School of Education and Leadership Student Capstone Projects

School of Education and Leadership

Summer 2021

A Toolkit For Mainstream Teachers Of Multilingual Learners In International Schools

Elizabeth Butterfield

A TOOLKIT FOR MAINSTREAM TEACHERS OF MULTILINGUAL

LEARNERS IN INTERNATIONAL SCHOOLS

by

Elizabeth Butterfield

A capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

Hamline University

Saint Paul, MN

August 2021

Capstone Project Facilitator: Karen Moroz
Content Expert: Bozena Maher

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction and Research Question

When I made the decision several years ago to return to school to pursue a

Master's Degree, I chose the field of English as a Second Language (ESL) because I

wanted to teach in an international school. Living abroad had been a lifelong dream, and I

saw teaching English as a way to both fulfill my own dreams and make a positive impact

in the world. Two years ago, that dream came true when I was hired to teach in Morocco.

When I arrived at my first international posting, I had stars in my eyes. I couldn't

believe my good fortune, and was eager to see what cutting-edge ideas in language

acquisition I was about to be privy to. I imagined stepping into a well-oiled machine that

was cranking out fluent academic English speakers and launching them into their

university careers and beyond, and couldn't wait to bring my own teaching up to that

stratospheric level.

To say that I did not encounter a well-oiled machine would be wrong because

there was no machine whatsoever. I arrived on my first day to find no curriculum and no

materials other than a small bookshelf of a mixture of ESL manuals, reading intervention

guides, and vocabulary builders. I felt lost and bewildered. I knew the school had been

created in the 1950s, so I couldn't help but wonder: what had they been doing with their

multilingual learners all these years?

One of the downsides of international schools is the employment model: teachers

are usually hired on 2-year contracts, which they can renew at their own discretion. Many

teachers stay on for the third year, but retention falls after the third year as teachers move

on to other adventures. This creates a revolving door and can lead to inconsistencies in

instruction, especially in a department like the English as an Additional Language (EAL) department, which is not a content area but considered a specialty. As specialists, ESL teachers can often be viewed by staff and administrators as a support to the more important work of the content teachers. This can lead to underinvestment in staff and materials. Add to this the revolving door, which can result in a lack of personal investment by many teachers in the school, and you end up with an international school that is over fifty years old, yet still has no solid model of supporting multilingual learners.

This has led my colleague, the only other EAL teacher in the secondary school, and I to re-evaluate how we are supporting students. We are re-thinking our model of support, if one can call it a model, with the intention of creating a solid EAL department that is able to deliver research-based instruction and support to our growing numbers of multilingual learners. My research question is the same as the question we are asking ourselves: How can we educate and collaborate with content teachers to support multilingual learners in a 21st century model of instruction?

Through my project, I plan to create a tool for collaboration that will be used within the new model of co-planning, co-teaching, and co-assessing that is considered a best practice (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015), and which we plan to implement at my school. This tool will be a guide for EAL and content teachers, with the intention of mitigating the effects of the high rate of turnover that is characteristic of international schools. This toolkit will stay with the school and will establish procedures that will become embedded in the school culture and will remain in place even when staffing changes.

Professional Experience

I started my teaching career in 2014 in Minneapolis. I was hired at the school where I did my student teaching. It was a contract alternative school with a high population of English learners. I taught a sheltered English language arts class, so I was using ELA standards to guide my unit planning. We had no set curriculum, so I had great freedom to design engaging and interesting lessons. My students were in grades ten through twelve, but could be up to twenty-one years in age before they "aged out" and had to attend the adult high school during the evening. These students often had one or even two jobs which they worked to help support their families. Some would go on to community college, but most of them would leave high school to directly enter the workforce. Many dropped out.

To say that this was a challenging way to start a teaching career would be an understatement. It was also very rewarding and I felt like I was making a difference for some students. One of the best parts of this first position was that I did a lot of co-teaching and co-planning. The Director of the school paired up *all* of the teachers, not just content teachers with specialist teachers. One semester, I might co-teach with the math teacher; the next semester I might co-teach with the Social Studies teacher. We had designated co-planning time in which we planned lessons and assessed students together. It was effective, efficient, and it was fun. After four years of working with such challenging students, however, I was reaching burnout and needed a change. Two years ago, an opportunity presented itself at an international school in Morocco, and I jumped at it. I'm now in my second year at this school in Morocco.

As stated earlier, I arrived here expecting to see the gold standard in education for multilingual learners (MLs).What I found was a program that seemed to have had no planning or research put into it, and very little of what one could even call a program. There was no procedure for identifying which students needed English support, so in my first year I would often get emails from teachers alerting me to a student that they thought might be an English learner. By the time the teacher got in touch with me, the student was often already in danger of failing multiple classes. We used the WIDA screener to assess the student and often found that, yes, they were indeed still learning English, and they had been left to their own devices in the classroom. This was a heartbreaking and unacceptable situation.

Because of this, my colleague and I got to work and created a language survey that was based on the one from my district in the U.S. We shared it with the admissions office with instructions that it be given to every student who enrolls. The admissions office began to use it, and now we have a much better system for identifying multilingual learners.

The next hurdle was determining what to do to support those learners. The year before I arrived, there were two teachers who were content teachers for half of their day, and EAL teachers for half of their day. So we essentially had one full time position for grades 6-12. The model they used was a blend of "pull out" and "push in" support. This outdated terminology was used then, but has since been replaced with "direct instruction" and "co-teaching". When I arrived, one of the teachers who had been an EAL teacher for half her day shifted to full-time EAL teaching, and then of course I was a second

full-time position that the school added. Things were certainly better than they had been, but they were far from ideal.

I spent that first year in the model described above, teaching three direct instruction (also known as English Language Development) classes, and I co-teaching in three content area classes. I use the term "co-taught" loosely here, because it mainly consisted of the content teacher teaching the class, and me standing in the back of the room, sometimes acting as what WIDA calls the "language whisperer" (Nordmeyer & Honigsfeld, 2020, p. 5), meaning I would repeat instructions or deliver other means of support to the MLs while the content teacher taught the lesson. I felt like, and was often treated like, an assistant.

There were many reasons why this situation was so abysmal: staff and administration were not properly trained in how to create an effective co-teaching model, we were not given time for adequate co-planning, the common attitude seemed to be that the MLs were "my" students and I needed to "fix" them, and the overall school culture did not seem to value what we as EAL teachers were doing. This is what led my colleague and I to put the brakes on co-teaching and to focus on building capacity in our direct instruction classes, while researching what we could do to implement a cycle of co-planning and co-teaching that would be truly effective for both students and teachers.

Rationale and Context

I am now in my second year at this school. I plan to stay for a third year, but beyond that, I'm not sure if I will stay, or if I will move on to another school. I feel a sense of urgency about leaving the EAL department in better shape than it was when I arrived. This, combined with just how intolerable the co-teaching situation had become,

is the rationale behind my idea for my capstone project. As my colleague and I are essentially building a new department from the ground up, it makes sense to also create the tools that both EAL and content teachers can use in their collaboration and support of MLs.

One of the biggest challenges we face is teacher buy-in. Our teachers are extremely busy and often overburdened, as many teachers in many schools are. Add to that the pressures of teaching during a pandemic, and even the slightest hint of adding another thing to a teacher's plate could send them over the edge. Therefore, whatever we are asking of teachers must feel to them like help rather than a burden; it must be seen as a way to lighten their load rather than make it heavier. My hope is that by creating this toolkit, I am giving teachers resources that they can use immediately that they know will be effective. They will have what they need when planning lessons that include MLs, and they can pick and choose what works best for them. By its design, it would be a differentiated tool.

Stakeholders

The direct audience for this project is teachers. Content teachers will be able to use this tool to help them plan and deliver lessons that are differentiated for MLs. EAL teachers will have a model for co-planning and co-teaching that they can use year over year as they move students through the EAL program. This toolkit will help EAL teachers communicate our model of ML support with incoming teachers and administrators, using research to explain what we are doing and why we are doing it. This will take the burden off of EAL teachers, who often feel the need to justify their role in

the school, and sometimes have to remind colleagues that they are not reading

interventionists, SPED teachers, or assistants.

While this will not be a tool that students will interact with directly, they will

benefit from it. When teachers faithfully co-plan, co-teach, and co-asses in a true cycle of

collaboration, students benefit (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015). When the EAL teacher is

valued as an expert in language acquisition, MLs benefit. When there are two teachers in

a classroom, making differentiation easier to implement, all students benefit.

Parents will also be indirect beneficiaries of this tool and the overall

implementation of a research-based model of ML support. With a solid model of support,

we can clearly communicate to parents what we do and why we do it. We can explain

how their child will benefit overall from what we do, and how their child will grow in

their English development. With a clear model in place, parents don't have to wonder if

and how their child is being supported in their language growth. They also don't have to

wonder whether what we are doing is what is best for their child.

Summary

This chapter began with some background on my own experiences in teaching,

and how my expectations of international teaching did not mesh with the reality. While I

love international teaching, and feel very lucky to be doing it, I was quite surprised that

international schools are not necessarily the "gold standard" when it comes to supporting

MLs. This realization is what led to the formation of my research question, how can EAL

teachers educate and collaborate with content teachers to support multilingual learners in

a 21st century model of instruction?

The chapter then describes my teaching experience, both in the United States and abroad. While my first teaching job was rewarding and gave me a lot of freedom to design the kind of lessons I thought would best support my students, it was also an emotionally draining job and one I was ready to leave after four years. However, I had some very productive co-teaching experiences at that school because the Director intentionally paired teachers and gave us co-planning time in our daily schedules. Because of this experience, I know what effective collaboration can look like, and I know how beneficial it can be for both teachers and students.

I then went into more detail about my experience at my school in Morocco, and what my EAL colleague and I are trying to accomplish this year, and why we feel it is so important. She may be leaving after next year as well, so we both feel strongly that we want to leave our school with a solid model of English language development and collaboration that they can continue to use for many years to come, no matter how often the staffing changes. My capstone project, creating a toolkit for supporting MLs in the content classroom, will be the foundation of that model. It will contain resources, tools, templates, and strategies that can be used both in a collaborative setting as well as by content teachers when they don't have a co-teacher in the classroom.

Finally, I highlighted the main stakeholders in this work: teachers, students, and parents. I explained that teachers will benefit from this directly because they will have tools at their disposal that will make planning lessons easier and more efficient. Students will benefit because they will be receiving research-based instruction using a 21st century model. Parents will benefit because they will clearly understand how their child is being supported and what to expect from our program.

In chapter two, I will review the research in detail, focusing on the latest research in language acquisition, models of successful collaboration, the effectiveness of well-planned collaboration, and the most effective strategies for content teachers. I will also research other international schools which are using effective models of support for their MLs to see what those models have in common, and how we can adapt them to our site.

In chapter three I will go into greater detail about my project. I will explain the components of the toolkit and how I plan to make the kit available to teachers. I will explain how the toolkit reflects research on best practices in EAL and language acquisition.

Chapter four will conclude the paper component of my capstone. It will contain a summary of the research, as well as implications and limitations of this project. In Chapter four I will also highlight ideas for future research in this area.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Introduction

It's the 21st century, and multilingual learners (MLs), especially those learning English, are still largely thought of as a problem in the school setting. Even in international schools, where one would expect to find a more progressive attitude towards English learners, it is still common to find programs that result in subtractive bilingualism such as "English Only" policies, anemic or non-existent English language departments, and mainstream teachers who are at a loss as to how to teach MLs. This creates a situation where the job of the English as an Additional Language Specialist (also known as the English as a Second Language, or ESL, teacher) is really twofold: educating English learners *and* educating mainstream teachers (and often administration as well). In this situation, EAL Specialists find themselves asking, "How can we educate and collaborate with content teachers to support multilingual learners in a 21st century model of instruction?" This is the question that this capstone project addresses, ultimately resulting in professional development for mainstream teachers housed within a collaboration toolkit for both EAL and mainstream teachers.

This literature review looks into issues that are particular to international schools, who can and should be global models for language development instruction and collaboration. It also investigates current theories of second language acquisition in order to inform best pedagogical practices. Finally, it looks at issues that can arise in a collaborative model, and how to best approach collaboration so that both teachers and students benefit.

International Schools, Globalization, and Power Dynamics of Language

The international school system is a product of post-World War II Europe (Carder, 2007). After the war, the United States and Britain set up schools around Europe to ensure a complete education to the children of diplomats serving in the foreign service (Gallagher, 2008). These schools used English as the language of instruction, and brought the wholesale curriculum from their home countries to their international schools with little thought as to whether creating an island of English in the middle of a country whose language was not English was advised or even ethical. There was also little thought given to students whose first language was not English. This attitude largely came from domestic attitudes about immigrants and non-English speakers. In recent years two things have happened in the world of international education: an explosion of international schools, and a recognition that their support of multilingual learners was lacking. There has also been a growing consensus, since the 1990s, that language teaching must take on a multifaceted approach, embracing a variety of perspectives and pedagogies (Block, 2004).

Today, the face of international education is changing. There is a boom in recent years in the number of international schools (Carder, 2018). At the same time, beginning in the 1990s, many have begun realizing that their usage and teaching of the English language needs to take a more nuanced approach, and must deal with the ethical issues that arise any time one brings their language, culture, and methods into another's cultural space (Block, 2004). However, many schools are still wrestling with what Gallagher (2008) calls, quoting Ruiz, the "three basic perspectives about language...language as a problem, language as a right and language as a resource" (p. 3).

While from the outside, one might assume that the international setting would serve as the gold standard in language education, the reality is quite different. Even in the 2000s, there are instances of international schools punishing children for speaking languages other than English. In a school in Italy, it was reported that students who were caught speaking Italian on campus *on the playground* were deprived of their recess (Gallagher, 2008). This happened in the face of research that confirms the importance of building, maintaining, and strengthening a child's mother tongue (Carder, 2004).

Identity and Language in a Globalized World

The anecdote above is not an exception, and it illustrates an attitude that is pervasive in most English-dominant spaces: that English is taken for granted as the "lingua franca" of a globalized world, and there is nothing problematic about this fact. On the contrary, the attitude seems to be that it is good to have a global language, and there is no downside to this phenomenon. There is also the perception that the spread of English globally is a natural result of an interconnected world. In fact, the spread of English has been intentional, largely led by neoliberal governments and multinational corporations, and aided and abetted by international schools. This spread was often done clumsily and hegemonically, and resulted in a subtractive bilingualism in the populations that it attempted to dominate. Phillipson (2009) coined the term "lingua frankensteinia" to refer to this phenomenon, pointing out that the consideration of English as a *lingua franca* is not without its monstrous results.

As English spread globally, the cultures it encountered were often met with an attitude of superiority, and local languages are often associated with lower achievement and even lower cognitive function. Skuttnab-Kangas calls this "linguicism" to put it on a

par with other "isms" like racism, sexism, or classism (Phillipson, 1997). This perception of speakers of other languages as the Other (which always means the Lesser) is largely to blame for the underfunding of robust, culturally appropriate ESL programs in England and the United States as well as the prioritizing of English "at all costs" in international schools. This linguistic imperialism is like a modern-day colonialism, spreading through the internet and media rather than ships, tanks, and accoutrements of war. The results, however, can be quite similar: the loss of culture, tradition, value, and of course, language.

What are international schools to do? First of all, they need to recognize and come to terms with their place in this system, without guilt or hand-wringing. They need to face the reality of their position, and then accept their place on the front lines of social justice. Teachers need to realize that they come to an international school with their own identities and values, and to see how that identity impacts the lessons they teach, the methods they use, the priorities they set.

The global stage is not a neutral stage, however, and it is also not singular. Coupland (2010) notes that globalization has meant a shift from language being valued for its usefulness within a particular culture to being valued for its exchange value in a globalized economy. While students and parents may feel emotional ties to their mother tongue, they also feel a strong pull toward English as a ticket to prosperity. This can cause them to push for a style of English education that, in the end, works against their cultural interests and even against their educational interests, knowing the role that a first language plays in cognitive development.

Bilingualism: Benefits and Liabilities

For those with a general understanding of research in language acquisition, a few names come to mind: Krashen, Vygotsky, Cummins, Collier to name a few. These researchers have contributed a great deal to the field of language acquisition and since their theories are fairly well known in the world of education, there is no need to rehash them here. What is more important is an understanding of bilingualism, both at the cognitive level and at the political level, in order to improve classroom practice. Teachers need to understand both the cognitive challenges that their students face when learning a new language, as well as the advantages they will enjoy if their additional language does not deteriorate their first language. Teachers also need to be sensitive to the politics around bilingualism lest they find themselves perpetuating old stereotypes about language learners and clinging to cultural ideas that do not serve students.

The Personal is Political, Even in Language Learning

The old feminist mantra that the personal is political holds true for language learners as well. Historically, language learners have been looked upon with anything from pity to scorn to outright exclusion from society. Take the case of the international school in Italy mentioned above, and it's clear that we are not any more enlightened today than previous generations on this front. In the U.S. particularly, language learners tend to be immigrants, and one only needs to turn on a television or open a newspaper to see the abysmal way that immigrants are still treated in this country. This has led to policies that usually harm rather than help: practices of assimilation, "English Only" programs, neglect of students' first languages with its resulting subtractive bilingualism are but a few (Cummins, 2001; Verdugo, 2007).

In addition to the view that language learners are somehow deficient (never mind the fact that they are in the process of *adding* language to their repertoire) comes the general and often unconscious view that English speakers are the culture-less, color-less, identity-less "normal". They are the standard by which the Other is created and measured against. Gallagher (2008) implores English-native teachers to become aware of their own identities, and how they present them in the classroom, warning that without this introspection, teachers can unconsciously "otherize" language learners and engage in practices that do not recognize, let alone honor, the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of their MLs.

Advantages of Bilingualism

Research is making more and more clear the ways in which bilingualism actually results not in deficient thinking and learning, but in cognitive and social advantages that monolingual students do not have. In having access to two different language systems, bilingual people are able to think more nimbly and to see alternatives to common thoughts and assumptions. Research has found evidence that bilinguals even retain higher levels of cognition into old age (Carder, 2007). Carder points out that people who are fluent in more than one language have advantages in the workplace as well, and earn higher wages on average than monolinguals.

There is a danger, however, to learning new languages. Cummins (2001) coined the term "subtractive bilingualism" to refer to what happens when someone learns a new language before becoming literate in their first language, and the new language slowly replaces the first. Why does the learner not simply become fully literate in the new language and reach parity with their monolingual peers? The answer lies in a process that

is unique to second language acquisition: when we learn a new language, we apply the literacy and language skills from our first language to the new language. We compare and contrast the grammar structures, we make use of cognates, and we use our literacy skills to speed up the language learning process (Cummins, 2001). When a child does not have literacy in their first language, learning a new language can then be detrimental if the first language is not continued (Carder, 2007, 2018). Collier (1987) found that these effects can be long-lasting or even permanent.

English Language Acquisition Programming- Best Practices and Pedagogies

Knowing how people, and particularly children, learn second languages, the obvious next step is a pedagogical one. Research on language acquisition should inform best practices, which can then test language acquisition theories and inform future studies. There are a few approaches which particularly stand out as being solidly research-based, and which have been tested and shown to be effective. These are: the Prism Model, Critical Inquiry, Critical Reading, and CALLA, which are subsequently described in this chapter.

Bilingual Education

Bilingual education is defined as content being delivered in two languages. There are two types of bilingual education: one-way and two-way bilingual education. One-way bilingual education is when a group of language learners is educated both in their first language and in another language (which in American schools is English). Two-way bilingual education happens when both language learners *and* language proficient speakers are learning content through two languages. For example, two-way bilingual education in the United States might look like all students-- English proficient and

English learners-- learning some content through English, and some content through Spanish in a school where students comprise mostly English speakers and Spanish speakers. In this model, both groups experience being language learners for some of their day, and language experts for some of their day.

In a monolingual model, by contrast, a student learns English while simultaneously having to learn content through English. In this model, students tend to fall behind their English-speaking peers. Once they fall behind, every year that they do not catch up (which entails learning *beyond* the pace of their peers) is another year where the gap in their achievement widens. The result is often long-term English learners. It is becoming more and more common in the United States to see students who enter kindergarten in ESL classes, and graduate high school still having been enrolled in ESL classes. This cannot be allowed to continue, especially if predictions cited by Collier and Thomas (2007) are correct that the U.S. English learner population will comprise 40% of all learners by 2030.

Monolingual education also tends to create an unconscious bias toward English (or the language of the school) and against other languages. In the U.S. and even in international schools, it has resulted in the view of what Gallagher (2008) calls "language as a problem" (p. 27). She encourages schools to move from seeing language as a problem to seeing language as a resource. The only way for schools to make this shift, however, is if more than one language is valued, and they are valued equally. How does a school make a genuine shift to seeing language as a resource, however, when all content is delivered through only one language? The answer is, they don't. The solution is bilingual education.

Bilingual education has been shown to close the achievement gap between native English speakers and English learners within five years (Collier & Thomas, 2003). Carder (2007, 2018) recommends bilingual education for international schools as well, so it is not a model that only suits U.S. schools. Not only that, but bilingual education is a benefit to *all* students, not just language learners. According to Cummins (2001), it is well-established in studies conducted in many different countries that bilingual education promotes both literacy and content knowledge for all students.

Virginia Collier and Wayne Thomas (2007) developed the Prism Model, which incorporates four aspects of learning: sociocultural, linguistic, academic, and cognitive. Through their research, they have shown that when these four aspects are addressed, learning outcomes improve. Bilingual education addresses the sociocultural needs of learners by positioning English learners on equal footing with English speakers. Both groups are language learners *and* members of both groups have opportunities to be language experts. At the same time, both groups can at times be both student *and* teacher of culture and tradition. Since language cannot realistically be extracted from culture, having a model which addresses both is realistic and holistic.

That a bilingual model would inherently address linguistic issues is obvious, but cognitive issues might be less obvious. Research has shown a connection between language and the ability to engage in higher-order thinking (Gallagher, 2008: Collier & Thomas, 2007). Higher order and critical thinking requires the ability to use and manipulate academic language. If a student has not only lost much of their first language, but also has fallen behind academically due to learning English in a monolingual model, they actually risk losing not just language, but thought. Again, if the U.S. is facing a ML

population nearing 40%, the implications of this situation are obvious and the future of the country as a whole appears grim. On the other hand, Collier and Thomas (2007) have shown that when students are taught in a bilingual model and become multilingual, they actually *surpass* the achievement of monolingual English speakers.

Bilingual education also addresses the problem of subtractive bilingualism, which happens when a child's first language is replaced by another language. In the words of Cummins (2001), "Whether we do it intentionally or inadvertently, when we destroy children's language and rupture their relationship with parents and grandparents, we are contradicting the very essence of education" (p. 16). This is a statement that should stop every educator of MLs in their tracks, and call into question every policy that does not promote literacy and growth of a child's first language. Carder et al. (2018) are strong advocates of both bilingual education and a mother tongue program for students at international schools. The mother tongue program addresses the unique issue that international students, by and large, are not immigrants, and in fact will very likely return to their home country, where they may wish to enter higher education in their first language.

Critical Inquiry

This brings us to Critical Inquiry pedagogy. In contrast to Traditional Pedagogy, which sees children as empty vessels waiting to be filled, or even Transformational Pedagogy, which centers the child and has them connect learning to their own lives, Critical Inquiry goes a step further to place them into the global context, asking them to question nondemocratic institutions and practices. The focus moves from the content to the context, with the intention of creating critical thinkers who are positioned to be active

agents of social justice. International students are in a unique position to not only make connections to multiple cultural contexts, but also to see the machinations of multiple social, cultural, and governmental frameworks, and to question their validity as a force for equity on a global stage.

Alma Flor Ada (2017) created a framework for bilingual literacy which she calls The Creative Reading Method, consisting of five phases: reading and questioning the text, called the Descriptive Phase; making connections to the text, the Personal Interpretive Phase; questioning the validity of the text, the Critical Analysis Phase; and the Creative Active Phase, where students apply their learning to a real-world situation and propose solutions. Her model integrates Critical Inquiry into its design, putting students at the center of learning, and making real-world application the norm for every learning unit. This is very similar to a framework created by Chamot and O'Malley (Chamot & O'Malley, 1987; Cummins & Davison, 2007) called CALLA, the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach . It consists of:

- tapping prior knowledge in what's called the "preparation phase"
- the presentation of both the content *and a learning strategy* that students
- are expected to master (this aspect stands out as unique to this model)
- collaborative learning and inquiry, where students work together to "digest" the content and practice using the strategy in a relatively low-stakes environment
- student self-evaluation of both content and learning strategy
- "expansion", where students take their knowledge and skills and apply them to a real-world situation.

The inclusion of explicit instruction of a learning strategy addresses the fact that research has shown that MLs are more successful when they are explicitly taught content (the what) *and* strategy (the how) (Verdugo, 2007). Both of these models integrate Critical Inquiry pedagogy, and both could easily be done in a multilingual environment. Both models have students engaging with each other in a way that supports their sociocultural growth and linguistic practice; both engage students' academic and cognitive development; and because both models are student-centered, they are by nature differentiated and well suited to the skills of students at a variety of levels of English proficiency. This is essential in a bilingual context because as Cummins (2007) states, "Undifferentiated instruction, no matter how innovative, will not be effective for all students" (p. 319).

Mother Tongue Programs

Another layer to bilingual education is the addition of what Carder calls a Mother Tongue Program (2006, 2007, 2008). Carder spent years teaching and leading in international schools, and proposes a model that he considers best practice in the international setting: bilingual education, a Mother Tongue Program (MTP), ongoing teacher training, and deep parental involvement. All aspects of his model are meant to grow *all* students into multilingual learners, not to get non-English speakers to "catch up" to English-speaking peers.

While a school might be bilingual English-Spanish or English-French, we know that students come from a variety of linguistic backgrounds. The MTP fills in the linguistic gaps in the bilingual program. It allows students to build literacy in their first

language, which is especially critical in elementary grades. If a student does not have literacy in their first language, and then they are placed into monolingual education or do not reach literacy in their first language, they suffer academic and cognitive delays that can become permanent, resulting in subtractive bilingualism-- a state where a person is not fully literate in any one language (Cummins, 2000). In fact, Cummins found that any time lost in learning English, because a student is learning through their first language, does not result in any delay in learning English. This shows that literacy in a first language actually enhances literacy in a second language.

In secondary grades, the MTP builds *academic* language in the first language. A student at this level will be literate in their first language, but it is at the secondary level that academic language learning becomes critical. This is of particular importance in the international setting, where students might return home to continue higher education in their first language.

What all of these models have in common is recognition of language as an asset, language as the basis for critical thinking, and the recognition that education in the 21st century must be focused on engaging students in analyzing and solving real-world problems. Many of them, especially Carder's model and CALLA, emphasize the importance of ongoing, intentional teacher training in best practices in teaching MLs. Nordmeyer and Honigsfeld (2020) and Honigsfeld and Dove (2008, 2015) argue that teachers must be trained in effective methods of collaboration, as they see collaborative planning and teaching as the best way to fully support all students.

Collaboration Between ELD and Mainstream Teachers: Issues and Methods

The trend over the past roughly twenty years has been a shift from the old "pull out" model of ELD instruction to co-teaching. The idea is that it is better for English learners to be in a classroom with English speaking peers, and to learn language through content. This seems logical and is certainly better than treating English learners as deficient and ghettoizing them into classes with only other English learners.

Issues arise, however, when teachers are simply told to collaborate, but they are not trained in the *how* and the *why* of collaboration. There are also issues around power dynamics both within the physical space of the classroom, and within the mental space of the teachers themselves. Because of these issues, teachers are often left feeling powerless, frustrated, and find themselves just going through the motions of collaboration but with deep resistance. This often manifests in poor instruction, power imbalances in the classroom, and the dismal situation of the ELD teacher being what Jon Nordmeyer (2020) at WIDA calls being the "child whisperer": stuck standing in the back of the classroom or next to the English learners, and simply whispering to them what they are supposed to be doing. When this happens, students are not receiving the full potential of all that collaboration can be; in fact, they are likely learning from teachers who are feeling burnt out and frustrated.

There is a better way. It involves recognition by teachers and administrators of the role of ELD teachers and mainstream teachers, and their separate but complementary expertise. It involves ongoing professional development in not only collaboration but also in overall best practices when it comes to teaching MLs. It involves openness to sharing physical and mental spaces, to learning new ways of teaching, to making mistakes, and to

continuous improvement. Finally, it involves true commitment to the full cycle of co-planning, co-teaching, and co-assessing by all teachers involved.

Power Dynamics and Perceptions of English Teachers

What does an ELD teacher bring to the mainstream classroom? This is a question that both ELD teachers and mainstream teachers need to answer, and do answer to themselves, whether they are truly aware of it or not. Creese's (2002, 2006) studies have found that for some mainstream teachers, the answer is "Not much." Or, at least, "Nothing that anyone couldn't do." There is an unspoken belief that ELD teachers' so-called expertise is in something that any English speaker already intuitively knows. Mainstream teachers cannot be blamed for holding this view if they have not had any training in language acquisition or collaboration, and the ELD teacher's role in their classroom closely resembles that of an Instructional Assistant, rather than a highly qualified teacher.

Because of the actual experiences of co-teachers in the classroom, the role of the ELD teacher is seen as supportive and generic (Creese, 2006). This is one of the reasons why Carder (2007) emphasizes the importance of language and warns against using the term "language *support"* when describing the role of the ELD teacher. This also contributes to the deficit model that WIDA works to ameliorate with their focus on what students *can do*, rather than what they lack. After all, a person who is whole and unbroken should not need support. When we as ELD teachers talk about "supporting" English learners, we are contributing to the notion that MLs are broken and in need of fixing, an issue which Creese (2006) and Gallagher (2008) both take issue with. In an interview that Creese conducted in England in her 2006 study, one of the mainstream

teachers actually described the English learners as "weak" students that the ELD teacher was there to help. When MLs are seen as the weak students in need of fixing, the teacher who is there to "support" them is often also seen as a weaker teacher, there to do the lighter "supportive" lifting in the classroom.

Professional Development

There is no one way to correct these misconceptions. It requires a school-wide culture shift (world-wide?) which takes time and needs to come from multiple sources. One of these sources is professional development (PD). Teachers are required by most states in the U.S. to do it in order to renew their licenses, and so it is built into most schools within or outside of the school day. This makes PD an obvious choice for where to begin when it comes to such a massive undertaking as culture shift.

Carder recommends ongoing PD, making it clear that a "one and done" model will accomplish little if a school truly intends to make lasting changes. He recommends a third-party PD program that is popular in international schools called "Teaching ESL Students in Mainstream Classrooms" (now known as "Teaching in English in Multilingual Classrooms") delivered by Lexis Education. Davison (2006) sees some weaknesses in this training, however, in the way that the ELD teacher is again presented as not having content expertise, but rather simply having a set of skills and methods. Davison does grant that the training is very strong in delivering the *how* of teaching MLs in the mainstream. Their concern is that without giving teachers the underlying *what* of EAL content and making clear the expertise that EAL teachers have, attendees might fall back into old belief patterns, and the EAL teacher finds themselves back to playing child whisperer.

Collaboration: For Better or For Worse?

According to the old adage, "two heads are better than one". This seems intuitively obvious, but becomes far more complicated when we ask ourselves *how* we put those two heads together without creating a monster. However, this is exactly what mainstream and EAL teachers are asked to do when they are told to collaborate, but not given the training, time, and resources to do it right. Assuming a school has at least started off on the right foot and implemented ongoing PD on teaching MLs and how to collaborate with the EAL teacher, the next thing that school must do is give teachers time to co-plan. Co-teaching without co-planning is as useful as flying an airplane without putting any fuel in it. It's going to crash and burn quickly and messily.

Honigsfeld and Dove have created multiple tools for collaboration, so teachers do not need to reinvent the wheel to get a good start. They do, however, have to have time to plan. Davison (2006) found that only one-quarter of teachers surveyed reported having "frequent contact with other teachers to plan joint classes, review student work, or team teach" (p. 458). This means that 75% of teachers are not engaging in true collaboration, and so it is likely that the teachers are frustrated and students are not getting what they need. They are likely at the lowest level of what Davison has identified as five levels of collaboration: the level of pseudo compliance. When teachers are operating at this level, true collaboration is not even taking place. It looks like the content teacher planning content-focused lessons, and the EAL teacher coming into the content teacher's room not knowing what the day's lesson entails (other than possibly what they can glean from posted learning objectives), and therefore relegated to a supportive role.

At the highest level of collaboration is what Davison calls Creative Construction. As the name implies, teachers are working together to construct effective lessons, taking into account the different but equally important expertise that each brings to the table. They are engaging in the full cycle of collaboration, and most importantly, they do not see co-teaching as simply the addition of the EAL teacher into the mainstream classroom. They see co-teaching as a completely unique style of teaching, and they see themselves as learning and growing into the mindset and methods needed to make it effective. Teachers at this level are planning not just *what* they will teach, but *how* they will teach it. They are using Honigsfeld and Dove's (2015) models of co-teaching, intentionally choosing which model best suits the goals of the lesson, the students they are teaching, the time they have, even the space in which they are delivering the lesson. These models are as follows:

One group: One leads, one "teaches on purpose" (assisting individuals or small groups of students who need extra help understanding the lesson).

One group: Two teach the same content.

One group: One teaches, one assesses.

Two groups: Two teach the same content.

Two groups: One preteaches, one teaches alternative information.

Two groups: One reteaches, one teaches alternative information.

Multiple groups: Two monitor and teach the various groups. (p.4)

If teachers do not have time in their schedule to meet with each other to co-plan, should they drop the collaborative model altogether? Honigsfeld and Dove (2015a, 2015b, 2008) continually re-assert that teachers can do some co-planning separately, but they do still

need to have *some* time to plan together, in person. This begs the question, whose responsibility is it to ensure that teachers have time to adequately plan and assess lessons together? If there is not an extra prep time given to teachers for this work, then it is the administration's responsibility to change teacher schedules. If that has been done, but teachers are still unwilling to make time, or they come to co-planning meetings unprepared, then the fault lies with them. This is actually good news, since it means that it is within their power to fix it.

Implications and Connections to This Project

Reading through this literature was eye-opening for me, especially the two books by Carder (2007, 2018) as they relate to English teaching in international schools. To be blunt, it was depressing. When I first arrived on the international school scene, thinking I was going to see the best in language pedagogy, only to be met with "English only" and a sorely understaffed and largely ignored department, it was a shock. When I learned from Carder that my school was not at all exceptional in this neglect and misunderstanding of English learners, it was more than a shock-- it was infuriating. I knew that my project had to do something to remedy the situation at my school. Carder's model helped to solidify for me the shape that my project would take: teacher development in bilingualism and how to best teach MLs.

In my research, I found plenty of support for Carder's model, and the discovery of the Prism Model, CALLA, and the Critical Reading method made me think about how I would engage teachers in this work. The training that I plan to create will actually be written using a blended version of CALLA and Critical Reading. Through this structure, I will present teachers with information that they can access and apply in their teaching.

Topics covered will include the subtopics from this chapter, with particular emphasis on best pedagogical practices.

This teacher training will be part of a larger toolbox for collaboration, which will be grounded in theories and practices from Honigfeld and Dove, and other researchers cited in this chapter. The toolbox will contain resources for co-planning, co-teaching, and co-assessing students, with suggestions for what each teacher should be responsible for within this cycle of collaboration. The toolbox will stay with the school, so that even with teacher turnover, there will be a consistent resource that, hopefully, will help to ameliorate the negative effects of international 2-year teacher contracts.

Summary

Research supports the idea that being multilingual has lifelong benefits over being monolingual, but with the caveat of avoiding subtractive bilingualism. As the world becomes more and more integrated, this fact should be kept front and center, as the draw toward learning English and jettisoning mother tongues could become stronger, especially in disadvantaged populations. People who are learning a second language, whether it is English or any other language, need to be encouraged to attain and strengthen literacy in their first language if they want to reap the many benefits of bilingualism.

The vanguard in this message must be the schools, where much of the language learning is happening. Teachers need training in how students learn language, parents need to be involved and also taught the benefits of bilingualism and the pitfalls of subtractive bilingualism. Administrators need to be more than supportive of their EAL teachers and MLs; they need to actively lead school culture creation toward an embrace

of bilingualism and the ways that MLs enhance a school, rather than create a problem for it.

Part of this leadership also entails making space for teachers to collaborate, as well as giving them the training they need to be effective teachers to their MLs and effective collaborators with their EAL teachers. Schools can "talk the talk" about how they value bilingualism and multiculturalism, but if they do not "walk the walk" and actually create an environment where research-supported best practices can actually happen, then schools will continue to wrestle with how to manage the "problem" of English learners. We have solutions; we just need the will to implement them.

In Chapter 3, I will go into more detail about the teacher professional development I plan to create for my project. I will review the audience for the project and the framework I plan to use. I will revisit some of the research that will inform both the methodology and the content of the PD I plan to create. I will also describe the setting and the time frame in which this PD will take place.

CHAPTER THREE

Project Description

Introduction and Research Question

There is a joke that circulates among teachers and which comes up whenever educators engage in professional development: teachers make the worst students. Inevitably, someone casually makes this remark, they all have a laugh, and then return to the emails and lesson planning that they are doing in stealth while some poor soul attempts to deliver a presentation and keep the educators' collective attention. Often, they are failing and they know it, the participants know it, but all are there to play their roles, check off the box, and go back to doing what they do. In one particularly cringe-worthy session, the presenter actually pulled out a spatula and, when talking about how to turn a negative conversation into a positive one, she told teachers to "just flip it!" while driving home the point with her spatula. The collective eye roll was palpable. We must do better.

Experiences like this leads one to think about how professional development can truly achieve its goal of enhancing the experience and effectiveness of teachers. There is no silver bullet, to be sure, but one solution can be to create a more customized approach when trying to answer the research question: how can we educate and collaborate with content teachers to support multilingual learners in a 21st century model of instruction?

The question is actually two questions: first, how can we educate content teachers in their classrooms, where a growing proportion of students are multilingual? Second, how can we create a culture of collaboration so that both mainstream and language specialist teachers can share a mental and physical space of teaching and learning, with a common goal of creating optimal outcomes for all students? It feels like a herculean task,

and it is not one that will be accomplished in this project alone. However, it is a task that, little by little, over time, can be achieved. This chapter will describe the project and research rationale, the setting and participants, and the timeline for completion.

Project Description

Professional development (PD) does not have to be painful, tedious, redundant, or irrelevant, but it often feels like it is. PD is often delivered using a one-size-fits-all approach, particularly in larger districts in the U.S. Teachers often ask each other: Did anyone bother to ask *teachers* what they needed? It's an obvious, but often overlooked first step. The project I plan to do will begin with this essential element, in the form of a survey I will distribute to the teachers at my school. I will take the answers from this survey to inform a self-paced professional development course that will give teachers tools they need to more effectively teach their multilingual learners (and by extension, *all* learners). I will use Schoology as the platform for the PD, which teachers at my school are already familiar with. This will address the first part of my research question.

To address the second part, this PD will also contain several collaboration tools, which teachers can use as they need them. Largely drawing from the research and tools created by Honigsfeld and Dove as well as tools that I will create in my own collaboration with teachers, it will contain templates for unit planning, models for co-teaching with guidance on how and when to use each model, and guidance on deciding roles and responsibilities for each teacher. The goal in having these two parts of the project is to create a resource that answers both the *why* and the *how* of teaching multilingual learners (MLs).

Relevant Research

In Maurice Carder's books, *Bilingualism in International Schools* and *Multilingual Learners in International Schools,* he emphasizes the need for ongoing PD for staff that focuses on how language is learned, and how mainstream teachers can effectively teach their multilingual learners. While he suggests a specific course, it costs over $5000, so I know my colleagues and I will not be taking this course anytime soon. I'm creating this PD so that my school can benefit from this type of PD without the expense.

Gallagher (2008) agrees with Carder, and adds that teachers are often underprepared or unprepared to teach MLs, even though this is a growing population. Teacher training programs rarely spend much, if any, time teaching content teachers how language is learned. Add to this the fact that native English speakers are often monolingual, and you have a situation where teachers are both unaware of *and* unprepared to meet the needs of MLs.

The research from Honigsfeld & Dove (2008) focuses on the benefits of collaboration, and effective practices. They contend that when a mainstream teacher and an EAL teacher are both in the classroom, all students benefit, especially MLs. However, collaboration doesn't just happen. It needs to be done intentionally, with roles and responsibilities clearly defined in all parts of the cycle of collaboration: co-planning, co-teaching, and co-assessing.

Setting and Participants

This project will be created and executed in the international school in which I teach. It is in an urban setting, the capital city of the country I'm living in. There are

approximately 400 students in pre-K through grade 12. We have an International Baccalaureate degree option in grades 11 and 12. The school has about 70% students whose first language is not English. The student body consists of both local citizens as well as international students. The international students are mainly the children of people working at the embassies nearby, and some have parents who work for large multinational corporations.

The school is private and charges tuition. Local citizens pay this tuition themselves; international families generally have their government or employer pay the tuition, which is quite expensive. This means that the students all come from very privileged backgrounds, which makes them starkly different from most MLs in the United States, who are often immigrants. The students also differ because their stay in this country is temporary (with the exception of the local citizens, of course). They do not necessarily feel the need to acclimate or assimilate to the local culture. This can create tension and a sense of the school being an "island of English" in a non-English speaking country. Done badly, this tension can feel colonial. It is for this reason, among others, that training international teachers to effectively teach MLs has an element of social justice as well as pedagogy.

There are 35 full-time mainstream teachers at this school, 20 instructional assistants, and 4 English as an Additional Language (EAL) Specialists. The main audience for the PD are the mainstream teachers and the instructional assistants. The main audience for the toolkit is all teachers, including the EAL Specialists.

Timeline

The structure of capstone projects at Hamline prescribes and limits the timeframe in which they must be completed, as opposed to a more traditional thesis, which can take longer to complete. I plan to create the PD and toolkit during the fall semester of 2021, so that we can implement it in my school during the spring semester of the 2021-2022 school year. I would like for the PD and toolkit to remain available to teachers every year, with the expectation that all incoming teachers complete it as part of their orientation.

In designing and drafting the PD, I am going to use a CALLA-type structure, which consists of learning both content *and* learning strategies; it utilizes collaborative learning, which I will accomplish through online discussions; and it culminates in real-world application, which in this case, is application in the teachers' own classrooms.

I will build the course in Schoology, using multiple modalities and multiple points of entry, based on a participant's prior knowledge. In this way, I hope to avoid the dreaded "I already know this", "This is a waste of time" response that too many canned PDs receive.

The Schoology course will consist of several modules, which teachers can complete according to their own exposure to the topic. If a teacher already feels competent in a topic, they can complete a knowledge check and move on to the next topic without having to complete all parts of the module. This way, the course differentiates itself. There will also be modules that are content-specific, so that teachers can dig into strategies that fit their content area.

The topics for the modules will be: identity, effective strategies for teaching MLs, with an emphasis on unique challenges in various content areas, and finally the why and

how of co-teaching and collaboration. In the module on identity, teachers will explore their own identity as well as how language shapes identity. This module will get teachers thinking about their own ideas about who they are, as well as how they perceive their students. As Gallagher says, identity is an area that teachers often overlook, and this can lead to an "othering" of students (2008). The next module will allow teachers to explore the benefits of bilingualism and the dangers of subtractive bilingualism, as well as strategies for effectively teaching MLs so that classroom teachers are not inadvertently creating an environment that is hostile to MLs. Finally, teachers will learn about the cycle of collaboration, the benefits of collaboration and what the EAL specialist can bring to the classroom, and the different ways that collaboration can actually be executed in a lesson.

Finally, I will create a "Toolkit" folder in both the Schoology course and in my school's shared Google Drive. This will house multiple documents that teachers can use as needed. My hope is that, over the years, teachers can add to this toolkit so that it is a living resource containing the most relevant and useful tools for teachers.

Summary

This project will consist of a self-paced professional development course and a toolkit for teacher collaboration. It will address the research question: How can we educate and collaborate with content teachers to support multilingual learners in a 21st century model of instruction? The course will be on the Schoology platform, which teachers currently use daily. The participants will be teachers from an urban international school whose population is about 70% students whose first language is not English. In

the next chapter, chapter four, I will reflect on the process of creating this PD and summarize my final thoughts on the research question.

CHAPTER FOUR

When putting the last finishing touches on the first three chapters, the plan was to complete the project and chapter four during the fall semester. As the old saying goes, humans make plans, and the gods laugh. I ended up enrolling in the summer session when a section opened up at the last minute. This meant that the project would be done and ready for "prime time" by the beginning of the 2021-22 school year, which I was very happy about. It also meant that my Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (MATESOL) would be completed before beginning a possible search for a new international school posting. It also meant that I would be creating my project during the two months that I would be back in the United States, trying to make time to see friends and family that I hadn't seen in a year or more. There were times when I wasn't sure I would be able to do it. There were moments of panic and sheer terror. However, I was able to pack in visits and still create a project that I am proud of, and which addresses my research question, which is, How can we educate and collaborate with content teachers to support multilingual learners in a 21st century model of instruction?

The project, which is a professional development (PD) course created in an online platform called Schoology, addresses the main topics of my research: the international school system and resulting power dynamics, issues of bilingualism, best practices in the teaching of multilingual learners (MLs), and the "why" and "how" of collaboration. These were the main topics that I felt were most important for teachers to have grounding in when engaging in ML instruction and teacher collaboration. In my research and personal experience, I have found that most teacher training programs provide little to no

training in the specific needs of English learners nor do they prepare content teachers to collaborate with EAL teachers. I structured the course into three modules, with each module having three main sections: an introduction to the topic which I called "Dip a Toe"; a more comprehensive review of the topic called "Go for a Swim"; and a more in-depth section called "Deep Dive". The section titles reveal the time of year in which I created the project, but they also give the course a predictable structure which I think busy teachers will appreciate. While this course is meant to be done individually online, it does incorporate discussions so that teachers can share their thoughts and insights. I firmly believe that teachers are an untapped and rich resource of knowledge and experience about what works in education, and we get few opportunities to come together to share our ideas and experiences with one another. My hope is that the discussions in the course will deepen teacher learning and help build a bridge both between teachers as well as from the online world to real world application.

Since I teach in an international school, it was important to address the history of the international school system so that teachers in this context can fully grasp their place within it. It is especially important, I believe, for teachers to disrupt what has the potential to be a new type of colonialism. When the international school system was created after World War II, there was little thought as to the ethics or impact of placing what amounts to an island of English within a country whose main language(s) is not English. There was also little thought as to how English could become a kind of linguistic currency, and what effect that might have on the local population and the local language. In my research, I was dismayed but not surprised at this lack of consideration, and so I see my role as an international teacher to try to create a space for linguistic justice in my

classroom, and ideally, in my school. For me, this looks like implementing

research-backed pedagogy such as CALLA, Critical Inquiry, and the Prism Model, as

well as presenting my project to my principal in the hopes of having it implemented

school-wide.

The topic of international schools and international teaching leads naturally to the

topic of bilingualism and issues around bilingual education. In the past, it was common

for schools to try to replace a student's other language(s) with English as quickly as

possible. It was akin to a slash-and-burn policy for language, and the result was often

devastating: what Cummins (2000, 2001, 2007) calls *subtractive bilingualism.* In

researching, it became clear that some of those practices were being implemented at my

school, and it left me with a sick feeling in the pit of my stomach. How could we be

doing this to students? I felt all the more compelled to effect some kind of change. This

led to sharing research with my colleague and peer reviewer, and then with the secondary

principal. Subsequently, the principal's attitude about ESL and language learning shifted.

He is much more receptive to input from the English as an Additional Language (EAL)

team and has shown a better understanding of the value of the work we do. He even

confessed to not knowing much about meeting the needs of MLs when he was a

classroom teacher. I truly hope that in taking my course, other teachers will experience

this same moment of revelation, and will adjust their teaching practices to better meet the

needs of MLs.

Intention does not automatically translate to action, however. I knew I had to first

convince teachers of the needs of MLs, and then give them some research-backed

methods for meeting those needs. In my research, I was struck by the power of Critical

Inquiry, CALLA, and the Prism Model as outstanding 21st century models of instruction. All of them place the student at the center of learning, but they go beyond that and address issues of identity and social justice. By placing the student at the center of learning, all of the models I focused on provided multiple ways for MLs to use language in authentic ways that fostered both language and content learning. Done well, teachers using these models should never have to hear students ask, "Why are we learning this? What does this have to do with real life?" The course gives educators an opportunity to investigate these models in the "Go for a Swim" section of Module 2. In the "Deep Dive" section, they apply one of the models to a unit that they have taught in the past. In this way, teachers begin to create a tangible and practical artifact that they can immediately bring into the classroom.

Finally, the course guides teachers into the world of collaboration. It was important to me that teachers not just get tools for collaboration-- the *how* of collaboration-- but that they also understand *why* the teaching of MLs is best accomplished with a content teacher working hand-in-hand with an EAL teacher. My research confirmed to me that my own experience was epidemic in the world of teaching: teachers are often placed into collaborative partnerships with few to no tools for doing it effectively, few to no explanations for why they are doing it, and many experiences of frustration and disappointment. My hope is that the course I've created will equip teachers with the *why* and the *how* of collaboration so that they will have positive, effective teacher relationships that translate to powerfully effective teaching of MLs and by extension, *all* students.

The plan for the project came to fruition, for the most part, according to the plan that was put in place in Chapter Three. There were two elements in the plan which I did not end up doing, however. When I wrote the first part of the paper, I was planning to do my project in the fall semester of 2021. Instead, I took it in the summer, and so I was not able to send a survey out to the teachers at my school before I created my course. This was because of the last-minute nature of my registration and the fact that asking teachers to do anything extra in the last weeks of school is an exercise in futility. Instead, I plan to ask participants to complete an evaluation at the end of the course. If consistent themes emerge which I think would improve the course, I will make additions and updates. Another idea which I ended up rejecting was a knowledge check requirement if teachers wanted to skip any parts of the course. As a teacher, it felt pedantic and insulting. I find that teachers are often not treated like the professionals that they are, and the knowledge check felt uncomfortable to me.

Now that I have a course that I believe will result in empowered teachers who are ready to collaboratively meet the needs of their students, I plan to share it with my school principals (the school where I teach has an elementary principal and a secondary principal) and director. Even if I leave the school for a different international posting, my current school can continue to have teachers take the course. This is one of the best aspects of placing it on Schoology, rather than having the course delivered live via a slideshow or similar. Instead, it is self-paced and I don't have to be at the school where it is being administered. It can stay at my current school, and I can bring it with me to any school I teach at in the future. Even if they don't use the Schoology platform, every school now does use some type of online learning platform, and I could adapt the course

for most any platform that a school employs. The most important thing is the content of course, not the form that it takes. I also see this course as a living, breathing entity, so to speak. It should not be static, but rather adapt to new research, new information, new resources, which can easily be incorporated into the modules, especially into the "Deep Dive" sections.

The process of birthing this project does feel a lot like an actual birth: grueling, painful, exhilarating, very rewarding, and ending with a result that I am proud of. I hope that the course that I created will truly make an impact on the teaching of MLs and on the experience of teacher collaboration. Honigsfeld and Dove are to be credited for having an immensely positive impact on the field of research on collaboration, and I hope that more research will continue to be done by others in the field. This is still a developing area of research, and one that has great potential to improve the lives of teachers and students. Another area that warrants further research is the impact of English as a lingua franca. There is still debate about whether English as a lingua franca is a net benefit to the world and more needs to be learned about its impact, not only on other languages, but on cultures and societies. What are we losing by pushing English? What do we need to fight to preserve, and in what ways to do other languages need to stand their ground, so to speak? Conversely, what are we gaining as a global community by embracing English as a lingua franca? These are questions that are vitally important and need to be considered before it's too late and we have lost languages and cultures that can never be brought back. After all, language is a key aspect of what it means to be human. Research is beginning to show us just how much language is intertwined with identity and with the very thoughts that we think, as well as our ability to think those thoughts. How we treat

language is worthy of great care and consideration. My hope is that this project will help

schools, especially international schools, to be at the forefront of that care as we nurture

future leaders, researchers, artists, and teachers. This capstone has inspired me to

continue to learn about the balance of language and power, and to position myself as an

agent of language justice and an advocate for the languages of my students.

REFERENCES

Ada, A. & Campoy, F. (2017). Critical creative literacy for bilingual teachers in the 21st century. *Issues in Teacher Education, 26*(2), 115.

Block, D. (2004). Globalization and language teaching. *ELT Journal, 58*(1), 75-77. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/58.1.75

Chamot, A. & O'Malley, J. (1987). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly*, *21*(2), 227–249. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586733

Carder, M. (2006). Bilingualism in international baccalaureate programmes, with particular reference to international schools. *Journal of Research in International Education, 5*(1), 105-122. https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240906061867

Carder, M. (2007). *Bilingualism in international schools: a model for enriching language education*. Multilingual Matters.

Carder, M. (2008). The development of ESL provision in Australia, Canada, the USA and England, with conclusions for second language models in international schools. *Journal of Research in International Education, 7*(2), 205-231. https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240908091305

Collier, V. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(4), 617-641. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586986

Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (2007). "Predicting Second Language Academic Success in English Using the Prism Model." *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*, Springer US, pp. 333–48, doi:10.1007/978-0-387-46301-8_24.

Coupland, N. (2010). *The Handbook of Language and Globalization.* (1st ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

Creese, A. (2002). The discursive construction of power in teacher partnerships: Language and subject specialists in mainstream schools. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 597-616. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588242

Creese, A. (2006). Supporting talk? partnership teachers in classroom interaction. *Null, 9*(4), 434-453. https://doi.org/10.2167/beb340.0

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy : Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596773

Cummins, J. (2001). Bilingual children's mother tongue: Why is it important for education? *Sprogforum,* (19), 15-20.

Cummins, J., & Davison, C. (2007). *International handbook of english language teaching* (1st ed.). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-46301-8

Davison, C. (2006). Collaboration between ESL and content teachers: How do we know when we are doing it right? *Null, 9*(4), 454-475. https://doi.org/10.2167/beb339.0

Gallagher, E. (2008). *Equal rights to the curriculum : Many languages, one message*. Channel View Publications.

Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. (2008). Co-teaching in the ESL classroom. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin.*

Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. (2015). Co-teaching ELLs: Riding a tandem bike.(co-planning and collaborative teaching for the sake of english language learners). *Educational Leadership, 73*, 56. https://search.proquest.com/docview/1746821756

Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. (2015). Collaboration and co-teaching for English learners: A leader's guide. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Nordmeyer, J, & Honigsfeld, A. (2020). *Collaboration: Working together to serve multilingual learners*. WIDA.

Phillipson, R. (1997). Realities and Myths of Linguistic Imperialism, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 18:3, 238-248, DOI: 10.1080/01434639708666317

Phillipson, R. (2009). English in Globalisation, a Lingua Franca or a Lingua Frankensteinia? *TESOL Quarterly*, *43*(2), 335–339. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00175.x

Verdugo, R. (2007). *English-language learners: Key issues*. Sage Publications. https://doi.org/nfo:doi/