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New and veteran teachers alike say they do not feel very well prepared to teach effectively to...students from diverse cultural backgrounds...The fact that new teachers report as much unease as their veteran colleagues indicates that teacher education and professional development programs are not addressing the realities found in today's classroom.

Richard Riley, 1999
Former Secretary of Education

Abstract

The federally-funded Training All Teachers (TAT) project is an innovative program of curricular enhancement for preservice and inservice educators across disciplines. The Project focuses on English Language Learners (ELLs) in US schools and the fact that the training of school personnel in issues related to these children’s needs has not kept pace with their growing numbers. The goal of the TAT project is to increase opportunities for all pre/inservice teachers, pupil services personnel, administrators, and other education personnel to learn about issues specific to ELLs. To these ends, School of Education faculty across departments and disciplines participated in a variety of activities designed to support integration of ELL issues into their teacher/professional graduate courses. The goals and structure of these faculty development activities and their outcomes are discussed as well as future plans and iterations of the TAT trainings.

Introduction

Core curricula for educators in training too often fall short of the depth and detail needed to successfully serve English language learner populations. Coursework and professional development activities do not typically integrate issues particular to ELLs, ELL advocacy practices, nor the development of understandings concerning the needs and strengths of this population. Although much university coursework may strive to include issues of student diversity, it often lacks systematic treatment of practical issues concerning ELLs.

The goals of TAT’s program of activities are 1) to infuse ELL issues throughout core curricula for teachers and school personnel in training; and 2) to extend this knowledge into on-site partnerships with in-service practitioners and school personnel. In this way, the needs and strengths of ELL children and their families will be supported through improved understandings and facility with ELL issues throughout the school community. Efforts to help ELL children meet higher learning standards will thus be grounded and enhanced through an increased shared knowledge base and accompanying conversation between and among school personnel (Adger & Locke, 2000; August & Hakuta, 1998; Claire, 1998; Burns, Griffin & Snow, 1999; Darling-Hammond, 1997).

Perspective

In 1999, nearly every teacher in US schools could expect to have English Language Learners in her class. With the number of ELLs in US schools predicted to double by the year 2050, it is more than likely that every US teacher will have ELLs in her classroom at some time. Facts such as these have prompted academic accrediting and state education agencies to require training in the many and complex issues related to linguistic minority students in US schools (Samway and McKeon, 1999). By many accounts, however, the more complex and critical aspects of working with ELLs have merely received lip service and are often subsumed under the umbrella of local efforts at 'multiculturalism' (Cummins, 2001).
Research and recommendations regarding linguistic minority students in US schools during the past decades can be viewed as divided into two distinct camps: the first, on the rightmost side, claims that the perceived and much publicized ‘failure’ of linguistic minority students in US schools is attributable to the student herself, her culture, her homelife, her linguistic ‘deficit’. The second, on the leftmost side, claims that differential treatment of linguistic minority students – treatment that results from larger socioeconomic-based norms, practices, and language -- is at the root of linguistic minority disenfranchisement with education. Central to both schools of thought are differing perceptions of power relations within given communities and the larger US society.

Both of these perspectives can be readily translated into the kinds of relationships one might predict would ensue between linguistic minority students, their families, and school personnel. In school contexts where children whose native language is not English are judged as ‘deficient’ (the rightmost camp), one might predict labeling, segregation, and, consequently, alienation. In school contexts where linguistic minority children are viewed as bringing assets (another language, another culture, differing life experiences) to the community, one might predict what Pierce (1995) terms investment on the part of both learners and school personnel. For the latter case, where roles and relationships between school personnel and English language learners are grounded in mutual respect, one would surmise that a prerequisite for such school personnel would be basic knowledge and understanding of second language, literacy, and culture learning. In short, to be supportive of this population, school personnel need critical information and informed understanding.

Moreover, research on second language learners underscores the benefits ELLs derive from school contexts where personnel are well informed and correspondingly supportive of their strengths, needs, and differences (Carter & Chatfield, 1986; Lucas, Henze & Donato, 1990; Reyes & Laliberty, 1992, for example) and the risks involved when the school context in general, and the instruction in particular, are conversely impoverished (Cazden, 1986; Cummins, 1989; Reyes, 1992; Schinke-Llano, 1983). Contexts supportive of ELLs, however, tend to be the exception, not the norm. For the most part, ELLs attend schools where training in issues related to their educational well being have been fleetingly incorporated, if incorporated at all in professional development activities. Moreover, when it comes to the linguistic, cultural, and curricular complexities involved in ELL instruction, quick-fix, short-term professional development interventions have been shown to be grossly ineffectual (Claire, 1998; Penfield, 1987). After years of self examination regarding linguistic and cultural diversity, it also remains clear that linguistic and cultural issues are neither peripheral nor incidental to relationships within schools. Professional development efforts for new and practicing school personnel face a number of tenacious challenges, many to do with the complexities of language and culture, and many to do with ingrained oversimplifications and misconceptions that do not reflect these complexities.

**Myths and Assumptions**

A large portion of the challenge involved in preparing school personnel to work effectively in supporting ELLs involves myths held in the US concerning language, learning language, and the English language (Light, 1997; Reyes, 1992; Soto, 1997)

A composite of these major societal/conceptual challenges might look something like this:
First, there are beliefs about the English language. What Reyes (1992:29) calls “the veneration of English”, puts the English language in a superior position to other languages and, consequently, to those who speak them. This tendency to ascribe English with a superior status is inextricably bound up with both its status as the contemporary lingua franca and its collateral as a key to economic opportunity in the US and around the globe. This belief about the English language carries with it the perception that those who speak a language other than English have a deficit; they are handicapped in a way that makes their chances for success poor. The perception of the native language as a deficit carries over into beliefs concerning the ELL child and her family as well. It underscores difference and can fuel the fires of cultural stereotyping both within school contexts and the larger society. These beliefs get transferred into and shape interpersonal patterns of communication – the ‘treatment’ of ELLs and their families in schools. Hand in hand is the US notion of quick immersion to eradicate the ‘problem’ of the native language – a tenacious misconception that predominated 1970s – 80s discourse concerning bilingual education. Moreover, it is rarely recognized that learning an additional language is arduous enough an undertaking, but that ELLs in US schools have the additional onus of learning academic English while keeping up in grade appropriate academic content. The sum of these myths is a set of overly simplistic beliefs and assumptions about language, how it is learned, and learners that are in fact complex on many levels.

Professional development efforts concerning ELLs in US schools must gently confront these often ingrained misconceptions. For the TAT Project, doing so consisted of sharing basic information within the context of specific Education courses and encouraging discussion. In the following section, specific activities designed for various participating faculty and students is detailed.

Working with and for Professional Educator Faculty and Students

It is imperative that English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) professionals and all school personnel work closely and well (Chamot & O’Malley, 1989; Claire, 1998; Harklau, 1994; van Lier, 1996), and that relationships between and around linguistic minority students be participatory and collaborative, rather than segregated and divisive. For these reasons, and reasons associated with the complex professional lives of the educators of school personnel, the TAT Project selected to work with School of Education faculty in ways that modeled responsive, rather than prescriptive professional development. Suggestions for the best formats in which to work with faculty came from the faculty themselves. And suggestions for the best fit of ELL-related information and faculty syllabi also came directly from the faculty.

In an effort to undertake curricular revision and enhancement of core courses required of all preparing and practicing classroom teachers, school administrators, counselors, and area specialists training at The University at Albany, TAT forums consisted of 1) “push-in” work whereby ELL experts worked directly in participating faculty classrooms to infuse ELL issues on an ongoing basis; 2) group workshops with follow-on support whereby faculty grouped by discipline were provided tools and knowledge as a group, then individual support throughout the academic year; and 3) peer presentations whereby graduate students specially trained in ELL issues presented tailored information to faculty and their students on demand.

Broad topics for these trainings included:

- the nature of language and its relation to society and culture;
- the processes of first and second language acquisition;
- cross-cultural issues in schooling;
- roles and responsibilities of schools and school personnel regarding ELL children; and
- methods for communicating effectively with school personnel and parents regarding ELL children.

Additional topics of concern were determined for each of the focal groups; e.g., special methods and accommodations for the teaching of math to ELL children for math teacher educators, issues associated with biliteracy for reading specialists, and particular emphasis on state and federal regulations regarding ELL children for school administrators.
Formats & Material

The chart below outlines TAT participants thus far in the project, the format for their participation, and the materials that were shared with and provided to participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Material – Specific</th>
<th>Material – All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math Education</td>
<td>Faculty &amp; Graduate Students</td>
<td>Push-in</td>
<td>CAL Materials1</td>
<td>Shock Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facts &amp; Figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NYS Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Language Learning Basics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resources list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CALLA Handbook selections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading Faculty</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>CAL Materials NYSED ELA2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quick Answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Art (ELA)</td>
<td>Faculty &amp; Graduate Students</td>
<td>Push-in</td>
<td>CAL Materials NYSED ELA Quick Answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>School Administrators</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>CAL Materials NYSED ELA Quick Answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back to School for a Day</td>
<td>In-service teachers</td>
<td>Simulated day at school for ELL</td>
<td>CAL Materials NYSED ELA Quick Answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAT Speakers Bureau</td>
<td>In-service educators, school personnel</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Speakers’ choice</td>
<td>Speakers’ choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcomes

Each of the participating faculty completed a questionnaire regarding ELLs to assess 1) shifts in their beliefs concerning issues related to ELL children; 2) if and how they had integrated training session content into their teacher and administrator curricula; and 3) what additional ELL-related issues they would be interested in pursuing in subsequent trainings (see Appendix A). Additionally, 36 students completed a written questionnaire concerning their knowledge of ELLs (see Appendix B). We are treating the information from these questionnaires as strictly formative at this juncture; findings are informing the design of TAT’s ongoing and future activities.

Faculty Responses

We received the responses from four participating faculty members: one in Math Education, one in English Language Art (ELA) Education, and two in Reading. Due to their professional backgrounds and past experiences working with ELLs, these four faculty members expressed a range of views and emphases regarding ELL issues. However, they all commented favorably concerning their involvement in TAT activities and uniformly reported considerable growth in their understanding of ELL.

- Perceptions of ELLs

Before participating in the TAT Project, the four faculty members had had varying perceptions of ELLs. The Math Ed instructor thought that ELLs were in a “sink or swim” position in the classroom without much support from schools. The ELA Ed instructor reported that she was familiar with the various programs offered to ELLs, but was not familiar with the laws governing their education. In addition, she considered ELLs as “assets” to the classroom, rather than a commonly-held notion viewing ELLs as “problems”. She saw ELLs’ diverse cultural backgrounds as potentially enriching the learning of all learners in significant ways. The two Reading instructors, due to their prior experiences working with ELLs in public schools, were aware of what services and programs were available to ELLs. They also reported having been concerned about the literacy difficulties that ELLs encounter.

1 CAL is the Center for Applied Linguistics. See Reference for CAL Materials.
2 NYSED is the New York State Education Department. See Reference for NYSED ELA material.
Following their involvement in TAT, Math Ed and the ELA Ed faculty reported a shift in their perceptions of ELLs’ as regards the legal responsibilities of schools and teachers for providing specialized instruction and assistance to ELLs. The Math Ed instructor said that she began to realize that there was a screening process and that many ELLs did qualify for assistance that their schools had to provide. On the other hand, she also mentioned that she became aware that not every ELL received adequate support: those with higher levels of English language proficiency do not, for example. Consequently, she considered it even more important for all teachers to design instruction based on individual learner needs. The ELA Ed instructor emphasized a deeper understanding of the mandated accommodations and the support programs available for ELLs as well as specific methods and strategies of teaching ELLs.

The two Reading instructors did not think their original perceptions of ELLs had changed, but did feel these had been “reinforced”. They became more “hyper-aware” of ELLs’ needs and language differences. One even reflected that she thought the “shock therapy” - a mini-lesson taught in Chinese only - gave her a sharp sense of frustration and made her more deeply sympathize with ELLs. She learned that even dedicated students could feel tremendous frustration and overwhelming demands on themselves when their language proficiency and resources were limited in terms of opportunity and experience. Her comment underscores the need to sensitize teachers to the difficulties and challenges that ELLs may encounter in the classroom.

- ELL Issues Integration

All four faculty members had incorporated some issues concerning ELLs in their teacher preparation courses before participating in the TAT Project. Each faculty member had a different focus on these issues. The Math Ed instructor did not make a concerted effort to talk about ELL issues specifically, but viewed those issues as subsumed under working with diverse learners in terms of learning styles. She generally places much emphasis on the use of hands-on materials and diagrams to help children, particularly those whose learning styles differed from the majority’s, to learn the language and symbolism of mathematics. The ELA Ed instructor had included teaching strategies for ELLs, but she did not think what she had done was sufficient. One Reading instructor had incorporated the special needs of ELLs in her course “Identifying and Correcting Reading Problems” and highlighted the understanding of the difference between ELLs’ oral English fluency and academic English proficiency. The other Reading instructor reported that, though her primary focus was on ASL (American Sign Language) and deaf students acquiring English literacy, she had included the issues of L1 influences on L2 acquisition, especially as these referred to literacy skills.

After working with the TAT Project, these faculty expressed eagerness to expand the role of ELL issues in their future courses. When asked what ELL issues they felt were most crucial for their students to understand, they expressed diverse opinions. The Math Ed instructor views classroom teachers’ responsibility to ELLs as the most critical one. She notes that classroom teachers cannot simply expect that ELLs’ needs will be “taken care of” by the school district or by some pull-out program. They need to know what mechanisms, materials, and resources that they can draw on to help ELLs. In her future courses, she plans to have a more detailed discussion of diverse learners, placing special emphasis on ELLs, as justification for the careful integration of manipulatives and diagrams. She expects her students to make use of the materials and suggested approaches particularly when working with ELLs.

The ELA Ed instructor still considers learning specific teaching strategies for ELLs as the most important task for novice teachers. She thinks that her students need help in planning instruction for ELL children. In addition, she regards information on laws pertaining to the education of ELLs and the standards they are required to meet greatly important. She said that she would provide information on the legal responsibilities of schools and teachers as well as the resources and models for planning instruction for ELLs in her future courses.

One of the Reading faculty highlights two critical issues for her students to learn. First, they have to understand that the range of ELLs is representative of all the kinds of English speaking students one encounters in US classrooms. ELL children can come from literate and less literate families, and they will experience the entire range of strengths and weaknesses as those experienced by English speaking children. ELL children will, however, have the added challenge of doing this in a second language. Second, new teachers have to be aware that ELLs’ oral English fluency does not indicate that they are able to perform well at an academic proficiency commensurate with their verbal abilities. Teachers need to realize that cognitive academic language proficiency takes longer to develop.
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The other Reading instructor finds it critical for teachers to understand the impact of L1 knowledge, pre-literacy, and literacy skills on English literacy development. She emphasizes that teachers need to have positive attitudes towards ELL students’ native language and culture. She even employ personal narratives concerning second language learners to render ELL issues more “real” for her future and practicing teachers to understand.

**Students’ Reactions to learning about ELL issues**

The TAT Project used “push-in” workshops in the Math and the ELA Education classes where the TAT trainers infused ELL issues directly through mini-lectures, class activities, and discussions. The students in the two classes, according to the two instructors, generally liked the workshops and thought they were well-done. The Math Ed instructor remarks that many of her students had not thought much about ELLs. There seemed to be a reaction of “Oh, is that my responsibility? I didn’t know.” She regards it as a positive reaction in that the students began to see the need to plan instruction with an awareness of diverse students in a class. In addition, the ELA Ed instructor notes that many of her students are now interested in adding TESOL certification to their certification in English.

The two Reading faculty who participated in a TAT group workshop in the summer specifically designed for the Reading faculty, incorporated the ELL issues in the course that they taught in the fall semester. They found that their students were interested and receptive in those issues, especially since many of them were in-service teachers in public schools teaching Latino children as well as students from other language backgrounds. However, one instructor was both surprised and concerned that many of her students were unaware of the lag between ELLs’ verbal English proficiency and academic language ability. Her observation of the students’ lack of awareness of this issue actually pushed her to put more emphasis on ELLs’ needs.

Students from two of the courses taught by participating faculty completed a questionnaire concerning their knowledge and understanding of English Language Learners. One group was comprised of mainly pre-service and some in-service English Language Arts masters students completing a course in teaching methodology. The second group consisted of in-service teachers completing a course in Reading remediation taught asynchronously online. Due to the differing content and foci of these two courses and the means by which TAT content was ultimately integrated into the course by the two participating faculty members, responses to the project’s open-ended question concerning beliefs about ELLs differed in emphasis. Whereas both groups reported growth and specific change in their understanding, the younger ELA Ed students’ reports emphasized the classroom strategies they had learned while the more experienced Reading students’ reports focused more on the increase in empathy for cultural/experiential differences reflected in the ELL population. For example, the ELA Ed group frequently mentions their appreciation of background information and practical strategies, as in -

“I better understand the specific strategies I can use.”
“Tb breadth of my professional knowledge has expanded.”
“I now know the responsibilities of schools and teachers [concerning ELLs].”

One ELA Ed respondent even reported that the instructional support strategies that she learned for using with ELLs could be readily applied to native speakers of English to improve their language skills. Whereas those in the Reading group tended to emphasize cross-cultural empathy –

“I gained respect for different cultures.”
“Different cultural perspectives are valuable for my teaching.”

Another marked difference in the reports of both groups is that nearly all of the less experienced teachers stated that prior to the relevant graduate course, they had known little or nothing about ELLs. “I had perceived them with mystery”, reported an older woman while a younger student who had once substituted a class with ELLs reported she had “thought they had learned the English language previous to their entrance into the U.S.”. Another reported that she had “honestly thought that they were not treated well at all”.

Graduate students with more school-based experience, on the other hand, reported having gained some sense of how ELLs were instructed in their schools. Nearly one half of this group reported an awareness of ESOL support classes in their schools though almost as many stated that ELLs learned chiefly through “immersision” – “picking up” English by attending regular classes and interacting with native speakers. A handful of perceptions reported by this experienced group are clearly of dubious accuracy:
“I thought ELLs went to a special school to learn English.”
“I thought they were trapped in ESL classes from which they could never escape.”

Another believed ELLs were all placed in bilingual classrooms and “moved through the system”.
(Whereas some states have experimented with separate schools and separate classes, ELLs in the state of New York do not segregate.)

Three of the eighteen in-service students were ELLs themselves as young children. Their responses reflected the challenges they had met as non-native English speakers in US schools, and the subsequent amount of patience and support they saw as desirable qualities of their teachers and now of themselves.

Student and faculty respondents both expressed surprise at learning of the legal rights of ELLs and of the laws governing the responsibilities of schools in New York State to provide very specific support to this population. Recent changes to these laws – including the provision that ELL scores on state-wide tests will be factored into overall school performance records (school report cards) also pressed the urgency of increasing the dialog between ESOL specialists and these future teachers. Both groups mentioned wanting and needing to learn more.

In terms of what student respondents deemed most important for educators to understand about ELLs, the two groups again emphasized a number of different issues within and between groups. In response to the question “Based on what you have learned in this class about English Language Learners, what do you think is the most important information for all teachers to know in working with ELLs?” the ELA Ed class expressed a range of reactions:

The most important for all teachers is to:
-employ ways to compensate for ELLs’ lack of comprehension;
-realize that ELLs are as capable as native English speakers;
-be familiar with the ELA/ESOL standards;
-know that “they are not ignorant or stupid”;
-learn and use appropriate teaching strategies;
-simplify content to make it more accessible;
-locate resources and information that can help;
-“treat each learner with the special needs at heart”;
-know the laws pertaining to ELL rights and schools’ responsibilities;
-“include them [ELLs] in everything a teacher does”.

This extensive list reflects the breadth of ELL-related topics covered in their class. The online Reading class students again repeatedly emphasized the need for teachers to be sensitive to and respectful of differences due to culture and the critical role these differences play in teaching and learning processes. In addition, there was mention of the need to be supportive of the child’s family. A handful from this group mentioned the powerful possibilities of using the ELL children in class to teach other students about different cultures and perspectives. Finally, one of these more experienced teachers suggested that all teachers “flood the student with easy-to-read English books” as an important teaching strategy.

Finally, when asked what they felt they would like or need to know more about ELLs, both groups had similar desires. The vast majority of both groups stated they wished more effective strategies for teaching non-native speakers of English as well as understanding these children’s home countries and cultures. One of the older Reading students even went so far as to wish she could experience first hand the “physiological and psychological affects on learning – of being submersed in completely unknown cultural environments – school and community”.

Perhaps the most significant shift in beliefs is implied in responses to all four project questions: that is an overall shift from not knowing very much about ELLs, from not having given thought or consideration to the complex of issues, from having had limited contact with and limited information concerning ELLs, to being aware and empathetic of the ELL experience. Graduate course experiences in both classes appears to have provided students not only with awareness, but with specific strategies for working with and for these children. As one young woman states, “I don’t have any now, but when I do in the future, I feel better prepared”. At the very least we can conclude that both the inexperienced and experienced teachers from these classes now know what the issues are, what questions to ask, and where resources can be located.
Overall shifts in knowledge and beliefs concerning ELLs in U.S. schools were clearly evident in all assessment activities. Faculty reported undertaking integration or plans to integrate this information in their professional educator curricula in a number of forms. These faculty-designed methods of integration are to serve as implementation models for future TAT trainings. Finally, faculty consistently underscored the need for additional ELL issues integration efforts like those of the TAT project for future education professionals of all kinds.

Conclusion

In the US, education continues to reel from the myths of accountability and the Bell Curve – and the resulting events that brought all sectors of US society to place blame on individual learners for not fitting a one-size-fits-all instructional paradigm. This has brought society in general, and schools in particular to “mistaking limited experience with limited ability…even before the child actually arrives at the classroom door” (Allington, 1994:3). Current “no child left behind” rhetoric and ESEA Reauthorization reflect this history of reforms that have indeed left children from dominated minorities “behind” their white middle class counterparts. “No child left behind” allows for just that – being ‘left behind’ the forward-moving mainstream by virtue of difference or deficit. Children will continue to be left behind if the deficit camp continues this and similar campaigns of underscoring difference as deficit rather than difference as asset and will consequently perpetuate the kind of societal misconceptions that undermine supportive educational contexts for English language learners.

Part of our charge as teacher and school personnel educators and crafters of models and materials used in educator preparation is to teach cultural tolerance and to help those responsible for our nation’s children to unlearn racism (Cochran-Smith, 2000). This includes the various misconceptions we may have about linguistic difference. If, as Snow and Wong-Filmore (in press) emphasize “…we expect teachers to educate whoever shows up at the schoolhouse, provide their students the language and literacy skills to survive in school and later on in jobs, to teach them all of the school subjects that they will need to know about as adults, and to prepare them in other ways for higher education and for jobs”, it is imperative that professional educator development initiatives integrate issues related to ELL children across the board so that non-native English speaking children will be served and served well in our schools. This project presents one effort to infuse knowledge of ELL issues throughout professional educator curricula.
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Appendix A

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

The Training All Teachers Project is requesting the following information from you as part of ongoing design and redesign of its training activities. Whereas answering these questions is voluntary, we urge you to do so so that the project can continue to offer the kind of “push-in” workshop we offered for your class last semester. Your responses will be kept confidential and will in no way impact your status at the University at Albany.

1) Before you participated in the TAT Project, how did you perceive English Language Learners? How did you think they were educated in the U.S.?

2) How have these perceptions changed after having participated in the TAT Project?

3) Prior to working with the TAT Project, had you incorporated issues concerning English Language Learners in your courses?
   If so, what issues did you include in your curriculum? How?

4) Once having worked with the TAT Project, what new information did you find important for your students to understand?

5) Which among these issues did you feel were the most critical for your students to understand?

6) Do you plan to incorporate the information provided to you by the TAT Project in future courses? If so, how?

7) How did your students react to your including English Language Learner issues in your course?

8) Any other comments or suggestions?

Appendix B

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The Training All Teachers Project is requesting that you answer the following questions to help the Project in its work with School of Education faculty on integrating issues related to English Language Learners into courses. Answering these questions is voluntary, your responses will be kept confidential and will in no way impact your status in this or any other course, or at the University at Albany.

Age:
Gender:
Professional Area:
Course:

1) Before you took this course and learned about issues related to English Language Learners, how did you perceive English Language Learners? How did you think they were educated in the U.S.?

2) How do you see the knowledge you gained concerning English Language Learners playing a role in your present or future teaching?

3) Based on what you have learned in this class about English Language Learners, what do you think is the most important information for all teachers to know in working with English Language Learners?

4) What don't you know about working with English Language Learners that you think may be important?