learning outcomes were found to be transferable from EAP writing instructions (including the FYW): (1) *Content* (using resources and developing topics), (2) *Organization* (organizing and establishing coherence), 3) *Language use and mechanics* (using appropriate vocabulary and using appropriate syntactic patterns/devices), and (4) *Process efficiency* (using process knowledge and writing efficiently). In this research, the participants shared many commonalities in their transference of composition knowledge and skills across writing tasks and contexts, but in the meantime their practice of transfer and trajectory of writing development at college differed from each other, because their educational experience prior to college, dispositions towards learning, personality, and even family background were all in play. The following is a synthesis of cross-case findings and a discussion on implications.

Being Strategic in the Writing Process

First of all, process efficiency was found the most salient composition knowledge and skill transferred from the FYW instruction. All the participants mentioned in the interviews that they had learned from the Writing 101 ML course a more comprehensive and effective writing process, which included planning, drafting, and revising and editing. Although they adopted various strategies at the pre-writing and revising stage, the student writers started to understand

an essential concept in composition—writing is a process rather than a mere product, and it often involves hard thinking. Prior to entering college, English writing to those L2 students were more about expression and translation. According to the student participants, in their home country China, no matter in the TOEFL or IELTS test preparation classes in academies or in the English language classes in high schools, English writing instruction was heavily influenced by the grammar-translation approach and all the students as well as the writing teachers tended to focus more on how to use the English language to express their Chinese thoughts. Although in the past thirty years, English teachers in China had tried to adopt a variety of English teaching methods from the West (among which communicative language teaching is the most popular), there are challenges in the EFL teaching context that prevent teachers from fully engaging students in the communicative activities during the teaching process (Rao, 2013; Wang, 2010). Hence, many teachers switch back to the traditional ways of teaching English and grammar translation is still widely practiced in present-day China (Du, 2021) .

The participants recognized that the value of the FYW course is more than just helping them fulfill the first-year writing requirements set by the university. Although not confident in her writing all along, Zoe said that the FYW course eased her anxiety about writing because she had practiced different types of academic writing in a "safe" place where her language skills were not judged. With that practice, she found herself equipped with the techniques to handle academic writing tasks—what to do before, during, and after writing. For example, she had learned to adopt the active reading skills for the tasks involving summary or reaction to readings and would also use the freewriting technique for brainstorming. FYW also helped Sally become more strategic during the writing process. She used to leave little time for revising because the majority of the time was wasted in struggle at the prewriting stage, but now she learned to

balance the time allocation for each stage of the writing process and realized that revising a draft was more than grammar check. In addition, Sally had developed a habit of making outlines to organize her ideas before writing so that she could write more efficiently. Therefore, the writing process they were introduced to and practiced in the FYW course had been evidently transferred beyond the course. Roger reported that thanks to the intensive training in the FYW course, he had become more skillful in writing and thus been able to complete writing tasks faster than before. All the other participants resonated with him in the focus group discussion and shared how they perceived the improved efficiency of their writing process as well.

Although the participants often found more differences than similarities among the writing tasks in different classes and, they were able to develop their own strategies based on the underlying knowledge and skills of composition. For instance, Rebecca had never written a research memo before taking the Business Analysis course but she applied and adapted the experience of research-paper writing in the FYW course to complete the task. While she encountered a new task and felt lacking guidance for it, the process knowledge of academic writing in general (i.e., planning, writing, and revising) had provided her with a clue of where to start. This demonstrated that when those students are put in the situations that push them to meet the writing challenges on their own (due to lacking or feeling lack of support), soliciting prior composition knowledge and skills becomes a necessity automatically.

Adapting to a Different Epistemology

Furthermore, the FYW course has changed those students' way of thinking about writing. For instance, Michael had learned to analyze his target audience before writing and to look at his own writing from the audience's perspective. This reinforced audience awareness enabled him to understand writing as a means of communication rather than mere expression. Rebecca related

how her FYW instructor helped her dig deeper into the reading for a textual analysis paper and encouraged her to think more critically about the sources she found for a research paper. “When I went to office hours to discuss my drafts, he (the FYW instructor) often asked me to attend to more details in the text and to give my argument a second thought” (Rebecca, individual interview, 2019). It was also in the FYW course where Sally learned that “there were no easy answers” in good argumentation (quoted from Sally, individual interview, 2019). Even though she was already skilled in the argumentative writing, the course has freed her rigid way of writing and helped her develop new habits of mind.

> I used to think that when I try to make an argument, I should stick to it and find only the evidence to support it. But now, I would also consider counterevidence to complicate my own argument so as to make it more compelling.
>
> (Sally, individual interview, 2019)

The above quote from Sally also touched upon the point of “content” transfer (James, 2010), namely making good use of sources to deepen the exploration of a topic or problem. Research skills were mentioned by five out of the six participants (except Michael) during the interviews when they were asked about the most impressive and useful knowledge and/or skills learned from the Writing 101 ML course. This could be partially explained by the differences between Asian and American epistemology. Students coming from Asian epistemological tradition may find it new to them that knowledge construction is based on analytical arguments and making analytical arguments primarily means engaging with sources. Moreover, for the students who are new to a content area, broad and solid research skills can serve as their door opener. When Steve found it difficult to pick a topic for his assignment in the research method course in Psychology due to insufficient subject-matter knowledge, he solicited his experience in writing a research paper in the FYW course, for which he was also given the freedom to choose a topic of his interest and research into it. “Research” here is not limited to searching for sources

for a typical research paper. It also refers to collecting resources to prepare for writing. For example, Roger did research on the company at which he was applying for an internship to prepare for his cover letter writing.

It is worth mentioning that among the six participants, Roger and Steve went to high school in the U.S., while the others came to the U.S. for college. Roger's and Steve's cases showed that being exposed to the Western rhetoric and epistemology earlier could contribute to L2 students' readiness for tackling challenges in college writing. Experiences in the American high schools had also made them more confident in writing. Compared with them, Michael's experience was different. Before he came to study in the U.S., Michael had completed the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme (IBDP) in China. Mainly taught in English, the IBDP is an assessed program for students aged 16-19 and is considered a pathway to leading universities across the globe. Even though he was taught with a Western-style curriculum in an international high school in China, Michael's English writing did not reflect a Western way of thinking. Many of the sentences were blunt translations from Chinese to English, which might confuse the readers. Furthermore, his drafts were usually like freewriting without a clear logical flow. Michael admitted that for the research paper in Writing 101 ML, which required him to discuss an analysis-worthy topic by synthesizing multiple sources, he had to think in Chinese to develop ideas before starting to write in English. This approach had influenced not only his expression (e.g., the blunt translations) but also the organization of his writing because Chinese rhetoric differs from English rhetoric in many ways (You, 2010). For instance, argumentation in Chinese writing is structured in a way that writers provide reasons and/or contexts before giving out their main points. While argument as a means of persuasion plays an essential role of Western rhetoric, it is depreciated in Chinese culture since "it is equated with contentiousness,

with exaggerating differences, with decreasing mutual understanding, with undermining harmony" (Jensen, 1987, p. 233). Therefore, many Chinese do not have the habit of arguing in their rhetorical tradition (Gu, 2008) and found it difficult to structure their arguments according to the English writing conventions.

As a matter of fact, it was not realistic to expect first-year college students, who came from a foreign culture, spoke another language, and were educated with a different epistemology for about 18 years, to achieve the same level of language and academic competency as those students who studied in the U.S. education system for much more time. Ormrod (2004) argued that how people make sense of new knowledge is subject to culturally bounded epistemology. While "American epistemology places individualized knowledge acquisition at the center of learning and highly values analytical argument as a means of meaningful knowledge construction" (Hung & Hyun, 2010, p. 347), Asian epistemology tends to attach hierarchical human relationship to the positionality of the learning process, e.g., knowledge is from authority and uncertainty is to be avoided (Nisbett, 2003). That is why most of the participants found it difficult to be critical in analytical writing albeit their language proficiency, and being unclear about the instructors' expectations or requirements would cause more stress for them. It will be helpful for faculty to show more patience with those students and whenever possible, allow them more time to understand and adjust to the new academic culture, which might contrast their past experiences and beliefs.

From Language Learners to Language Users

Rebecca was the one who was seen to have successfully transferred her knowledge and skills of organization and structure to disciplinary writing. When she wrote the research memo for a case study in the Business Analysis course, she was not sure about the content or the format

due to lack of experience and guidance, but she had a clear idea about how to organize the information collected from research and make it understandable to the audience.

> It (the research memo) was different from the research paper because I do not need to develop a topic or take a position. The task of the research memo was more straightforward – to do some research about the case and then discuss my findings with teammates to work out a solution together, so organizing the information I have is important. I need to make points out of the information rather than merely listing it. I saw that problem in my teammates' research memos when we did peer review in class. They listed a great deal of information but I do not know what they really wanted to say. I also helped them in our collaborative writing for the final report.
>
> (Rebecca, focus group discussion, 2020)

Although not completely satisfied with her research memo, Rebecca was quite proud of her work in the collaborative writing of the final report for the case study. She said that the skills of building paragraphs she learned in the Writing 101 ML course were helpful in her individual writing and also in the collaborative writing with teammates. She knew that an effective paragraph should be focused and it was better to explore one point thoroughly in a paragraph rather than touching upon several points superficially. In her own research memo, she paid attention to topic sentences and carefully made transitions to help ideas flow. In the teamwork for the case study, Rebecca's teammates include L2 students from other countries and also L1 English speakers. While she admitted that they relied on the L1 English speaking peers to do the final editing and proofreading to avoid language problems, Rebecca had contributed to the substantial revision of the collaborative writing task, especially in organizing the whole team's ideas and structuring the whole paper.

> They (L1 English speaking peers) are better at sentence level and helped fix the language problems on my part, but I did a lot on restructuring the report and reorganizing the paragraphs and they appreciated that as well. Those skills were what impressed me in the Writing 101 ML course, and I am glad that I can use them in other tasks.
>
> (Rebecca, focus group discussion, 2020)

In the focus group discussion, all the other participants nodded when they heard the

above words from Rebecca. While those international and multilingual students recognized their limitations in English language, they did not necessarily see themselves as less competent writers compared to their L1 English speaking counterparts. Rebecca thought that her American peers had a linguistic advantage and more experience of writing in the U.S. education system, so they were assumed to be more skillful in handling academic tasks, but the FYW instruction had also equipped her with the fundamental knowledge and skills of academic writing to collaborate with and even help them in those tasks. In this sense, the FYW course had also given Rebecca the confidence to work with her L1 English speaking peers despite her linguistic disadvantage.

That being said, a major concern for most international and multilingual students is the potential problems in their language use in writing (typically, imprecise word choice and awkward expression due to blunt translation), because as L2 writers, they sometimes are not able to tell whether they have chosen the best way to express themselves or whether their L1 English speaking audience can understand them. While James (2010) suggested that language and mechanics (using appropriate vocabulary and syntactic patterns/devices) were proved to be transferable from EAP instructions, they were the least reported by the participants in this research. On the contrary, all of the students said that they needed to improve further their expression and vocabulary, and five of them (except Sally, who had received strict English grammar training back in China) thought grammar errors were a big problem in their writing.

In fact, it is understandable why the research participants did not see or were not aware of their language transfer from the FYW course to other writing contexts in the disciplinary courses. Firstly, given the nature of the Writing 101 ML course, language instruction was a small component of the curriculum (about 10% including sentence structure, rhetorical grammar, etc.) and grammar accounted for only 5% of the total grade for all the papers. Since first-year college

students have many other composition knowledge and skills to learn and practice in the FYW course, there is usually limited time left for language instruction. Secondly, expression and vocabulary cannot be improved visibly within a short period of time (e.g., a 16-week semester). More importantly, even though students get to practice their language skills in the FYW course, language use in different disciplines may vary and the language of a specific discipline could be new to them whenever they enter a new content area (Nguyen, Williams, & Trimarchi, 2015). All the participants agreed that they kept encountering and learning new words in their major studies, and their writing in the disciplinary courses to a large extent relies on imitating the language used in the assigned readings. Zoe even had a notebook collecting the vocabularies and expressions from the assigned readings, which she thought could be useful in her own writing. "That might not be a smart way to learn language, but is the only way that seems to work for me, especially in writing" (Zoe, individual interview, 2019).

Conclusion

All of the participants perceived that they had achieved improvement in academic writing more or less after completing the FYW course, but it could be told from their writing samples and reflections in the focus group that stronger writers in the FYW course continued to be strong in other disciplinary courses while weaker writers seemed to keep struggling with writing in the discipline. The stronger writers (Sally and Rebecca) are independent learners who are more conscious about their own writing practices and experiences. Hence, they are able to achieve further transfer of composition knowledge and skills by identifying both the differences and similarities between prior and new tasks and develop new strategies by themselves. In contrast, the weaker writers (Michael and Zoe) tend to rely on more specific guidelines and they usually need the instructors to walk them through the writing process. However, those students are also

self-motivated and are willing to invest more time in learning writing. Additional support for writing outside the writing classes will enable them to achieve progress more efficiently. Roger and Steve appeared to be confident writers. The confidence comes from their oral proficiency and more experiences of studying in the U.S. Although it does not ensure their higher performance in academic writing, they seem to be coping with the challenges in writing tasks with more calmness and self-assurance. Even so, both of them commented in the written reflection in the focus group that the reflective writing prompts and the interview questions in this research had guided them to better understand their own processes of writing and learning to write. It follows that helping those students use the composition knowledge to theorize their own writing practices will make them more conscious of the strategies they have adopted and developed and transfer them further.

It is also to be noted that most international and multilingual students had little rhetorical knowledge in English writing before they came to study in the U.S., and their way of learning L1 writing could be totally different from how they learn to write in L2. That is why many of those students feel they need to learn English writing all anew when entering universities in the U.S. – academic writing is a way of learning and knowing, and it requires a deeper understanding of the culture of the academic community the writer is in. The meaning and value of EAP writing instructions, especially the FYW course, lies in introducing the academic culture and expectations and guiding them to view and learn writing in a new way that allows them not only to build on their prior knowledge and experiences, but also to develop strategies for future writing tasks in unfamiliar contexts. More importantly, continued support in writing in the disciplines is desirable so that the students are able to keep improving their academic literacy and competency. To put it another way, teaching writing is not only the responsibility of writing

teachers. Rather, disciplinary faculty are encouraged to use writing as a way to socialize the students into the discourse community. Besides designing writing tasks to help students acquire and generate knowledge in the disciplines, integrating instructions on writing in the discipline into the curriculum is also worthwhile pedagogical consideration.

All in all, it is essential for the faculty to understand international and multilingual students' developmental trajectories of academic skills and provide more patience to allow them to navigate the new environment, which is foreign to them in all senses. The FYW course is never a magic course or a boot camp that could turn novice writers into experienced writers within a short period of time (one semester or even one year). L2 students especially need more time to accustom themselves to not only the language that has not been used much in their life before but also the new ways of thinking and learning. If the faculty, whether in writing courses or disciplinary courses, could be aware of those student writers' needs as well as their conscious or unconscious writing practices, they might be able to provide support more pertinently and facilitate the transfer to accelerate their students' writing development at college.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Xin Chen is a lecturer of business communication at Indiana University Bloomington (IUB). She received her Ph.D. in Literacy, Culture, and Language Education from IUB and holds a Certificate in Teaching EFL & ESL. Her research focuses on second language writing and multilingual students' development of academic literacy.

References

Artemeva, N., & Fox, J. (2010). Awareness versus production: Probing students' antecedent genre knowledge. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 24*(4), 476-515. https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651910371302

Barnett, S. M., & Ceci, S. J. (2002). When and where do we apply what we learn? A taxonomy for far transfer. *Psychological Bulletin, 128(4),* 612-637. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.4.612

Baik, C., & Greig, J. (2009). Improving the academic outcomes of undergraduate ESL students: The case for discipline-based academic skills programs. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*(4), 401-416. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360903067005

Bazerman, C. (1992). From cultural criticism to disciplinary participation: Living with powerful words. In A. Harrington, & C. Moran (Eds.), *Writing, teaching, and learning in the disciplines* (pp. 61-68). Modern Language Association.

Bazerman, C. (1994). Systems of genres and the enactment of social intentions. In A. Freedman, & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric* (pp. 79-101). Taylor & Francis.

Bazerman. C., & Russell, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Writing selves/writing society: Research from activity perspectives*. The WAC Clearinghouse. https://doi.org/10.37514/per-b.2003.2317

Beech, K. (1999). Consequential transitions: A sociocultural expedition beyond transfer in education. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 101-139. https://doi.org/10.2307/1167268

Bergmann, L. S., & Zepernick, J. (2007). Disciplinarity and transfer: Students' perceptions of learning to write. *Writing Program Administration, 31*, 124-149.

Butler, A. C., Godbole, N., & Marsh, E. J. (2013). Explanation feedback is better than correct

answer feedback for promoting transfer of learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*(2), 290-298. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031026

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: learning from multilingual writers. *College English, 68,* 589-604. https://doi.org/10.2307/25472177

Carroll, L. A. (2002). *Rehearsing New Roles: How college students develop as writers.* Southern Illinois University Press.

Casanave, C. P. (1990). *The role of writing in socializing graduate students into an academic discipline in the social sciences.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Casanave, C. P. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410612366

Currie, P. (1993). Entering a disciplinary community: Conceptual activities required to write for one introductory university course. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(93)90012-r

Day, S. B., & Goldstone, R. L. (2012). The import of knowledge export: Connecting findings and theories of transfer of learning. *Educational Psychologist, 47*(3), 153-176. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.696438

Dannels, D. P. (2000). Learning to be professional: Technical classroom discourse and professional identity construction. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 14(1)*, 5-37. https://doi.org/10.1177/105065190001400101

DePalma, M.-J., & Ringer, J. M. (2011). Toward a theory of adaptive transfer: Expanding disciplinary discussions of "transfer" in second-language writing and composition studies. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20*(2), 134-147.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2011.02.003

DePalma, M.-J., & Ringer, J. M. (2014). Adaptive transfer, writing across the curriculum, and second language writing: Implications for research and teaching. In T. M. Zawacki, & M. Cox (Eds.). *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 43-67). Parlor Press. https://doi.org/10.37514/per-b.2014.0551.2.01

Detterman, D. K. (1993). The case for the prosecution: transfer as an epiphenomenon. In D. K. Detterman, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Transfer on trial: Intelligence, cognition, and instruction* (pp. 1-24). Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Du, Y. (2021). Grammar Translation and its Use in Present-day China. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, *10*(5), 28-35.

Foley, J. M., & Kaiser, L. M. R. (2013). Learning transfer and its intentionality in adult and continuing education. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education, 137*, 5-15. https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.20040

Gargano, T. (2012). Grounded identities, transient lives: The emergence of international student voices in an era of cosmopolitan learning. *Journal of International Students, 2*(2), 144-157. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v2i2.527

Gerring, J. (2007) *Case study research: Principles and practices*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511803123.001

Grimshaw, T. (2011). The needs of international students rethought–Implications for the policy and practice of higher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 17* (6), 703-712. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2011.625147

Gu, J. (2008). Rhetorical clash between Chinese and Westerners. *Intercultural Communication*

*Studies, XVII:*4, 44-51.

Hansen, J. G. (2000). Interactional conflicts among audience, purpose, and content knowledge in the acquisition of academic literacy in an EAP course. *Written Communication, 17(1)*, 27-52. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088300017001002

Harklau, L. (2000). From the "good kids" to the "worst": Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly, 34(1)*, 35-67. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588096

Haskell, R. E. (2001). *Transfer of learning: Cognition, instruction, and reasoning*. Academic Press Inc.

Herrington, A., & Curtis, M. (2000). *Persons in process: Four stories of writing and personal development in college. Refiguring English Studies Series.* National Council of Teachers of English.

Hung, H-L., & Hyun, E. (2010). East Asian international graduate students' epistemological experiences in an American University. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 34* (4), 340-353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2009.12.001

James, M. A. (2008). The influence of perceptions of task similarity/difference on learning transfer in second language writing. *Written Communication, 25(1)*, 76-103. https://doi.org/10.1177/074108830730954

James, M. A. (2009). "Far" transfer of learning outcomes from an ESL writing course: Can the gap be bridged? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*(2), 69-84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.01.001

James, M. A. (2010). An investigation of learning transfer in English-for-general-academic-purposes writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19(4)*, 183-206.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.09.003

Jensen, J. V. (1987). Rhetorical emphasis of Taoism. *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric, 5*(3), 219-229. https://doi.org/10.1525/rh.1987.5.3.219

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2013). Transfer of learning transformed. *Language Learning, 63*, 107-129. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00740.x

Leki, I. (1995). Coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly, 29(2)*, 235-260. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587624

Leki, I. (2001). "A narrow thinking system": nonnative-English-speaking students in group projects across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly, 35(1)*, 39-67. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587859

Leki, I. (2003). Living through college literacy: Nursing in a second language. *Written Communication, 20(1)*, 81-98. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088303253571

Leki, I. (2007). *Undergraduates in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315084442

Leki, I., & Carson, J. G. (1994). Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(1), 81-101. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587199

Leki, I., & Carson, J. G. (1997). "Completely different worlds": EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. *TESOL Quarterly, 31(1)*, 39-69. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587974

Lobato, J. (2003). How design experiments can inform a rethinking of transfer and vice versa. *Educational Researcher, 32*(1), 17-20. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x032001017

MacRae, R., & Skinner, K. (2011). Learning for the twenty-first Century: Maximising learning

transfer from learning and development activity. *Social Work Education, 30*(8), 981-994. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2010.520118

Nguyen, T. T., Williams, J., & Trimarchi, A. (2015). Discipline-specific language instruction for international students in Introductory Economics. *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 6(3),* 1-21. https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2015.3.7

Nisbett, R. E. (2003). *The geography of thought: How Asians and Westerners think differently…and why.* The Free Press.

Ormrod, J. (2004). *Human learning* (4th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.

Prior, P. (1991). Contextualizing writing and response in a graduate seminar. *Written Communication, 8(3)*, 267-310. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088391008003001

Rao, Z. (2013). Teaching English as a foreign language in China: looking back and forward: Reconciling modern methodologies with traditional ways of language teaching. *English Today*, *29*(3), 34-39. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266078413000291

Reiff, M. J., & Bawarshi, A. (2011). Tracing discursive resources: How students use prior genre knowledge to negotiate new writing contexts in first-year composition. *Written Communication, 28*(3), 312-337. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088311410183

Russell, D. (1991). *Writing in the academic disciplines 1870-1990*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Russell, D. (1997). Rethinking genre in school and society: An activity theory analysis. *Written Communication, 14(4)*, 504-554. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088397014004004

Ryan, J. (2011). Teaching and learning for international students: Towards a transcultural approach. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 17*(6), 631-648. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2011.625138

Sawir, E. (2011). Academic staff response to international students and internationalising the curriculum: The impact of disciplinary differences. *International Journal for Academic Development, 16*(1), 45-57. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144x.2011.546224

Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: a longitudinal case study. *Written Communication, 14(1)*, 3-62. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088397014001001

Terraschke, A., & Wahid, R. (2011). The impact of EAP study on the academic experiences of international postgraduate students in Australia. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10(3)*, 173-182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.05.003

Trice, A. (2003). Faculty perceptions of graduate international students: The benefits and challenges. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7*(4), 379-403. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315303257120

Vasilopoulos, E. (2016). Exploring international student academic discourse socialization in Canadian Universities through a Deleuzian lens. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education, 7*(2), 17-26.

Wang, S. (2010). The significance of English grammar to middle school students in China. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *1*(3), 313-319. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.313-319

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (4th ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

You, X-Y. (2010). *Writing in the devil's tongue: A history of English composition in China.* Southern Illinois University Press.

Zamel, V., & Spack, R. (2006). Teaching multilingual learners across the curriculum: Beyond the ESOL classroom and back again. *Journal of Basic Writing*, *25*(2), 126-152.

https://doi.org/10.37514/jbw-j.2006.25.2.07

Appendix A: Profiles of the Six Participants

	Nationality and transnational experiences	*Years studying in the U.S. when the research began*	*Major and minor studies at college*	*Educational background before college*
Michael	Chinese; arrived in the U.S. at the age of 18 for college	One year	Major in Finance and minor in Entrepreneurship	Graduated from an international high school in China and enrolled in an International Baccalaureate Diploma Program (IBDP)[1] to prepare for study overseas. Also took the TOEFL[2] test to apply for universities in the U.S.
Sally	Chinese; arrived in the U.S. at the age of 19 for college	One year	Major in Accounting and minor in Math	Graduated from a private high school in China and had studied in a Chinese University for one year when she also went to an academy to prepare for the IELTS[3] test
Roger	Chinese; arrived in the U.S. at the age of 16 for high school	Four years and a half	Major in Finance and minor in Technology Management	Graduated from a private high school in the U.S.
Rebecca	Chinese; arrived in the U.S. at the age of 18 for high school	One year	Double major in Finance and Accounting	Dropped out from a public high school in China due to depression and spent one year overcoming depression while preparing for the TOEFL test
Steve	Chinese; arrived in the U.S. at the age of 16 for high school; lived in Singapore during kindergarten years	Four years	Major in Psychology	Graduated from a private high school in the U.S. and took college-prep courses in high school

[1] International Baccalaureate Diploma Program (IBDP) is an assessed program for students aged 16-19 and is considered a pathway to leading universities across the globe.
[2] Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) is a standardized test to measure the English language competency of the students whose first language is not English and who wish to enroll in English-speaking universities.
[3] The International English Language Test System (IELTS) is an international standardized test of English language proficiency for speakers whose first language is not English.

Zoe	Chinese; arrived in the U.S. at the age of 17 for college	One year	Major in Early Childhood Education	Graduated from a public high school in China; obtained the diploma within 1.5 years and then went to an academy to prepare for the TOEFL test

Information for Contributors

INTESOL JOURNAL

The INTESOL Journal, a professional, refereed journal, encourages submission of previously unpublished articles on topics of significance to individuals concerned with language teaching and learning. Although the INTESOL Journal was formerly published as a print journal, beginning in 2014, the INTESOL Journal will be an open-access journal published exclusively online. As a publication that represents a variety of cross-disciplinary interests, both theoretical and practical, the INTESOL Journal invites manuscripts on a wide range of topics, including:

- psychology and sociology of language learning and teaching;
- issues in research and research methodology;
- testing and evaluation;
- professional participation;
- curriculum design and development;
- instructional methods, materials, and techniques; and
- language planning professional standards.

Because the INTESOL Journal is committed to publishing manuscripts that contribute to bridging theory and practice in our profession, it particularly welcomes submissions that address the implications and applications of research in, for example,

- anthropology;
- applied and theoretical linguistics;
- communication;
- education;
- English education, including reading and writing theory;

- psycholinguistics;
- psychology;
- first and second language acquisition;
- sociolinguistics; and
- sociology.

The INTESOL Journal prefers that all submissions be written in a style that is accessible to a broad readership, including those individuals who may not be familiar with the subject matter.

GENERAL SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Contributors are strongly encouraged to submit manuscripts of no more than 15-20 double spaced pages or 7,000 words (including references, notes, and tables). Submit one copy plus an informative abstract of not more than 200 words. If possible, indicate the number of words at the end of the article. To facilitate the blind review process, authors' names should appear only on a cover sheet, not on the title page; do not use running heads. INTESOL Journal prefers online submissions through the journal's online submission system. Please visit https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/intesol/user/register to create a user name and password prior to submitting a manuscript.

When evaluating a manuscript for publication in the INTESOL Journal, reviewers consider the following factors:

1. The manuscript appeals to the general interests of INTESOL's readership;
2. The manuscript strengthens the relationship between theory and practice: Practical articles must be anchored in theory, and theoretical articles and reports of research must contain a discussion of implications or applications for practice;
3. The content of the manuscript is accessible to the broad readership of the INTESOL

4. Membership;
5. The manuscript offers a new, original insight or interpretation and not just a restatement of others' ideas and views;
6. The manuscript makes a significant practical, useful, plausible contribution to the field;
7. The manuscript is likely to arouse readers' interest;
8. The manuscript reflects sound scholarship and research design with appropriate, correctly interpreted references to other authors and works; and
9. The manuscript is well written and organized and conforms to the specifications of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.).

All submissions to INTESOL Journal should be accompanied by a cover letter that includes a full mailing address and both a daytime and an evening telephone number. Where available, authors should include an email address and fax number. Authors of articles should include a very brief biographical statement (in sentence form, maximum 50 words), plus any special notations or acknowledgments that they would like to have included. Double spacing should be used throughout.

Manuscripts submitted to INTESOL Journal cannot be returned to authors. Authors should be sure to keep a copy for themselves. It is understood that manuscripts submitted to INTESOL Journal have not been previously published and are not under consideration for publication elsewhere. It is the responsibility of the author(s) of a manuscript submitted to an INTESOL Journal to indicate to the Editor the existence of any work already published (or under consideration for publication elsewhere) by the author(s) that is similar in content to that of the manuscript.

The Editor and Associate Editor of INTESOL Journal reserves the right to make editorial changes in any manuscript accepted for publication to enhance clarity, concision, or style. The author will be consulted only if the editing has been substantial. The Editor's decisions are final. The views expressed by contributors to INTESOL Journal do not necessarily reflect those of the Editor, the Editorial Advisory Board, Editorial Review Team or INTESOL. Material published in the INTESOL Journal should not be construed to have the endorsement of INTESOL.

Special Topics Issues

The INTESOL Journal is an annual publication; however, one additional issue per volume may be devoted to a special topic. Topics are approved by the INTESOL Journal's Editorial Advisory Board. Those wishing to suggest topics or serve as guest editors should contact the editor. Issues will generally contain both invited articles designed to survey and illuminate central themes as well as articles solicited through a call for papers.

These guidelines are largely adopted from the TESOL Quarterly guidelines (09/2004).

Reckoning with Hammers and Mallets: Indiana's Approach to Licensing English Learner Teachers

TRISH MORITA-MULLANEY
Purdue University

Abstract

INTESOL has actively advocated for appropriate certification and training of Indiana's EL teacher workforce, informing the policy of the Indiana English Learner (EL) Teacher of Record. The Indiana EL Teacher of Record requirement, established in 2019 by the Indiana Department of Education asserts that by 2022, all Indiana school districts will have an established 30:1 ratio of EL students to EL-licensed teachers meeting the minimum criterion of two Supreme Court cases, Lau v. Nichols (1974) and Castañeda v. Pickard (1984). The Indiana Department of Education, the funder of this policy, granted accredited universities in EL education to train and license educators, increasing the overall capacity of districts to meet the needs and rights of their ELs with appropriate staffing and programming. While efforts to meet 30:1 goal are still in progress, Indiana's approach has contrasted with other states who addressed such licensure initiatives with a heavy hammer, whereas Indiana has done it with a softer mallet. Implications for universities, districts, and families are discussed.

Keywords: *English learner, language policy, accountability, highly qualified teachers*

In 2019, Dr. Jennifer McCormick, then Indiana Superintendent of Public Schools sent out a memo requiring districts to meet a minimum staffing criterion of a 30 designated-ELs to one EL-licensed teacher (McCormick, 2019) mirroring guidance from INTESOL (Morita-Mullaney & Albrecht, 2017) and historic Office of Civil Rights investigations (Indiana Urban Schools

Association, 2005), holding to the intention and spirit of Lau v. Nichols (1974) and Castañeda v. Pickard (1984), two Supreme Court cases requiring English Learner (EL) programming. During the 2019-2020 school year 72,229 identified-ELs, legally obliged to receive some form of English language development (ELD) or bilingual instruction, only 1423 EL educators were licensed in this area at the time, accounting for a 50:1 student/teacher ratio. Yet, there are no assurances that these 1423 are active teachers working with EL students, so this number does not adequately capture what is happening on the ground in schools, suggesting that the ratio is much worse. The Superintendent memo (2019) compelled school districts to analyze their current staffing models and to move swiftly towards implementation to satisfy the 30:1 compliance requirement by September 2022.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) then furnished funding to accomplish this aim, working with universities with accredited EL-licensure programs to respond to the demand in due speed. The provision of funding reduced the financial burden on schools who may have regarded the requirement as an "unfunded mandate" (US Congress, 1995). The aspiration of an unfunded mandate is that an institution or individual will be compelled to remedy a given harm, and altruistically furnish the needed resources and funding. But, more often, there is frustration and resentment that a governmental entity is imposing its stance and subsequent requirements and thereby, overreaching. The policy feels like a hammer.

Some narratives that circulated throughout school districts was the shortage of EL teachers available from the outside or from within. Yet, when EL programs are underdeveloped and/or absent, then there is no glaring EL teacher shortage. Claiming a shortage rather than lack of programming is a potential argument used to evade admission that legal provisions for ELs are unmet, simultaneously absolving districts from financial commitment to ELs, rationalizing

their inaction. EL students are thereby, mainly served through general education or what scholars reference as “sink or swim” models (Wright, 2019), an unlawful, yet present circumstance in Indiana. Given that financial formulas for funding public education have become bifurcated and reduced, this financial circumstance reinforces the rationale for EL teacher shortages (Appleton, 2022).

To address the “ESL Program Staffing” needs, the IDOE began recruitment of in-service teachers to add-on EL licensure to their Indiana licenses in the Spring of 2020. EL district-leaders had to quickly identify cohorts of teachers and select a university program(s) in which to collaborate, with most EL (designated) district leaders having multiple duties beyond the EL-scope. The search for in-service teachers was fast paced and decentralized; methods for identification of teachers varied as did the knowledge base of EL-district leaders, many of whom had little to no training or expertise in English learner teaching (Morita-Mullaney & Stallings, 2018; Morita-Mullaney, 2019). Thus, teachers in EL-licensure programs entered with varied understanding about the IDOE policies and their expectations for assisting their districts in making this compliance benchmark by September 2022.

While this phenomenon is relatively new in the Indiana context, EL or bilingual licensure requirements have been enforced through consent decrees and state statute throughout the United States. I turn now to the literature on several states who have experienced this licensure requirement.

Literature Review

Licensing under compliance may be framed by districts as coercive or over-reaching, as many come with no additional funding to reach such goals, further constructing the policy as top-down because it is an “unfunded mandate” (US Congress, 1995). Compliance generally has

timelines for corrective action, creating the conditions for universities and private companies to meet the licensing demand. In this literature review, I examine four states, all with sizable EL populations relative to Indiana who have experienced this enforced requirement of adequately trained and licensed personnel to serve identified-ELs, including Florida, Arizona, New York, and Illinois.

Licensing under compliance

Following the passage of the Bilingual Education Act (1968), Lau v. Nichols (1974), Castañeda and Pickard (1982), states slowly moved into action to establish consent decrees, a legal obligation administered by regional courts that would ensure the full implementation of services for identified-ELs. Due to the density of ELs in New York, Florida, Arizona, and Illinois, regional or state administered consent decrees became commonplace and state agencies had to swiftly assemble interpretation of policy to move towards fuller compliance, which could include a bilingual and/or EL focused licensing or training provisions.

Florida. Florida's consent decree established in 1990, revised in 2003 and again in 2009, reiterates all the essential components of Castañeda v. Pickard (1982) stating that a program must be research-based, adequately resourced, and found to be effective. To meet this minimum criterion, staffing and specializing of teachers was needed, galvanizing a focus on licensing teachers with 300 hours of credits within a narrow window of time (Platt et al., 2003).

Universities swiftly built infrastructures to meet this impending demand, but the Arizona policy also allowed for the private agencies to come in to meet the licensing and training demands. Educators having to complete the ELL licensure requirement in a short time frame in order to remain employed or be employable were inclined to find the fastest and least expensive route to the licensure. Many private companies who "sold" the swiftest and tidiest route to

licensure became increasingly attractive. One Florida educator remarked, “I showed up to a meeting with the agency and they handed me a big volume of readings, signed a paper for me, and I applied for my ELL license not having read a single page” (Johnson, C. pers. comm., April 1, 2020).

The origin of this push for EL programming and adequate staffing came from African American and Hispanic community in cooperation with the Multilingual Education, Training and Advocacy (META) creating immediate specificity for the implementation of language programming for ELs (Florida Department of Education, 1990). Florida did not focus on just the stand alone EL teacher, rather any teacher with EL students would need to acquire a regiment of training and/or EL licensure.

Arizona. Arizona experienced a restrictive language policy measure that parted ways from some of the historically implemented bilingual approaches to language education. Instead of honoring such models, the Arizona legislature adopted Proposition 203 (Arizona Voter Intiative, 2000), moving to a mandatory structured English immersion (SEI) model that required identified-ELs to be served in a self-contained model for 4 hours daily (Bernstein et al., 2020).

Lillie and Moore (2014) found that restrictive structured English immersion (SEI) programs implemented with a mandatory four-hour instructional block for all identified-ELs and the demand for more trained SEI teachers led to predatory, private companies offering a swift pathway to this preparation. While universities critiqued the subpar preparation imparted by these private companies, there was no specificity within the policy nor in its enforcement that ensured a minimum level of content and quality. Importantly, the authors found that the private companies had appreciably shorter timeframes for completion, but problematically, many of the candidates did not pass the required teacher exams. Gándara and Orfield (2012) and Wright

(2005), lead scholars studying the Arizona context critiqued the student segregation due to the separate, 4-hour model and due to its remedial orientation with now, a disparately trained SEI teacher workforce. The origin of these laws came from an Arizona Voter Initiative, driven by conservative and restrictive orientations toward the EL community grounded in their ideological values of an English-only medium for instruction.

New York. New York's ASPIRA Consent Decree (1977), led by the Puerto Rican community plead that a bilingual education should be availed to their children, setting stage for specific ratios to be made for given languages. When 20 or more speakers of a given language in each grade level became represented in a school, then part to all of their day would be within a bilingual education model (Aspira of New York, Inc. v. Board of Education, 1975). Once this formula was aggregated, such programming had to be created and staffed. This opened stage for bilingual licensing and universities taking on a demonstrable role. Most New York schools worked within their schools and communities to develop the need for this unique bilingual workforce.

The origin of these laws came from the EL community itself, resulting in state statute. While the department of education was the implementer of such language policies, it did not originate from within the educational system itself, rather from the EL community experiencing its lack of bilingual education provisions in schools.

Illinois. Similarly, in Illinois, 20 or more students in each language at a school must have part of their day within a transitional bilingual education model with the appropriately certified teachers as stated in their state policy (Illinois General Assembly, 2013). When such staffing is not immediately trained or licensed, then investments are made to get those teachers to compliance. Additionally, an EL count of 200 or more comes with an administrative staffing

requirement, where an EL director must be identified and possess EL and/or bilingual teacher certification along with an administrator license.

The Bilingual Parent Advisory Committee (BPAC) and the Chicago Public Schools actively worked within the Illinois State Board of Education to advocate for appropriate student ratios within EL and bilingual programs. For Illinois, we see a joint effort from within the state department of education, the EL community, and educators (Nguyen, D. pers. comm., October 21, 2022).

Florida, Arizona, New York, and Illinois provide examples of what it means to enforce Lau v. Nichols and Castañeda v. Pickard with measurable policies including student/teacher ratios, which creates the demand for teachers to be licensed from within or brought in from the outside. Further, they provide context for how different state policies have manifested from within or were drawn from the outside due to the inadequacies of the schools to meet the needs of ELs within EL and bilingual program models. While the above states also had funding to support the increased demand for licensure, they are all located in states where the immigrant population is long standing and the provision for EL and/or bilingual education had greater precedent. In contrast, Indiana is a newer immigrant gateway state, where all sectors of government are still building infrastructures to meet the needs and rights of identified-EL families, especially in schools (Hilburn & Fitchett, 2012). I now turn to Indiana to examine the historic provision of EL programming and related teacher licensure and how it has been positioned differently, with INTESOL playing an instrumental role.

The Indiana TESOL History in Advocacy

Indiana TESOL has been actively engaged in setting a legislative agenda for K-12 schools since 2015. The ELL Regional Collaboratives were formed in November 2015; an effort

to bring together regional English Learner (EL) stakeholders from schools, universities, and educational services centers for input on the most compelling issues for identified-ELs in their districts and communities. Since 2015, the ELL Collaboratives have met annually in person or online the day before the INTESOL conference, with key representatives from all regions of the state, representing urban, suburban, town and rural communities. In its 2015 genesis, the process began with districts creating a portrait of their EL constituencies, demonstrating the diversity of languages and circumstances of families. In rural Northeastern Indiana, in Noble County, INTESOL learned about the growing number of Yemenese refugees resettled in their community and the tensions related to their Muslim faith, which stood in contrast to the mainline Christian church. In Allen and Marion County, we learned about the resettled Burmese refugees who came from a variety of ethnic groups and thus, different languages and faith orientations. In the rural communities of Frankfort and Logansport, we discussed the density of identified-ELs being as high as 30% and that the Hispanic community was nearly 50% of their school population. The Indiana portrait of ELs was diverse.

The years that followed moved from portraiture to an identification of the needs and rights of ELs across the state and how their districts and communities were responding to their increasing representation in their schools. In 2016, districts, universities and educational service centers collectively identified three main areas of concern including 1) need for more qualified and licensed EL staff and EL infrastructure; 2) professional development among teachers and administrators; and 3) increased state and/or district funding to support such needs. The idea of a White paper was introduced.

A White paper is a position paper that would inform state language policies for ELs. Based on the most urgent need identified by the ELL Regional Collaborative group was highly-

qualified staff either through EL licensure and/or high quality professional development based on the density of ELs in a given district (Morita-Mullaney & Albrecht, 2017). A proposed ratio of 30 ELs to 1 highly-qualified teacher was established with supporting evidence from research and Indiana's historic visitations from the Office of Civil Rights in the mid 1990s that established the same ratio among cited districts (Indiana Urban Schools, 2006). The White paper authored by Morita-Mullaney and Albrecht (2017) and signed by 62 INTESOL members/stakeholders was published on the INTESOL website and sent to all INTESOL members, Deans of Education at Indiana's universities, ELL Collaborative leaders, and the Indiana Department of Education. Thereafter, the paper was circulated in various administrative venues for Indiana principals and superintendents (Albrecht & Morita-Mullaney, 2018; Morita-Mullaney & Albrecht, 2018). The objective was to saturate varied language policy decision makers to emphasize the desperate need for training of an adequately trained workforce to serve ELs.

Two years later, on August 9, 2019, the then Indiana Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Jennifer McCormack issued a memorandum called, "English Learner Program Staffing." While the INTESOL White paper (Morita-Mullaney & Albrecht, 2017) was not cited, much of the information demonstrates the imprint of the INTESOL White paper. The memorandum was sent to all district Superintendents and in its introduction, stated:

> The passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015 provided new clarity for state and local education agencies on their responsibilities and requirements for serving English learners (ELs) in public schools, building on the previously-established legal standards for ELs established by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Lau v. Nichols (1974), and Castañeda v. Pickard (1981). In response to ESSA and its increased spotlight on ELs, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) conducted an internal review of its

> practices to ensure compliance with ESSA, Title VI of Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA) and to fulfill its responsibility to ensure that all LEAs meet their federal requirements to properly identify, assess, and support English learners through an effective English language development program. As part of this review, IDOE releases this memorandum as a renewed commitment to guide and support LEAs in EL program staffing. *Properly certified English learner teachers, in sufficient quantity, are a must in order to meet the needs of Indiana's diverse learners* (emphasis added) (Indiana Department of Education Memorandum on EL Program staffing, 2019, p. 1).

A series of supporting documents were attached detailing the timeline and the need for Indiana districts to become compliant with the long-standing federal ruling of Lau v. Nichols (1974) and Castañeda v. Pickard (1984) (Appendix A, B). The state of Indiana was finally recognizing its lack of compliant status and was finally providing specific and enforceable language policy measures. Yet, Indiana's policies are not at the state legislative level nor the regional court level, like Florida and New York (consent decrees as driven by EL families) and Arizona and Illinois (state laws), rather at the level of policy implementation and enforcement with the Indiana Department of Education. This unique meso-level policy context is important because it recognizes that ideologies supporting the rights and needs ELs led from within and outside the department informed the policies and their subsequent roll-out. When consent decrees or state legislation comes down, oftentimes, it is the role of the department of education to interpret, implement and enforce. Importantly, top-down policies like consent decrees or state laws can be problematic as they fail to recognize the persons for whom it impacts, namely school educators and EL families (Spolsky, 2017). In Indiana's case, their department's division of English

learning worked with universities and school districts to create this policy in response to INTESOL's efforts, generating a policy to build an infrastructure of trained EL personnel. Unlike Arizona and Florida, the IDOE worked directly with universities with accredited licensure programs and not private companies.

Districts had to meet this 30:1 ratio by September 2022. At the time of the 2019 memorandum, only 1423 teachers were licensed in EL (with no assurances they were actually teaching ELs). In full, Indiana needs to license to license another 2,138 EL teachers to meet the minimum criterion in just three years.

In support of this effort, which would be a cost to local districts who were already complaining about the 'unfunded mandate' and the swift timeline, the Indiana Department of Education sponsored a tuition program to fund such efforts alongside of increased licensure in Special Education and Gifted and Talented, other hard to fill areas. Indiana's universities that had accredited EL programs were asked to apply to be a part of this provision and **12** of the 27 accredited EL programs were vetted by the IDOE and committed to the task. The IDOE set the minimum criterion that they must have accredited programs, pushing out predatory practices, specifically private entities who were not university affiliated, contrasting with the policies of Arizona and Florida who did bring in private, for profit entities to conduct licensure and/or professional coursework (Lillie & Moore, 2014).

Compliance and Capacity in Credentialing

As districts recruited their in-service teachers to take on this additional commitment, universities had to respond to the various language policy messages teachers were hearing and understanding. Some teachers had no idea that there was an impending policy deadline of 30:1 and welcomed the opportunity for professional learning and capacity building at no cost. Other

teachers were aware of the policy content and timeline and claimed that they would soon serve as a teacher of record in their school to ensure all legal measures were in place instructionally for identified-ELs.

Whether teachers and/or their district administrators took this as a hammer or an invitation, the hope is that teacher cohorts will change the teaching landscape in their schools. Perhaps they are serving in a stand-alone role as an EL teacher or serving as a more fully prepared grade level teacher of identified-ELs and families. By having a greater proportion of teachers licensed in EL, they become important "social models" of proximity as how to best teach ELs is made accessible by a grade level partner who is now licensed in EL (Bandura, 1971; Morita-Mullaney, 2018). Other possible outcomes of proximity can be made in adjacency to other districts. A district with a growing cohort of licensed EL teachers can begin to change the decision making in a nearby district who may be reluctant participants in the requirement. Adjacency to one district creates the conditions of comparisons and when one district begins to make movement on meeting the requirement, others with appreciably smaller infrastructures for EL programs can hopefully follow suit. The force of a neighbor is sometimes a more accessible and softer message than the hammer of the state. They serve as the softer mallet of encouragement.

As September 2022 has since passed, the 30:1 EL student/teacher ratio has not yet been met. Since the 2019 IDOE memo from the then Superintendent, Jennifer McCormick was put out, an additional 867 teachers have been EL-licensed, representing a 38% growth for a total of 2,290 certified EL teachers statewide. With an identified EL-population of 77,563 for the 2021-2022 school year, Indiana is still understaffed by 2,585 certified EL teachers.

Providing a generalized portrait does not highlight districts who have reached and exceeded their 30:1 teacher/student ratio, training not just the stand-alone ESL specialists, but building the capacity and EL-licensing their general education teachers. This two-pronged focus is building the vertical leadership of specialty within an ESL program, but also building the horizontal leadership among grade level and content area teachers. Done in tandem, EL teachers and general education teachers who have the same body of preparation can co-build their expertise and create programming that goes beyond the mere compliance requirement, moving toward systematic capacity, benefitting identified-ELs.

The generalized portrait does not recognize the grave underrepresentation of EL staffing for many Indiana districts. Appleton (2022b) states that "one-third of districts and two-thirds of charter schools statewide reported not having any licensed English learner teachers" (p. 2). Importantly, the disparity for charter schools is high. Where there is the presence of an EL teacher, many are on emergency permits, which is not an official teaching license, let alone someone with EL specialization. Thus, an identified-EL attending a charter school is much more likely to have no services or services furnished by unqualified personnel.

Many districts continue their efforts to meet this IDOE requirement, but they are doing so during a time of stretched resources and departing faculty. Districts are now concerned with retaining and recruiting general education teachers, due to teachers leaving the profession during the COVID-19 pandemic, potentially reducing emphasis on building their EL staffing and related EL-programming (Cushing-Leubner et al., 2021). Despite these constrained conditions, INTESOL and the IDOE continue to invoke the requirements of Castañeda v. Pickard, ensuring that a 1) a program is adequately resourced (licensed staff); 2) employs a researched based model; and 3) is found to be effective. Attending to the first prong of the Castañeda is a move

toward adequately and effectively staffing EL programs, yet the next challenge for the EL and bilingual profession is attending to the other two prongs that will more fully build the capacity of Indiana's schools to best serve their growing EL community.

Importantly, the push for requiring EL licensure to satisfy a specific ratio comes alongside the expansion of Indiana's dual language programming (Indiana Department of Education, 2015). Dual language bilingual education is a distinct form of bilingual education that joins together English majority and identified-ELs (Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Lindholm-Leary & Hernandez, 2011; Thomas & Collier, 1997). Presently, there is no such bilingual teacher license available in the state of Indiana, nor that educators within these program models have any specific training and/or licensure. In 2010, prior to the adoption of the dual language pilot in 2015, the bilingual education teacher license was stricken as a professional teaching license as it was seen as duplicative to the EL-teacher license (Morita-Mullaney & Chesnut, 2022; Indiana Office of Educator Licensing, 2010). While the 30:1 ratio looks to licensure in English learning, that can and should be applied to educators teaching within bilingual and/or dual language bilingual education models.

Call to Universities. Continue to license teachers in English learning, but also train them in the different program models they can develop and implement, including those that include use of the students' native languages. Bilingual education is an allowable provision within the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (2015) and the state's Indiana's Bilingual-Bicultural Instruction Policy (2005). The role of the native language plays a mitigating role in language development and ensuring that we maintain and develop the multilingualism of our emergent bilingual youth and not resigning ourselves to sole use of English to instruct students.

For educational leadership programs, preparing principals and superintendents, include content on the legal history of ELs, including Lau v. Nichols and Castañeda v. Pickard and localize the licensure requirements, so administrators can identify the types of program they have and where further development and resources are needed. Presently, there is a lack of content related to ELs within leadership preparation programs, increasing the likelihood that ignorance and ideologies will arbitrate decision making for EL programming (Morita-Mullaney, 2019; Morita-Mullaney & Chesnut, 2022).

Call to School Districts. Ask yourself what EL and/or bilingual programs are you employing and what is the best suited model for your current student constituency? EL programs often begin in one way and remain that way, just becoming bigger as the EL student population grows. But the third prong of Castañeda of "being effective" needs to be continually reevaluated as your multilingual community changes over time.

Call to Universities, School Districts and Educators. Work together on training and preparing educators to not only meet the requirements for the 30:1 ratio, but to build the capacity of your programs and its related staffing to include a wider reportoire of input. Commit to particpating in the INTESOL ELL Regional Collaborative so that the varied perspectives of EL students and families are recognized, incorporated and understood. As evidenced by New York and Illinois, advocacy from the outside of schools can provide the invitational mallet to more enduring policy implementation for ELs.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Trish Morita-Mullaney is an Associate Professor at Purdue University. Her research focuses on the influences of educational policy at the federal, state, district, school, and classroom levels and how this informs the practices of educators who work with and among

emergent bilinguals. Framed by critical language, critical race, and feminist theories, she employs a variety of methods to accomplish these aims. She uses participatory and constructivist methods with her study participants, as they analyze their orientations towards emergent bilinguals and multilingualism. Her most recent work focuses on how equity can be trapped for emergent bilinguals within dual language programming.

Email: tmoritam@purdue.edu

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the ELL Regional Collaboratives for their solidarity in generating this important work that making a lasting imprint on Indiana's landscape for English learners.

References

Albrecht, D., & Morita-Mullaney, T. (2018). English Learners' Success, IDOE Priorities and Educator Preparation. *Indiana Association of School Superintendents*.

Appleton, A. (2022a). 3 takeaways from Indiana lawmakers' hearing on funding for English learners, kids in poverty. *Chalkbeat*. https://in.chalkbeat.org/2022/10/18/23411751/indiana-school-funding-students-poverty-english-learners-committee-session-2023

Appleton, A. (2022b). Some Indiana schools may be failing to meet staffing rules for English learner students. *Chalkbeat*. https://in.chalkbeat.org/2022/11/3/23437484/indiana-english-learner-students-teachers-staffing-shortage-federal-requirementAspira of New York, Inc. v. Board of Education, 394 F. Supp. 1161 (S.D.N.Y. 1975).

Arizona Proposition 203, English for the Children, Arizona Voter Initiative (2000).

Bandura, A. (1971). *Psychological modeling; conflicting theories*. Aldine--Atherton.

Bernstein, K. A., Katznelson, N., Amezcua, A., Mohamed, S., & Alvarado, S. L. (2020). Equity/Social Justice, Instrumentalism/ Neoliberalism: Dueling Discourses of Dual Language in Principals' Talk About Their Programs. *TESOL Quarterly*, *54*(3), 652-684. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.582

Bilingual Education Act, Pub. L. No. (90-247), 81 Stat. 816 (1968).

Castañeda v. Pickard (648 F.2d 989 (5th Cir., 1981).

Cushing-Leubner, J., Morita-Mullaney, T., Greene, M. C. S., Stolpestad, A., & Benegas, M. (2021). The (im)possibilities of equitable education of multilingual emergent bilinguals in remote teaching: a survey of English language teachers in the Great Lakes region.

Planning and Changing Journal, *50*(3/4), 139-164. https://education.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/planning/Cushing_PandC_50.3-4.pdf

Every Student Succeeds Act, Pub. L. No. Public Law 114-95, (2015).

Consent Decree: League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) et al. v. State Board of Education Consent Decree United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, (1990). http://www.firn.edu/doe/bin000ll/cdpage2.htm

Gándara, P., & Orfield, G. (2012). Why Arizona matters: the historical, legal and politcal contexts of Arizona's instructional policies and linguistic hegenomy. *Language Policy*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-011-9227-2

Hilburn, J., & Fitchett, P. G. (2012). The New Gateway, An Old Paradox: Immigrants and Involuntary Americans in North Carolina History Textbooks. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *40*(1), 35-65. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2012.647976

Illinois General Assembly, Transitional Bilingual Education, par. 14C-11 (2013).

Indiana Bilingual-Bicultural Instruction Policy (2005). Public Indiana Code 20-3-9.

Indiana Dual language pilot program, Indiana Code § 20-20-41 (2015). http://iga.in.gov/legislative/2015/bills/senate/267#document-d98be4d3

Indiana Office of Educator Licensing. (2010). *Rules for Educator Preparation and Accountability (REPA)*.

Indiana Urban Schools Association. (2005). *Report on ESL funding from general fund*.

Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

Lillie, K. E., & Moore, S. C. K. (2014). SEI in Arizona: Bastion for states' rights. In S. C. K. Moore (Ed.), *Language policy process and consequences: Arizona case studies* (pp. 1-27). Multilingual Matters.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *13*(1), 43-60. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050902777546

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Hernandez, A. (2011). Achievement and language proficiency of Latino students in dual language programmes: native English speakers, fluent English/previous ELLs, and current ELLs. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *32*(6), 531-545. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2011.611596

McCormick, J. (2019). *English Learner Program Staffing* Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Department of Education Retrieved from chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.in.gov/doe/files/Teacher-of-Record-Memo-Updated-5-2022.pdf

Morita-Mullaney, T. (2019). At the intersection of bilingual specialty and leadership: A collective case study of district leadership for emergent bilinguals. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *40*(1), 31-53. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1563005

Morita-Mullaney, T., & Albrecht, D. (2017). English Language Learner (ELL) Preparation for Indiana School Educators: A White Paper. In Indiana Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (Ed.). Indianapolis, IN.

Morita-Mullaney, T., & Albrecht, D. (2018). English Language Learner (ELL) Preparation for Indiana School Educators: A White Paper. *IndianaGram*, 1-24.

Morita-Mullaney, T., & Chesnut, C. (2022). Equity traps in the deselection of English learners in dual language education: A collective case study of school principals. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/26390043.2022.2079390

Morita-Mullaney, T., & Stallings, L. (2018). Serving Indiana's Emergent Bilingual Immigrant

(EBI) Youth: A Collective Case Study of EBI Teacher Educators. *The Teacher Educator*, *53*(3), 293-312. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2018.1462422

Platt, E., Harper, C., & Mendoza, M. B. (2003). Dueling philosophies: Inclusion or separation for Florida's English language learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(1), 105-133. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588467

Spolsky, B. (2017). Language Policy in Education: Practices, Ideology, and Management. In S. May & T. L. McCarty (Eds.), *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education* (3rd ed.). Springer International Publishing.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, (1995). chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-104publ4/pdf/PLAW-104publ4.pdf

Wright, W. E. (2005). English language learners left behind in Arizona: the nullification of accommodations in the intersection of federal and state policies. *Bilingual Education Journal*, 1, 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2005.10162821

Wright, W. E. (2019). *Foundations for Teaching English Language Learners: Research, Theory, Policy, and Practice* (3rd ed.). Brookes.

APPENDIX A

Indiana DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Dr. Jennifer McCormick
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Working Together for Student Success

To: Indiana Local Education Agencies

From: Dr. Jennifer McCormick, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Nathan Williamson, Director of Title Grants and Support
Valerie Beard, Asst. Director of English Learner and Migrant Education Programs

Date: August 9, 2019

Subject: English Learner Program Staffing

The passage of the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA) in 2015 provided new clarity for state and local education agencies on their responsibilities and requirements for serving English learners (ELs) in public schools, building on the previously-established legal standards for ELs established by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, *Lau v. Nichols* (1974), and *Castañeda v. Pickard* (1981). In response to ESSA and its increased spotlight on ELs, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) conducted an internal review of its practices to ensure compliance with ESSA, Title VI of Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA) and to fulfill its responsibility to ensure that all LEAs meet their federal requirements to properly identify, assess, and support English learners through an effective English language development program. As part of this review, IDOE releases this memorandum as a renewed commitment to guide and support LEAs in EL program staffing. Properly certified English learner teachers, in sufficient quantity, are a must in order to meet the needs of Indiana's diverse learners.

In January 2015, the U.S. Departments of Justice and Education jointly released a Dear Colleague Letter with policy guidance on EL program staffing in compliance with civil rights law. The Dear Colleague Letter emphasized local education agencies' obligation to provide "the personnel and resources necessary to effectively implement their chosen EL programs" and further clarified, "Where formal qualifications have been established, e.g., the SEA requires authorization or certification to teach in particular EL programs, or a school district generally requires its teachers in other subjects to meet formal requirements, a school district must either hire teachers who already have the necessary formal qualifications to teach EL students or require that teachers already on staff be trained or work towards attaining the necessary formal qualifications and obtain the formal qualifications within a reasonable period of time." In other words, since Indiana requires formal qualifications for 4th grade teachers, middle school science teachers, high school English teachers, and all other various subjects, it must also ensure that we have properly certified English learner teachers for all English learners, whether a school has one English learner or hundreds.

115 W. Washington Street ■ South Tower, Suite 600 ■ Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
317.232.6610 ■ www.doe.in.gov

Indiana
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Dr. Jennifer McCormick
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Working Together for Student Success

According to a 2012 national evaluation of Title III implementation by the U.S. Department of Education, Indiana was one of nine states not requiring EL licensure. While Indiana does have a formal qualification for EL teachers--the English As a New Language (ENL) Professional Educator License--EL teacher licensure has been required variably across Indiana schools and EL programs. Not only would changing this requirement align us with other states, but we would finally be working to attain compliance with civil rights law. Currently Indiana schools staff their EL programs at an average of 83 students to 1 ENL-licensed teacher (83:1). Nearly half of Indiana's local education agencies reported having zero ENL-licensed teachers on staff during the 2018-2019 school year while more than 90% of Indiana LEAs reported having at least one English learner enrolled. Of the 1,259 ENL-licensed teachers working in Indiana LEAs this year, over half of them are concentrated in fifteen LEAs. In light of the recently-clarified legislation and policy guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, IDOE is issuing additional guidance for Indiana schools regarding requirements for EL program staffing.

Every English learner enrolled in an Indiana local education agency is entitled to receive English language instruction via an ENL-certified teacher who acts as the "EL Teacher of Record." While this position may look different across various local contexts, IDOE has defined minimum expected responsibilities for the EL Teacher of Record to assist local education agencies as they ensure local compliance with federal requirements. It is important to note that recent Office of Civil Rights findings have cited that all English learner students are required to receive English language development services at least 30-45 minutes per day, 4-5 days a week in frequency and duration beyond standard English Language Arts instruction. *Castañeda v. Pickard* (1981) established additional expectations for LEAs as they implement their federally-required English language development programs, clarifying that these programs must be resourced and staffed in a way "reasonably calculated to implement effectively." Where too few ENL-licensed teachers are asked to oversee English language development for an unreasonably large caseload of students, a local education agency fails to meet its federal requirements under *Castañeda.* To comply with this requirement and to ensure EL Teachers of Record are able to effectively carry out their responsibilities, IDOE recommends that the EL Teacher of Record caseload not exceed thirty English learners.

IDOE has an obligation to ensure that all local education agencies comply with the federal civil rights requirements, and will begin implementing the clarified expectations on EL teacher qualifications effective immediately. Local education agencies will submit their plan to ensure every English learner receives English language instruction via an ENL-certified EL Teacher of Record beginning with the 2019-2020 school year as part of the English learner (Lau) Plan. In cases where no ENL-certified teacher is employed by the local education agency or

115 W. Washington Street ■ South Tower, Suite 600 ■ Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
317.232.6610 ■ www.doe.in.gov

where the ENL-certified EL Teacher of Record has an unreasonably large caseload, the LEA will report its plan to comply with the federal requirements to ensure teachers attain ENL licensure within a reasonable period of time--defined by federal guidance as no more than two years.

Because of the wide variance in EL program staffing across the state, IDOE has chosen to honor the experience of EL teachers who have been teaching and leading effectively in EL programs and meet certain additional requirements. Certified teachers who do not currently hold a valid ENL license but meet these additional requirements may either enroll in coursework as part of an approved educator preparation program for the Indiana ENL license or demonstrate their proficiency by fulfilling the requirements of the EL Teacher of Record Rubric as verified locally by an LEA administrator.

Local education agencies may fund coursework and professional learning for their teachers through Title I, A, Title II, Title III, the Non-English Speaking Program (NESP), or other federal, state, and local funding streams. IDOE will provide additional financial support and technical assistance for Indiana schools as they implement these clarified expectations throughout the 2019-2020 school year and beyond.

Additional Supporting Resources

The following additional resources can be found on the IDOE English Learner Policy and Guidance webpage:

Meeting Indiana English Learner (EL) Teacher of Record Requirements

EL Teacher of Record Responsibilities

EL Teacher of Record Reporting

EL Teacher of Record FAQ

Appendix B

Indiana Department of Education APPENDIX B

Dr. Katie Jenner, Secretary of Education

English Learner Teacher of Record Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Updated July 2022

The following information addresses FAQs regarding the teacher of record (ToR) for English Learners (ELs) within Indiana schools. Please review this accompanying guidance from the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) to support additional questions:

- EL Program Staffing Memo (August 2019)
- Meeting EL ToR Requirements
- EL ToR Responsibilities

The U.S. Department of Justice and U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights released a Dear Colleague Letter in 2015 to address the legal responsibilities of schools to ELs under civil rights law. The "Staffing and Supporting EL Programs" section of the letter provides relevant background for Indiana's EL ToR licensing requirements. Review the IDOE EL Guidebook for additional information on federal EL requirements.

General Guidance

Number	Question	Answer
1	**How does IDOE monitor local educational agencies (LEAs) for compliance with EL ToR requirements?**	IDOE is required to monitor LEAs' compliance with federal EL programming requirements, including the adequate staffing and qualifications of its EL teachers. IDOE annually reviews all LEAs' EL Plans (part of the Title Grants Pre-Application), which detail their core English language development services. This includes information on the number, qualifications, and roles of EL ToRs within LEAs. LEAs chosen for desktop or onsite monitoring for any federal program, including Title I, A, must provide evidence of meeting EL ToR requirements within its provision of an English language development program, as requested. This includes EL ToR qualification documentation, evidence that the ToRs are effectively performing the duties of the EL ToR Responsibilities, and that EL services are being provided in alignment with the LEAs' approved EL Plan. Review IDOE's English Learning and Migrant Education webpage for more information on EL Plans and IDOE's State and Federal Grants and Programs webpage for information on federal program monitoring.
2	**The school does not currently have a qualified EL ToR. What actions must be taken to meet compliance?**	Changes in Indiana EL teacher licensing requirements were announced in 2019, allowing LEAs sufficient time to address EL staffing needs. LEAs not meeting EL staffing requirements are out of federal compliance, and puts an LEA at jeopardy of losing access to federal Title funding. Efforts must be taken to ensure all EL students

		in the district have a qualified EL ToR. This may entail identifying a currently-employed, licensed teacher who will serve as the EL ToR. EL ToRs must either have obtained English as a New Language (ENL) licensure or have met the rubric requirements on or before September 1, 2022. If the teacher does not meet either by that date, then the individual must apply for an Emergency Permit for ENL through IDOE and make appropriate progress each year of the Emergency Permit in order to renew it (e.g., two ENL classes or sit for the ENL exam if the required coursework is completed) in order to serve as the EL ToR. See the ENL Licensure section of this FAQ for more information on Emergency Permits. Regardless of how the staffing needs are being addressed, it is important to ensure interim measures are in place to address EL student language needs.
3	**My corporation has no ELs. What are my requirements?**	LEAs must have a plan to serve future ELs that may enroll in the district via a qualified EL teacher. Per Section 1112 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), LEAs must begin providing identified ELs language developement services within 30 days of the beginning of the school year or within two weeks if enrolling after that window during the school year. With over 90% of all Indiana LEAs having at least one EL enrolled, a corporation or Choice school with zero active ELs is likely to receive EL students in the future. LEAs with zero ELs currently enrolled must not wait to identify at least one teacher in the district to meet the EL ToR requirements, as the timelines above will not be reasonably met if a plan is not developed until after an EL enrolls.
4	**What should corporations/schools do if the EL ToR leaves during the school year?**	LEAs must provide evidence that they have taken action to replace the position with a qualified EL ToR within a reasonable period of time. LEAs with small EL populations should always maintain two or more teachers who are qualified to serve as the EL ToR to ensure that services are continued appropriately while replacement staff are hired.
5	**Could LEAs with low EL populations share one EL ToR to provide services?**	If the EL ToR can meet all the requirements under IDOE's English Learner ToR Responsibilities for all students at both LEAs, then the teacher may serve as the EL ToR at more than one LEA. Two or more LEAs may wish to develop a cooperative agreement to share the costs of providing the EL ToR when the incidence rate in each district is very low, similar to how LEAs share costs related to the provision of special education services. All EL students must still be provided with robust services, so the sharing of costs should not greatly diminish the rate at which services are provided (e.g., at least 30 minutes per day, four to five days a week of English language

		development for all ELs).
6	**Do EL ToR requirements apply to non-public schools?**	EL ToR requirements stem from policy and case law pertaining to public education; therefore, the provision of core EL services delivered by qualified EL ToRs is not a requirement. However, non-public schools participating in Choice Scholarship Programs and/or receiving Title III funds do have specific obligations to EL students, including appropriately identifying, reporting, and assessing ELs. Non-public schools that accurately report EL populations to IDOE are also eligible for Title III equitable share and services from the public LEA. All non-public schools should work to effectively meet all students' language needs regardless of accreditation and Title III funding status. Non-public schools are strongly recommended to provide an effective English language development program that involves licensed, qualified EL staff. For more information on EL requirements for non-public schools review this Guidance Regarding Non-public School Participation in Title III and Requirements for English Learners.

ENL Licensure

Number	Question	Answer
7	**What are the requirements to earn ENL licensure in Indiana?**	Indiana requires ENL candidates to complete an approved program/ENL coursework and pass the ENL licensure examination to become certified. Coursework requirements vary by university.
8	**What universities offer the appropriate coursework to complete ENL licensure?**	IDOE's Office of Educator Licensing maintains a list of all approved educator preparation programs in the state, including those offering coursework required to attain the Indiana ENL Professional Educator License.
9	**How do corporations/schools without a licensed EL ToR apply for an Emergency Permit?**	Emergency Permits can be requested by LEAs in areas where staffing appropriately-licensed educators are experiencing difficulty. The Emergency Permit is a temporary credential issued to a school corporation for a person who is not licensed for that assignment. The applicant must possess a minimum of a bachelor's degree from a regionally-accredited university to be eligible for the permit. The Emergency Permit recipient must commit to working toward completion of an approved program to either add the content area(s) to an existing license or obtain an Initial Practitioner license for the content area(s).

10	**How long is an ENL Emergency Permit valid?**	ENL Emergency Permits are valid for one school year. Once issued, future renewals may be approved by the school if the applicant completes the renewal requirements. A school employer may approve an application for the renewal of an Emergency Permit annually as long as the permit recipient can meet renewal requirements by providing proof of continuing progress toward achieving full licensure in the content area(s). Failure to meet renewal requirements may result in denial of the renewal application. For more information on ENL Emergency Permits, visit IDOE's Educator Permits webpage.
11	**How can districts/schools fund ENL licensure coursework?**	LEAs may be able to use Title IA, IIA, IIIA, IVA, Non-English Speaking Program (NESP), or Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds to support teachers in completing ENL licensure coursework. While coursework may be federally-funded, note that the time and effort to provide the core English language development services, including the cost of the EL teacher(s) salaries, must still be funded through local or state funding, such as NESP.
12	**Are teachers with valid ENL licensure from another state eligible to serve as the EL ToR?**	Indiana maintains reciprocity with several other states, in which IDOE honors other states' licensure requirements if they are similar to Indiana's requirements. For more information, visit IDOE's Educator Licensing webpage.

EL ToRs and Providing EL Services

Number	Question	Answer
13	**What are the requirements to serve as an EL Teacher of Service (ToS) if you do not meet EL ToR qualifications?**	Qualifications to serve as an EL ToS include: • Holding a professional educator's license, and • Having continued participation in ongoing, meaningful, and job-embedded training on English language acquisition and EL best practices, as well as implementing the service delivery model. The EL ToR may assist in providing training to the ToS. This training does not include WIDA assessment administrator trainings and must extend beyond single workshops or conferences. It must also surpass training on instructional expectations of *all* teachers of ELs, which includes Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) and WIDA Standards implementation. Although in-service training for classroom EL teachers (e.g., sheltered instruction model) are beneficial in meeting students' needs

		and fulfills ToS qualifications, this training alone does not compare to the rigor required for full ENL licensure. Substantial evidence is needed to demonstrate training is of sufficient frequency and duration for an EL ToS, as services are not directly delivered by teachers with ENL licensure.
14	**What is required for EL services to be delivered by an EL ToS rather than the EL ToR?**	This structure would require the following: • Oversight of EL services by a qualified EL ToR, as detailed in the EL ToR Responsibilities. This includes meeting at least weekly with the EL ToR to determine instructional needs and plan English language development for the student. • Meet training qualifications requirements cited in the previous question. • Clear implementation of the chosen EL program service delivery model (e.g., sheltered instruction) with fidelity. • Detailing of this structure within the LEA's annual EL Plan. Documentation of ToS training and qualifications, EL ToR oversight and collaboration with the ToS, and the fidelity and effectiveness of the chosen model must be readily available in instances such as federal programs monitoring.
15	**A classroom teacher previously provided English language development via a sheltered instruction model after being properly trained. Is this still a valid model?**	Yes. However, this teacher could not serve as the ToR unless the qualifications of ENL licensure or the ToR requirements are met. They are still able to deliver core English language development instruction via a sheltered instruction model as an EL ToS. This can occur so long as they have been adequately trained in EL best practice and the service delivery model, the service delivery model is being implemented with fidelity, and those services are being overseen by a qualified EL ToR.

EL ToR Rubric

Number	Question	Answer
16	**What is the EL ToR Rubric, and how does it differ from full ENL licensure?**	The EL ToR Rubric, detailed in the Meeting EL ToR Requirements, was developed as a temporary option for those serving as EL teachers who did not possess ENL licensure to meet EL ToR qualifications. This was a method to honor EL teachers' years of experience without requiring enrollment in a full ENL licensure coursework program. Meeting the rubric includes a coursework requirement as well as evidence of years of service as an EL teacher, and EL professional development professional growth points (PGPs).
17	**Can I still meet EL ToR**	The EL ToR Rubric requirements must have been met and

	licensure requirements via the ToR Rubric?	documented by the educator and a supervising administrator on or before September 1, 2022. After this date, no new EL ToR Rubrics will be recognized as meeting EL ToR requirements.
18	**After successfully completing the ToR Rubric, how long will it be honored?**	After meeting the requirements of the EL ToR Rubric, an educator who maintains a valid Indiana Professional Educator License will remain qualified to act as EL ToR in Indiana. If the EL ToR who has met the rubric transfers to another Indiana school, they must maintain that documentation to be verified by the new administrator.
19	**After successfully completing the ToR Rubric, what documentation must be submitted or reported to IDOE?**	EL ToR Rubric completion documentation (i.e. rubric cover sheet, administrator letter of recommendation, coursework transcripts, and PGPs) does NOT require submission to IDOE for review and approval. This documentation must be reviewed and verified by an administrator and maintained locally. This documentation must be readily available in the case of federal programs monitoring, or if EL teacher qualifications come under scrutiny. IDOE will require that LEAs submit information on EL teachers' qualifications, including its teachers who have met qualifications via the rubric, in the annual EL Plan.
20	**Do years as an EL teacher in another state count toward the EL ToR Rubric?**	Yes, years of experience as an EL teacher in another state count toward the "Years of Teaching Experience serving as the EL Teacher" indicator on the EL ToR Rubric.
21	**What courses or classes can be taught by a teacher who has met the EL ToR Rubric?**	Teachers who have met the requirements of the EL ToR Rubric may act as an EL ToR in kindergarten through grade 12, as would an individual who receives an official Indiana ENL license. Please note that obtaining an ENL license or meeting the ToR Rubric requirements does not automatically make the teacher eligible to teach an academic content area if they do not also possess licensure with that content area. EL ToRs could co-teach, team-teach, or provide resource support to the students in content area classes, but cannot provide primary instruction in academic areas with ENL licensure or a ToR Rubric alone.

Please contact IDOE's Office of English Learning and Migrant Education with any additional questions.

INTESOL MISSION

INTESOL's mission is to strengthen the effective teaching and learning of English as a Second Language in the State of Indiana while respecting individual's language and cultural backgrounds. To this end, INTESOL, as a statewide professional association, supports and seeks to inspire those involved in English language teaching, teacher education, administration and management, curriculum and materials design, and research; provides leadership and direction through the dissemination and exchange of information and resources; encourages access to, and standards for English language instruction, professional preparation, and employment; and supports the initiatives of its international parent organization, TESOL International.

INTESOL Journal Volume 19 (1)

Indiana Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages
www.intesol.org
https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/intesol/index