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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Meeting the needs of English Learners (ELs) is a topic often discussed by teachers and school administrators at workshops and professional development meetings. Although there are numerous recommendations and resources available for this task, one point has been made clear: ELs have unique needs that must be met in unique ways (Lazarin, 2008; Ariza, Morales-Jones, Yahya, & Zainuddin, 2010; US Department of Education, 2010). Like many others across the United States, my district has seen a steady increase in the population of ELs over the past decade. Because of this increase, we are seeking innovative ways to meet the needs of these unique learners. Through my research, I hope to answer the following question: How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners? Within the following sections, I will discuss my own background with this topic, the summer program for which my curriculum is designed, and my district’s role in shaping this research and curriculum choices.

Researcher Background

Throughout my teaching career, I have found myself drawn to the concept of alternative and extended day instruction. I began developing this passion even as a college student as I volunteered every Thursday night at an after-school mentorship program. Implemented in the heart of Northeast Minneapolis, the program’s goal was primarily for at-risk, elementary students to develop relationships with positive role models. In addition
to creating constructive relationships, the program also sought to help the students academically. I was immediately drawn to this program because it fit so well with what I had come to know and understand about learners from my own experiences as a student: relationships and authentic learning form the core of successful instruction. In addition to weekly meetings, the program also implemented shared experiences to help students learn skills applicable to their every day life.

One such shared experience I looked forward to every year was our Christmas gift exchange. Students had to work at a local thrift store sorting items and cleaning the store to earn $5 for each of their family members. Once they had earned the money, the store gave students cash to choose gifts for their families. Observing the students’ pride in being able to successfully count out exact change, stick to their budget, and buy their family members’ gifts with their own money was an incredible opportunity. Students we had to force to do math and work together only days before were engaged with one another in a type of learning that was placed in the broader context of life rather than bound within the walls of a classroom.

The idea of creating such authentic learning experiences and opportunities for relationships continued to influence my instruction as a student teacher. My first paid position in a school district was as an extended day instructor teaching a poetry class for Karen newcomers at my student teaching placement. During the first few days, students hardly spoke above a whisper and only ventured in English to ask a question. However, from the very first day of class, my co-teaching partner and I worked tirelessly to make the content engaging and to help students feel respected. We encouraged them to talk to one another in Karen as they discussed assignments, processed their experiences as refugees
through their poetry, and formulated their ideas into English. Furthermore, we designed our class to include time for reflection and poetry sharing so students could develop trust amongst one another. Over the next several weeks, the students came alive with chatter as they began to feel comfortable voicing their developing English. In a matter of only a couple of months, my belief in creating authentic learning opportunities with relationships at the core was strengthened.

Currently in my fourth year of teaching, I work as the only full-time EL teacher in the school. Each day I meet with ELs in grades kindergarten through fifth grade and dance between guiding my students through classroom content and helping them acquire the English language. Similar to the demographics of the district as a whole, the percentage of ELs in our school is growing each year and currently accounts for approximately 5% of the student body. The school has just over 840 students, and like many schools, it is overflowing with students. Because of this, teachers are finding it increasingly more difficult to meet their students’ needs as the average class sizes continue to rise.

As a way to help meet the students’ needs outside of school, we offer Extended Day classes both before and after school throughout the academic year. Funded by Targeted Services money from the state, the school offers these classes to students who meet specific criteria including academic, emotional, and behavioral needs. Last fall, I took on a new role as the Extended Day Coordinator for this program at the school with the goal of not only helping ELs who often attend these classes but also to meet the needs of other students in our school who benefit from such classes.
Summer Program

In addition to the role as my school’s Extended Day Coordinator, I have enjoyed spending the past four years working with a team of EL teachers to design a weeklong summer program for ELs across the district. The team had piloted the program the summer before I was hired in the district and modeled it after an existing enrichment program for students who were thought to be candidates for a Gifted and Talented program.

When teachers first initiated the EL summer program, the goal was to create a program that focused on building language through authentic learning experiences such as field trips, community projects, and classroom activities. The percentage of ELs at each of the elementary schools across the district certainly varied, ranging from 4% to over 20%, but remained a minority percentage when compared to the overall student body. Therefore, the committee saw the need to create an environment where ELs could meet more students who shared similar experiences and backgrounds as themselves. Because many of the students had never felt the sense of belonging that comes from opportunities such as day camps or sports camps, the teachers wanted to create an atmosphere that mimicked such environments while still incorporating academic principles from the school year. In this way, the team hoped to create a program that provided natural openings for relationship building and oral language development while at the same time bridging the opportunity gap evident in many of these students’ lives.

In order to meet these goals, the planning committee ensured that all students could participate regardless of their families’ financial situations by offering the program free of charge with the help of both state and district funds. This approach has proved important
over the years, as nearly half of the participating students have received either free or reduced price lunches while in the program. Furthermore, the program has seen a steady increase of attendance over the past few years as it has grown from servicing 136 students during its first year in 2012 to having 273 students attend in 2015. However, due to district changes, the program lost nearly half of its funding during the 2015 year. Our current committee quickly turned to outside grant and sponsorship opportunities in order to maintain the quality and experiential nature of the program.

As we began reviewing the program for grant-writing purposes, we realized that many of the grants required measurable data that showed student learning. However, because the summer program lacked a strong link to the academic school year, it was challenging to collect data and measure student learning. We realized that in the attempt to create an authentic learning environment, we had allowed academics to become secondary to the various field trips, community projects, and classroom activities that had come to define our program. The committee desired to not only increase the quality and rigor of our program but to also acquire the funds necessary for it to continue, so we decided to look to the district’s theory of literacy learning to help integrate a stronger academic base into the program.

District Literacy Background

The planning committee spent significant time discussing the best way to incorporate academics into the program without making students feel as though it were another week of summer school. An idea that quickly began to take hold was integrating elements from the district’s literacy initiative into the program. Our district recently joined the Literacy Collaborative, which is a literacy model based on the research of Irene Fountas
and Gay Su Pinnell (Literacy Collaborative, 2015). The district is currently in year four of a five-year implementation plan. At this stage, each elementary school in the district has a trained literacy coach and a literacy leadership team who help lead professional development for teachers in the structure and implementation of the research-based components of the Literacy Collaborative.

As the program committee considered these various components, one in particular seemed a good fit for our program. An integral part of our district’s journey in literacy involves creating continuity among content areas through the use of district-created units of study. Each unit of study is approximately six weeks long and integrates content areas such as science and social studies with literacy to meet state standards. To help teachers implement the units of study, the district provides teachers with a set of mentor texts as well as a unit maps that outline which content and literacy standards are met. Additionally, these unit maps offer guiding questions, target vocabulary, and other ideas to help teachers implement the unit.

Moving forward in my capstone, I will be using the theories behind the district’s units of study to help guide the creation of my own unit of study for the EL summer program. Rather than a full six-week unit, I will develop a five-day unit to fit the needs of the program’s time constraints. The unit will integrate the district’s principles of thematic units with the enrichment opportunities the program committee has worked so hard to offer ELs. Furthermore, I will explore How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?

Summary
Chapter one explained my path towards creating a unit of study for a summer program designed for ELs. It described my journey from my first experiences with out-of-school programming to my current role as coordinator of Extended Day Learning in my school. It then discussed the background of the program for which I am designing curriculum. Finally, it briefly introduced my district’s current model of literacy curriculum, units of study, as inspiration for my own curriculum choice.

Chapter two will review research on the theories used in my curriculum development. First, it will explore the opportunity gap as the foundational rationale for the continuation of the EL summer program and will then carefully examine the legislation behind such programming. Third, it will review alternative methods to accelerating ELs’ acquisition of academic language while the final section will go to the heart of the research question: How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?
CHAPTER TWO

Overview

This literature review begins by defining and discussing the opportunity gap present in schools across Minnesota and the United States. Then, it discusses what current legislation has been designed to narrow and eventually close that gap as well as legislative suggestions for effective out-of-school programs. Third, it examines current research that addresses how to specifically meet the needs of ELs. Finally, it considers how thematic units could benefit the selected summer program and potentially be the answer to the research question of how to best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for ELs.

The Opportunity Gap

For decades, states such as Minnesota have sought various ways to not only improve overall school achievement but to also close the gap between the performance of various racial and economic subgroups, (Minnesota Department of Education [MDE], 2015a; MDE, 2015b.). In order to close this gap, referred to as the achievement gap by the Minnesota Department of Education, much attention has been given to the quality of instruction and educators during the academic school year with the presumption that if students are failing, then school year activity holds the majority of the responsibility (MDE, 2015a; MDE, 2015b.). However, as Miller (2007) explains, the achievement gap refers to a symptom of the opportunity gap in that students in the highest performing subgroup are often from white, middle-class families and therefore have opportunities to engage in activities such as high-quality summer programming or after
school recreational activities not readily available to students of color who may or may not be from lower income families. This section will therefore begin by challenging the notion of “failing schools” and conclude by discussing the opportunity gap as an alternative to the widely used achievement gap.

Failing Schools

In order to analyze the gap in performance between the various subgroups of students, researchers such as Downey, von Hippel, and Hughes (2008) have looked more closely at not only student data but perhaps more noticeably, data collection methods and their impact on determining the effectiveness of schools. Downey et al. used three different methods of analysis on a single set of data to determine school effectiveness and found noticeable differences among the results. They argued that school success is often measured solely by student achievement, which they defined as a score from a single assessment. However, they went on to reason that achievement scores alone cannot “adequately separate school and non-school effects on children’s learning” (p. 244). Because an analysis based on achievement only takes into account year-round results, it may be difficult to distinguish learning that occurs during the school year and learning that occurs outside of school. Downey et al. (2008) therefore considered both learning and impact as alternative measures of school effectiveness.

After discussing the disadvantages of exclusively using end-of-the-year student achievement data to determine the effectiveness of schools, Downey et al. (2008) examined the method of “learning-based” criteria used by states such as Tennessee, North Carolina, and South Carolina. Such criteria are based on the learning that occurs throughout the academic school year as opposed to the full calendar year. Although the researchers praised this method for removing the potential differences in summer experiences such as attending an academics-based
day camp rather than watching television, they argued that the *learning* model still did not separate daily school from non-school factors. They stated that because students still spend the majority of time away from school, even during the academic year, a different measure of school effectiveness was needed (p. 245).

Because measurement approaches that considered only student *achievement* and *learning* did not satisfactorily account for school effectiveness, Downey et al. (2008) explored *impact*. This approach measured the difference between children’s rate of learning in school and the rate at which they would learn if they had never entered school. The researchers explained that because the academic year included both school and non-school factors, researchers could find the *impact* of a school by subtracting the students’ summer learning rate from their school year rate. Using data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Cohort administered by the National Center for Education Statistics (2004) they examined school effectiveness based on all three aforementioned criteria: achievement, learning, and impact.

The results of their study indicated that the gap present when analyzing achievement alone does not, in fact, represent the impact that schools are having on all learners, including struggling learners. When discussing their study’s results, Downey et al. (2008) concluded that schools indeed have a positive impact on student learning regardless of socio-economic and racial status. In other words, a large contributing factor in student success appeared to be factors outside of school, including differences in the activities and learning that students experience during the summer.

Alexander, Entwisle, and Olson (2007) also studied the impact of summer learning differences in the early grades. For their study, they analyzed data from the Baltimore-based Beginning School Study (BSS) youth panel to determine if summer learning differences for
elementary students impacted their later schooling. In 1982, BSS randomly selected 790 students of mixed racial and socioeconomic backgrounds from 20 elementary schools to represent the student population as a whole. The study then followed these students from first grade through age 22.

In the published analysis, Alexander, Entwisle, and Olson (2007) analyzed the data from the Reading Comprehension subtest of the California Achievement Test (CAT-R), stating that their study of the math subset showed similar results. The research team included a total of 11 testing points (p. 169). For the first five years of the students’ schooling, Alexander et al. (2007) examined both fall and spring testing data. From this data they calculated the summative school year gain as well as the cumulative summer gain during the elementary years. However, in years 6-9 of schooling, students were only assessed in the spring, which prevented the researchers from separating gains made during the academic school year from those made, or lost, during the summer. Because of this, Alexander et al. (2007) calculated and reported the overall gains of these years.

When they looked at year nine achievement levels, the data showed that the differences in skills already existing by the time students began first grade compounded throughout elementary school. Although this seemingly minimized the impact of summer learning, Alexander et al (2007) also compared scores across the spectrum of social-economic statuses and found that nearly two-thirds of the total difference in points among students from the highest SES group and lowest SES group reflected differences in summer learning. In fact, the data implied that students in the lowest SES group actually made more gains during the school year than students in the higher SES groups but these gains were offset by distinctions in summer learning experiences.
Alexander et al. (2007) went a step further to understand the implications of such achievement differences later in students’ academic careers. The data they studied indicated that not only did the family and neighborhood environments impact achievement by ninth grade, but they also influenced success in high school and attendance in college (p. 175).

Based on their findings, Alexander et al. (2007) recommended that interventions should be targeted specifically for struggling students and be in place early in students’ academic careers to prevent the academic gap from widening. Once in school, struggling students need “year-round, supplemental programming” (p. 176). The researchers argued that while parents “generally want the same kinds of enriching experiences for their children” regardless of socioeconomic status, not all families have equal access to such experiences (e.g., Chin and Philips 2004 as cited in Alexander et al., 2007). In other words, in order to successfully improve the achievement of struggling learners, schools must not only ensure equal access to education during the school day but also increased access to activities that will enrich students outside of the academic day.

The Gap in Summer Opportunities

Findings from researchers such as Dewey et al. (2008) and Alexander et al. (2007) have indicated the need for programming that extends beyond the academic school day as a solution to the achievement gap. Because of this, scholars such as Miller (2007) have sought to define the source of difference between higher and lower achieving students by using the term opportunity gap rather than achievement gap. He argues that the term achievement gap discusses only the symptom of inequity while opportunity gap includes the rational for this inequity by including the disparity between many middle-income and lower-income students’ summer experiences. He clarified that while many peers from middle-income families often engage in camps and
programs that enrich and develop learning, most students from lower-income families do not have equal access to these opportunities. Miller described these enriching, often informal activities as the “conceptual framework and context for learning” (p. 7). He explained:

[T]hey cultivate such things as reading for pleasure and experimenting out of sheer curiosity; exploring interests and developing passions; a sense of mastery in something one cares about; and opportunities to practice and see the meaning of skills in the course of everyday life (2007, p. 7).

However, many students may not have the same access to these important summer learning opportunities. In the fall of 1999, the National Center for Education Statistics (2004) surveyed parents concerning their students’ participation in various summer activities including visiting the library, zoo, local museums, concerts, plays, and day or overnight camps. Families from the lowest socioeconomic groups reported lower participation in each of these areas in comparison to the middle and highest socioeconomic groups. Seemingly, those students who already had the advantage of higher income earning families, gained additional benefit from learning opportunities not afforded by students from lower-income families.

Ceci and Papierno (2005) likewise explored this idea by calling attention to the “Matthew Effect.” This concept, used in various fields outside of education such as psychology and economics, is based on the Biblical passage Matthew 13:12 (New International Version, 2006) which states, “Whoever has will be given more, and they will have an abundance. Whoever does not have, even what they have will be taken from them” (p. 814). Modern researchers and theorists now apply this concept to any initial advantage that tends to build across time and widen gaps (Ceci & Papierno, 2005, p. 150).
To help lessen this cumulative effect and thus narrow the gap in student achievement, many district and federal government programs alike have turned to various targeted programs that work to improve the achievement of struggling learners.

Targeting Struggling Learners

As a way to narrow and eventually close the opportunity gap, some schools have turned to before school, after school, and summer school programs (Office of Legislative Auditor [OLA], 2010). While many of these programs are funded by the state, districts and schools must often coordinate efforts to design and implement effective programs. This section will first examine relevant legislation regarding the opportunity gap as well as extended-day programming in Minnesota. Secondly, it will discuss practices in extended-day programming as a whole. Finally, it will explore the impact of summer programs on ELs.

Recent Legislation

In the 2013-2014 school year, districts across Minnesota developed their first World’s Best Workforce (WBWF) Annual Report and report summary (Minnesota Department of Education [MDE], 2015a). This report and summary stemmed from the most recent chapter of Minnesota’s educational legislation. In February of 2012, the U.S. Department of Education granted Minnesota a waiver from the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system (MDE, 2015b). Instead of continuing to enact NCLB, Minnesota designed its own local accountability system to ensure that students are “college and career ready” (MDE, How will we Measure Progress section, 2015a). While districts must use the same progress measures such as MCA scores and NAEP scores, they are able to develop their own plan to reach their goal.

Minnesota may have reason to enact such legislation as it has one of the greatest academic disparities between black students and white students in the United States (MDE
Because of this, the WBWF bill has given special attention to ensure that districts are also making gains in closing the gap not only between the performance of black students and white students but also between all ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic groups (MDE 2015a).

The WBWF bill is the latest step in a longer history of legislation aimed at helping raise overall student achievement. In 1987, Minnesota’s Legislature called for districts to provide alternative learning programs for high school students struggling in school (Office of Legislative Auditor [OLA], 2010). Later in 1990, programs and state funding were offered to elementary-aged students as well. While legislation originally limited these alternative-learning experiences to center-based schools, programming has since expanded to include extended-time opportunities such as before-school, after-school, and summer programs such as the one for which this curriculum is intended (OLA, 2010).

As Minnesota began to expand their alternative programs, it also began distinguishing between extended-time opportunities and alternative learning programs in regards to funding. Currently, programming such as EL summer programs receive partial funding through targeted services (MDE, 2015c). In order to receive this funding, the programs must meet the needs of the whole child by providing additional time for at-risk students to engage in creative ways with their peers, teachers and community rather than simply provide academic remediation (MDE, 2015c).

Recommendations for Summer Learning

Anfinson et al. (2007) placed relationships and healthy learning environments in the center of recommendations for a successful out-of-school learning experience. Miller (2007) added that summer holds a high potential to foster positive relationships among students, peers, and teachers because of the less formal atmosphere. He went on to emphasize the power in such
relationships for combating negative stereotypes and developing positive self-images.

In addition to affirming the power of relationships in successful out-of-school learning experiences, Miller (2007) also recommended an integrated approach to learning that combined the cognitive, physical, and social domains stating that such learning had been linked to better grades, improved leadership skills, and even high attendance during the academic year (p. 13). Anfinson et al. (2007) reiterated this idea of incorporating opportunities for inquiry, team building, and experiential learning. They stated that rather than mimicking the school day, effective out-of-school learning experiences complemented it. Weiss, Little, Bouffard, Deschenes, and Malone (2009) echoed this concept and encouraged program developers to create a sense of continuity between the school year, extended-day options, and even the students’ home lives.

Such continuity may be created when programs create partnerships among the schools, families, local businesses and community (Weiss et al., 2009; Anfinson et al., 2007). Weiss et al. (2009) argued that such partnerships must begin between the out-of-school program and families. They recommended consistent communication between the learning program and home as well as ongoing dialogue between students and families about homework and school activities. They emphasized that this partnership and familial involvement is especially critical for those learners most at risk of not succeeding, which includes ELs.

Importance of Summer Learning for English Learners

Over the past decade, the population of ELs has grown by 169% while the overall school population has grown only 12% (Francis, M. Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & H. Rivera, 2006, p. 3). The majority of these ELs is born in the United States and begins his or her academic career in English-only schools. Although some ELs may have a strong command of solely their native
language, others may have partial control of both their native language and English, while still others have limited control of one or the other. However, despite these linguistic differences, legislation such as the World’s Best Workforce call for schools to raise the English of ELs to the level of their English-only peers. Research demonstrates that this is an increasingly challenging task because kindergarten ELs may speak as many as 5,000 fewer English words than their English-only peers when they enter kindergarten. Furthermore, this disparity in English words naturally increases for ELs who begin school in English-only settings later in their academic careers (Lazarin, 2008, p. 5).

Perhaps the most challenging task for ELs is the development of academic language. Cummins (as cited in Ranney 2012) explained that in contrast to conversational English where meaning can be derived from gestures, facial cues, or the general context, academic English is more abstract and often requires the speaker or listener to synthesize, evaluate, or infer. Research shows that ELs can acquire the basic conversational English terms necessary to understand and produce English in a few years. However, more intensive instruction is needed to help students acquire the more complex language of academic English, which research suggests can take four to seven years to fully acquire (Lazarin, 2008, p. 7; Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000). Because of this, ELs must make more than a year’s growth in order to master the language necessary to keep up with their peers academically.

Beneficial Practices in EL Education

This section will discuss data-driven methods and theories in developing both productive and receptive language in ELs. First, this section will define and discuss academic language, and second, it will examine research-driven practices of expanding language emphasizing both oral and written language. Finally, the section will conclude with overarching recommendations for
learners of English.

**Academic Language**

As previously discussed, academic language is a high area of need for many ELs. In fact, with the development and implementation of the Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards in English Language Arts (MDE, 2010), schools and districts across Minnesota must now make language acquisition and usage a priority for all students. Because of its use throughout the various content areas, Francis et al. (2006) argued that, “Mastery of academic language is arguably the single most important determinant of academic success for individual students” (p. 7).

Cummins (1981) is recognized as the first to provide a distinction between conversational English used by students in daily interactions with peers and teachers and the more complex academic English. Leading academic language researchers, Zwiers, O’Hara and Pritchard (2014a), clarified the broad nature and complexity of academic language by stating that academic language is more than isolated vocabulary terms and instead “involves putting clauses, sentences, paragraphs, and other elements together to construct, negotiate, and communicate clear and whole academic messages” (p. 6). He argued that rather than spending too much time teaching students isolated, “watered-down” language, we should instead provide opportunities for our students to engage in complex and meaningful applications of academic language (p. 11-12).

Cummins (2000a) developed a four-quadrant framework (Figure 1) to help teachers first and foremost understand the differences in conversational and academic language and secondly to help them understand the need to scaffold instruction of academic language.
Ranney (2012) explained that within the framework, the vertical continuum moves from cognitively undemanding to cognitively demanding. This is meant to explain the difference between oral discussions of informal topics and oral or written communication on more complex academic topics. Furthermore, the horizontal axis moves from content embedded to context reduced language. Content embedded language involves face-to-face communication where physical gestures and facial expressions help decode the meaning. In contrast, context reduced language usually involves more complex written communication that rely heavily on prior knowledge and skills such as synthesis and inference (Ranney, 2012).

Cummins (2000a) described this framework as a model to help teachers understand why ELs who are able to successfully engage in social conversations with peers struggle still in academic tasks. While it may be a simplified view of language, the framework may help guide teacher instruction of academic language by providing a logical sequence to follow (Ranney, 2012). Rather than expecting students to easily transition between highly modeled and simplistic language to language that relies heavily on prior knowledge and experiences, teachers must
scaffold this transition in a manageable way. The following sections, will describe what this scaffolding could look like for all learners as well as ELs in particular for both oral and written contexts.

**Overarching Principles**

As of the 2012-2013 school year, Minnesota schools have been required to adhere to the Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards in English Language Arts, which were based on the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English Language Arts (MDE, 2010). For an EL teacher, these new standards bring both excitement and trepidation with their inclusion of language standards. On the one hand, research shows that all students benefit from direct instruction of academic language (Francis, M. Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & H. Rivera, 2006). However, the fact that ELs are now held to the same statewide standards addressing academic language as their English-only peers can be more than a little troublesome.

In striving to help ELs meet the new standards and successfully engage in classroom activities, there are several overarching principles that may hold true for ELs and native speakers alike. For example and as mentioned above, both ELs and native speakers benefit from the explicit instruction of academic language (Francis et al, 2006). Moreover, both student groups benefit from repeated exposure to such language throughout their academic careers. Such exposure should not be limited to isolated vocabulary lists, but should instead integrate complex sentences, phrases, and words in meaningful and authentic contexts (Zwiers et al., 2014a; Francis et al, 2006).

Furthermore, many of the instructional techniques and methods deemed beneficial for English-only students may also benefit ELs. For example, research indicates that all students benefit from clear objectives and collaboratively created behavioral expectations. Additionally,
ELs and native speakers both benefit from formative feedback, clear directions during introductions of new concepts and skills, set routines, and purposeful interactions with peers (Goldenberg, 2013). Likewise, students may benefit when teachers engage with them using the gradual release model. Within this model, students move from highly structured and teacher-led exposures to independent engagement with more familiar tasks (Francis et al. 2006; Scarlett, 2014; Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2010).

Although many similarities exist between the instruction of ELs and native English speakers, ELs are unique learners and teachers must therefore use some unique supports to meet their needs (Zwiers, 2014b).

Recognizing ELs as Unique Learners

Perhaps one of the most over-looked yet striking differences between ELs and English-only students, is the misunderstanding of what assets ELs bring with them upon entering school. ELs are not “blank slates”, but rather they come with diverse experiences that can and should be valued and utilized in the classroom (August & Shanahan, 2006).

An example of diverse expectations and experiences comes in the form of the possible discrepancy between a teacher’s classroom expectations and a student’s cultural expectations. When teachers use such common school-phrases as “speak up,” “use your own words,” or “stick to the point” they must be aware that not all students have had the same educational experiences that would allow them to understand these phrases (Zwiers, 2014b). While the words may make sense to the students, they may come from a cultural background in which speaking up is viewed as disrespectful or which circular reasoning is commonly used to prove a point. For such students, we must be sensitive to their hesitancy and model how to engage in such actions politely.
Understanding such linguistic and cultural differences can assist in creating an environment of mutual respect and trust. Such an environment may naturally foster better peer and teacher interactions in both oral and written contexts. Academic language is a complex task as can be seen through the models of oral and written communication that have been designed with ELs in mind. Language is “meant to bridge information gaps [and] to communicate ideas and information to others who don’t already know them” (Zwiers et al., 2014a). In this way, the goal of language is not grammatical or pragmatic perfection, but rather successful communication.

**Developing Instruction that Reflects ELs Unique Needs**

If the purpose of language is truly successful communication, instruction then should be geared not only to native speakers but to ELs as well, ensuring that all students are able to comprehend the task at some level (WIDA Consortium [WIDA], 2014a). Research has shown again and again that simply immersing students in academically language-rich environments is not enough to meet the needs of many students who are significantly behind grade-level expectations because of their English proficiency (Zwiers, 2014b; August & Shanahan, 2006). Instead, proper scaffolds should be in place in order to make the academic language or social language accessible to ELs.

One resource used by Minnesota teachers to do this is the combination of EL proficiency levels and Model Performance Indicators created by the WIDA Consortium. WIDA consists of representatives from state education departments whose purpose is to “[advance] academic language development and academic achievement for linguistically diverse students through high quality standards, assessments, research, and professional development for educators” (WIDA, 2014b). Because Minnesota is a member state, Minnesota EL teachers label a student’s language
level using one of WIDA’s six levels of proficiency moving from “Entering” to “Reaching”.

The first level, “Entering”, describes students who do not yet speak English but may or may not be proficient in another language and the final level, “Reaching”, describes students whose English is comparable to their English-only peers and have mastered the expectations of the previous five levels (WIDA, 2007). For this reason, linguistic modifications are only made for students within the first five levels because once students reach the sixth level, they are no longer in need of academic or linguistic support. WIDA describes the progression through the levels as moving from understanding and communicating concrete concepts, informal registers, general vocabulary, and single words or phrases in the “Entering” level to understanding and communicating abstract concepts, formal registers, technical vocabulary, and extended discourse in the “Reaching” level.

To help describe the goals that teachers set in helping students achieve this progress, WIDA created model performance indicators (MPIs), which act as language objectives. MPIs begin with a language function, an action verb such as sequence or classify that describes how the student will understand or use language (See Figure 2). The next part of an MPI is the example topic that specifies which academic subject the students will engage with. Then the MPI lists what supports teachers will offer students in order for them to be able to perform the language function. For students just learning English, teachers may include multiple supports such as visual aids, hands-on manipulatives, and peer support. However, for students who are more proficient in English, teachers may select just one support such as a graphic organizer. Finally, an MPI may or may not include an example of the language expected from students to meet the language objective.
Teachers can use model performance indicators to differentiate content objectives for multiple language proficiencies. They can begin with a content objective they have created for their class and then modify the language function or supports to make the objective attainable for all ELs. Figure 3 demonstrates how this can be done using what WIDA refers to as a strand of MPIs, or MPIs for the same content but different language proficiencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Entering</th>
<th>Level 2 Beginning</th>
<th>Level 3 Developing</th>
<th>Level 4 Expanding</th>
<th>Level 5 Bridging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce personal word/phrase lists from labeled pictures and check with a partner for edits and revision</td>
<td>Create phrases/short sentences from models and check with a partner for edits and revision</td>
<td>Edit and revise guided writing (e.g., for conventions and structures) based on teacher feedback</td>
<td>Edit and revise writing (e.g., using word processing or rubrics) based on class or peer reviews</td>
<td>Self-assess to edit and revise writing to produce final drafts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether done formally using WIDA’s (2007) MPI strands, or informally through the inclusion of listed supports, such modifications to content objectives can be used for ELs in all four language domains: listening, speaking, reading and writing. For the purpose of creating curriculum for the weeklong summer program, these language domains will be addressed by the overarching categories oral language and written language.
**Oral language.** Researchers have long linked early oral language experiences to early success in reading for both native English speakers and ELs alike (C. Miller, 2010; August & Shanahan, 2006; Morrow & Gambrell, 2011). Oral language provides the grammatical, pragmatic, and phonemic foundation for developing those same skills in literacy (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011). Furthermore, researchers have recently begun to acknowledge the role that oral language plays in the intermediate and secondary grades as well (Francis et al., 2006).

Fittingly, the Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards in English Language Arts adopted by all Minnesota schools during the 2012-2013 school year now includes both Speaking and Listening strands that are designed to be integrated across content areas (MDE, 2010).

In order to help ELs reach the expectations set by these new standards, researchers have been re-working older methods of instruction to fit a more diverse student population (Zwiers, 2014b; Harvey & Goudvis, 2007). One oral language support that has been receiving more attention is that of student-led discussion in both whole-class and small-group settings. Zwiers (2014b) explains a scenario he calls “pseudo discussions” in which a teacher poses a question to which they have a pre-determined answer or range of answers (p. 123). A single student responds to this question at which point the teacher responds with either positive or negative feedback before moving on to the next question. To help combat these pseudo discussions, Zwiers (2014b) maintains that teachers should use impartial feedback such as, *What evidence do you have for that?* or *Interesting...other thoughts?* that encourages students to further engage in the discussion. Harvey and Goudvis (2007), refer to such questions as authentic questions because teachers use them to discover more about what a child is thinking rather than to assess their knowledge of a topic (p. 124). Furthermore, such authentic questions encourages stacked thinking in which student interactions layer on top of each other rather than having students “[...](...)"
parroting back answers [...] or ‘spraying the room’ with unconnected ideas,” (Zwiers, 2014b, p. 126).

Throughout such whole group and small group discussions, modeling and re-establishing expectations is key. Zwiers (2014b) suggests modeling such nonverbal communications as nodding and smiling, which can help further enhance classroom discussions by creating commonly understood expectations for students. To help maintain such high quality expectations in peer interactions, he recommends recording some conversations as models. Students could then analyze these conversations and discuss factors such as the vocabulary used and how on-topic the conversation was in order to further develop their own discussion output (Zwiers et al., 2014a, pp. 125-26).

Another support for language development that has been revisited by researchers is that of sentence starters (Goldenberg, 2013; Zwiers et al., 2014a). Commonly used to help improve both oral and written communication for ELs, sentence starters act as a frame from which students can produce language. For example, a teacher may use the simple sentence starter, “I see a __________.” to help beginning English speakers create a list of items they observe in a classroom. Despite their popularity, very little research has been conducted on these methods; therefore Zwiers et al. (2014a) suggests moving beyond simple sentence starters and instead using linked sentence starters to expand thinking (pp. 130-31; Goldenberg, 2013). For example, in order to scaffold drawing conclusions, a teacher may offer the following linked sentence starter: “Evidence suggests that ______________. This conclusion is important because __________” (p. 130). Zwiers et al. suggests that teachers scaffold oral interactions with students beginning first with single sentences, then combining sentences, and finally organizing support
for their main ideas in more of a paragraph format. Such a flow of repeated oral practice can help students develop organizational skills that carry beyond their speech and into their writing.

**Written communication.** Students use their oral-language base in their writing on an almost daily basis. From phonemic spelling in the primary grades to the use of slang in the intermediate and secondary grades, students draw heavily from their knowledge of oral language to help support their developing skills as writers. However, students must discover that writing is more than speaking on paper and also more than simply a means of recording information that they have acquired. Writing provides us with an opportunity to slow down and truly think about our understanding of a given topic. Through writing, individuals not only display the information they have learned, but they also refine it (Spandel, 2005; Zwiers, 2014b). In the classroom, students can be assisted in recognizing the differences between oral communication and academic writing as well as understanding the power of writing to explore language and develop ideas.

Students in today’s schools must be ready to explore academic writing through several genres of writing including narrative texts, opinions/arguments, and informational texts beginning in the primary grades (MDE, 2010). Such writing requires students to consider overall organization, sentence structure, and word choice in addition to the new content they are learning. Incorporating authentic ways for young students to practice such organization and critical thinking is often a challenge for teachers. One powerful method recommended by Zwiers (2014b) is for students to first begin by organizing their oral language. Gibbons (2002) argues that by using strategic oral language activities we can help students create a “language bridge” between speech and formal writing (p. 42). An example of this could be the
incorporation of linked sentence starters to help students move from single-sentence responses to well-supported, oral arguments that resemble paragraphs.

This bridge between oral language practice and organized writing is especially important when considering the context for the curriculum development in this paper. Because the intended setting is a weeklong summer program, teachers will need simple activities that can quickly foster both oral and written language. One such option would be for teachers to incorporate times for students to utilize learning journals. Such an alternative to decidedly academic writing tasks provides students with a low-stress environment where they are free to explore and enjoy different language structures (Zwiers, 2014b). However, the key to fully maximizing these more informal opportunities is to provide quality teacher feedback on how to add more complex sentence structures and strengthen word choice (Goldenberg, 2013). For both informal journals and formal essays, Zwiers (2014b) recommends using student samples from previous years or other model texts at or just above students’ current language level. Teachers can lead the students in analyzing the models to teach concepts such as grammar and organization. Together, the teacher and students could create a class rubric to establish expectations regarding what language should be used and why. Such integration of student input may help motivate students and create a sense of ownership in their work, which can both be powerful forces.

By incorporating a mixture of student input, informal oral and written exercises, student samples, and scaffolded exposure to academic speech and writing, teachers can create a welcoming environment that encourages risks and enriches student language. Such an environment is key for summer programming that aligns with the school year while at the same time promotes the development of meaningful relationships (Anfinson et al., 2007). Therefore,
this study will strive to create a curriculum that not only includes beneficial EL instruction but also the district’s vision of authentic learning through thematic units of study.

Integrated Learning: Units of Study

Although an EL summer program may be rooted in an ideal to provide ELs with as many language-rich experiences as possible, it should still connect to the academic school year (Anfinson et al., 2007). This section will begin by briefly discussing the historical development of units of study, which will be used in the creation of curriculum for the EL summer program. Then, the section will discuss research regarding the effectiveness of such thematic learning opportunities in order to find an answer to: How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?

Units of Study

Creating authentic, integrated environments for learning is not a new concept, as such teaching finds its roots in Constructivism and can be seen through the work of theorists and researchers such as Dewey, Daniels, Zemelman, Goodman, and Smith (Tracey & Morrow, 2012; Daniels & Zemelman, 2004). One of America’s first constructivists was John Dewey (1859-1952) whose beliefs towards education later became known as inquiry learning. Similar to the mindset behind the World’s Best Workforce legislation, Dewey believed that the goal of education was to create successful, contributing members of society (Tracey & Morrow, 2012, p. 59). To do this, Dewey maintained that learning should be student-centered, collaborative and incorporate a problem-based approach to learning. This approach called for teachers to pose a real-world problem to students who would then work together with the teacher to research and develop solutions to the problem. In line with constructivist thinking, Dewey believed that while
the teacher must create a supportive, engaging classroom environment, the students themselves were ultimately responsible for their own learning (Tracey & Morrow, 2012).

Current constructivist researchers such as Daniels and Zemelman (2004) have built upon Dewey’s practices and have added the opportunity for student choice which research suggests may have positive benefits for student learning. Student choice can begin as early in the unit as student-created questions or student-posed problems. As the unit continues, students are often given options regarding research tasks and presentation formats to demonstrate their learning. Furthermore, the teacher’s role is defined as a “facilitator” who can help provide sufficient background knowledge or guide students toward quality research materials (Daniels & Zemelman, 2004).

A fourth constructivist thinker, Kenneth Goodman, took a different approach to understanding learning and developed the Psycholinguistic Theory of reading (Tracey & Morrow, 2012, p. 68). In explaining how students develop literacy, Goodman argued that students develop various oral language cues, which they then incorporate into their reading. Because of this interplay between oral and written language, psycholinguists believe that reading should be viewed in light of the broader linguistic process. In practice, the Psycholinguistic Theory incorporates authentic reading materials written in natural language as opposed “phonetically constrained language” contrived for beginning readers (Tracey & Morrow, 2012, p. 69). Researchers argue for this stating that because reading is part of a language process, it should closely resemble authentic and spoken communication.

One constructivist researcher, Frank Smith, used the role of language in the Psycholinguistic Theory as a foundation for his own theory, which is now referred to as Whole Language Theory (Tracey & Morrow, 2012, p. 70). This theory proposes that listening,
speaking, reading, and writing are interconnected and that reading skills are developed when students are immersed in literacy-rich environments. Similar to the practices of the Psycholinguist Theory, classrooms following the Whole Language Theory avoid overly simplified reading materials and instead incorporate quality children’s literature, which is then used as a basis for learning throughout the content areas. Such practices have resulted in the development of thematic instruction or units of study. Units of study typically span approximately six weeks and can be organized around a particular author, literacy genre, or content-area topic (Guthrie, 2011; Tracey & Morrow, 2012).

While early constructivists began their work in the 1920s, Constructivism remains a powerful force within some schools as can be seen in the implementation of thematic units of study (Tracey & Morrow, 2012). The following section will discuss the potential benefits of such thematic learning.

**Benefits of Thematic Learning**

Proponents of units of study list numerous advantages for learners. For instance, because thematic units are grounded in work relevant to the real world, research has found that students are better able to build connections between subjects, engage in higher order thinking, and more easily transfer knowledge across content areas when engaged in thematic units. Furthermore, research also indicated that students engaging in thematic units have increased rates of learning and motivation (Ronau & Karp, 2001; Cunningham, 2010; Hale, 2010; Hayes, 2010; Fogarty & Stoehr, 2008).

Ronau & Karp’s 2001 study explored environmental issues through a thematic unit, integrating literacy, science, and math. The unit began with a humorous read-aloud text that helped students understand the problem of littering. Students then worked in groups to predict
what sort of garbage would be found around their own school before working together to clean up garbage from the school’s property. Using graphic calculators and manipulatives, students summarized their findings using bar graphs, circle graphs, and strip graphs. The students then used these graphs to represent their findings in terms of fractions and percentages. Finally, they developed a data-supported campaign against litter in their school.

Ronau and Karp (2001) concluded that such learning encouraged students to encounter new perspectives and develop problem-solving skills. Furthermore, students were better able to understand the real-world applications of environmental science and the mathematical topics they explored. Fogarty and Stoehr (2008) extended this concept of cross-subject integration by equating thematic learning to “highly visible, all-encompassing umbrellas for curriculum and instruction” (p. 90). They stated that learning could become more meaningful and purposeful when students were able to see the connection between their classroom learning and daily lives.

In addition to creating a more holistic approach to learning, units of study have been found to also increase student learning and motivation. One such example can be found in the work of Hale (2010) and Cunningham (2010), who collaborated on a study to find the advantages of thematic learning on various aspects of literacy. Working in a co-taught model, Hale, whose background was in speech pathology, and Cunningham, whose background was in reading and education, integrated a social studies unit of study in a pull out setting. The pair met with first graders from seven different classrooms who struggled with reading. They met two hours each day for ten weeks and integrated reading, writing, and social studies through a unit discussing various forms of shelter. The pair taught students about five forms of shelter: tepees, igloos, castles, adobes, and log cabins (Hale 2010; Cunningham 2010).
While working as a team, Hale and Cunningham dedicated their research to different aspects of student learning. Cunningham (2010) concentrated her research on the acquisition and retention of vocabulary terms, increases in reading levels, and quality of writing. According to her research, the students participating in the thematic units made measurable gains when compared to students taught using more traditional, isolated techniques. In contrast, Hale (2010) specifically focused her research on the impact of thematic units on expressive and receptive oral language as well as written vocabulary instruction. Similar to Cunningham (2010), Hale (2010) found that the students engaged in the thematic units showed statistically significant increases in each of the three designated areas of research when compared to their peers engaged in isolated instructional techniques.

Furthermore, the team documented student and fellow teacher comments, behavior, and engagement during the thematic unit. They found that students were greatly motivated by this holistic style of learning and that their colleagues had highly positive feelings towards it as well. Such findings aligned with other educational researchers’ beliefs about such collaborative, student-centered, and authentic methods of instruction (Guthrie, 2011; Hayes, 2010).

A final proponent of this holistic style of instruction can be found in the work of Mike Schmoker (2011). While he never directly mentioned thematic learning in his book, Focus, he argued throughout the text that the heart of teaching is literacy and that students must learn to communicate clearly and think critically. Therefore, much of his book is dedicated to integrating authentic literacy into the various content areas. He argued that by critically discussing, writing, and reading about the content areas, students would develop the necessary skills to achieve success both in school and after school. Such beliefs combine the theories and practices of
Constructivism, the Psycholinguistic Theory, and Whole Language Theory into a concrete framework of instruction that could be applied to any classroom.

Summary

This review began by analyzing how the educational setting for an EL summer program currently influenced the program as well as how the setting could shape the program’s enhancement in the future. The summer can be an opportunity for great learning or of great learning loss depending on what is done during that time. To help optimize that learning time, many schools and districts have turned to summer programs. The second section of this review carefully examined the legislation behind such programming. Several programming suggestions were considered including the theory that a summer program should not mimic the school year, but complement it (Anfinson et al., 2007). Because ELs take additional time to acquire academic language, summer exposure to academic practices similar to those that take place during the school year would benefit these students in particular.

The third section reviewed alternative methods to accelerating ELs acquisition of academic language including the use of nonverbal discussion models and linked sentence starters. The final section analyzed how to best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for ELs. It explored how thematic units of study can be used to develop inquiry-based learning, critical thinking skills, connections among the content areas, as well as increased student achievement and motivation.

The next chapter will discuss the methods for developing curriculum that answers the question: How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners? It will begin by discussing backward design, inquiry learning, and the SIOP Model as the frameworks for curriculum development. It will
then discuss the setting that the curriculum will be used in and the participants who will engage with it. Furthermore, it will explain both the research and curriculum elements used to develop the lessons. Finally, it will discuss plans for implementing the curriculum in the future as well as ethical considerations for the research and curriculum design method.
CHAPTER THREE

Overview

In order to answer the question *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners*, the design drew from current research and curriculum design philosophies to create lessons that met the needs of the students. This chapter begins by describing the design methods selected to develop the curriculum, and then defines the proposed setting that the curriculum was used in as well as the participants that engaged with the curriculum. Next it articulates the research elements by explaining the selected method, mixed method approach, and the tool that was used for collecting data. The chapter then explains the critical curriculum elements used, which were derived from both the state standards as well as the selected curriculum frameworks. After explaining the plan to implement this curriculum, the chapter closes by discussing the ethical considerations that were made throughout this research and design process.

To begin, three foundational and interconnecting design methods were selected to develop a curriculum that combined the benefits of authentic literacy with those of EL-targeted instruction: backward design (Wiggins & McTighe 2005), an inquiry-based model (Harvey & Daniels, 2009), and the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol Model (Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2010). These frameworks helped in designing an engaging curriculum that answers the question, *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?*
Curriculum Framework

Backward Design

Forming the base of the curriculum was the “backward design” approach proposed by Wiggins and McTighe (2005). The basic structure of this approach is organized into three stages in which teachers must determine the desired results, identify what evidence is necessary to show results, and plan instruction that will help students reach the results.

Backward design was grounded in the mindset that curriculum is most effective when instruction and learning activities are aligned and serve a strategic purpose (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). To begin, teachers must prioritize learning outcomes, determine what is most necessary for students to understand and internalize, plan essential questions, establish over-arching goals, and determine what students will be able to understand or do as a result of the teaching. Then, teachers plan how they will assess students in order to identify evidence of learning. During this stage, teachers determine which assessment methods align with their goals as well as the criteria by which students will be assessed. The final stage of the backward design has teachers plan purposeful learning experiences that will help students achieve the desired goal. Within this final stage, teachers use their essential questions and assessment plans to help focus their planning and differentiate instruction. Incorporating backward design as the basis of the curriculum helps to ensure a strong purposefulness in the program as it combines with inquiry-based learning.

Inquiry

Layering on top of the backward design plan, the curriculum also followed the inquiry mini-research model of instruction as laid out by Harvey and Daniels (2009). In this way, the lessons created a sense of continuity between the school-year classroom and
the summer program because the district itself has begun to incorporate such learning across the elementary and middle school grade levels. In describing the foundation of inquiry design, Wilhelm (2007) advocated using the backward design format of identifying an essential question, determining the final project, and developing classroom activities. He encouraged teachers to develop these essential questions by turning state standards into questions. These over-arching questions then help guide student-directed inquiry and ensure that their activities are aligned with standards.

Following this blended method of inquiry and backward design, students begin to outline their intended inquiry projects, which allows them to pursue answers to questions while at the same time aligning these questions purposefully to ultimately meet the content standards. Although inquiry units of study typically span six weeks, the target summer program lasts only one week. With this in mind, Harvey and Daniels’ (2009) extended mini-inquiry framework was incorporated because it condenses longer inquiry projects while still maintaining the fundamental facets of inquiry (pp. 144 & 154).

Harvey and Daniels (2009) named these four facets immerse, investigate, coalesce, and go public (p. 144). Within the immerse stage, teachers incorporate related materials and resources that align with their focus question. They model curricular inquiry through think-alouds, invite student questions, and help guide students in forming small-groups based on interests. Students begin building background knowledge about the topic, begin asking questions, and meet with their groups to set goals and expectations.

During the second stage, investigate, the teacher brings in resources to help students answer the questions, models note-taking, and guides student discussion of an essential question. Students continue to develop their own questions or clarify the established
question, start researching answers, and share learning with their group members. Within the *coalesce* stage, the teacher models synthesizing, evaluating and organizing information to connect to the broader, essential question. At this point, students start targeting key ideas and information about the questions, evaluate the reliability of the sources and continue meeting with their groups to share and refine learning. In the final stage, teachers and students could work together to create rubrics for the final project, and teachers guide students in sharing their knowledge and reflecting on broader implications of the research. In turn, students have an opportunity to become the teachers themselves as they teach their peers about a topic and reflect on their learning and cooperation.

Reflecting on these stages, it is easy to see how such learning often takes place over an extended period of time. However, by providing students with exposure to such learning during a weeklong program, they were able to at least get a taste of what is expected in the classroom during the school year. Therefore, the curriculum incorporated each of the inquiry facets in an abbreviated form. Students were immersed in mentor texts, introduced to an essential question which guided the learning of the lesson, had an opportunity to synthesize the information, and finally share out their learning to a partner, the whole group, or their families. Furthermore, it helped meet the needs of the students by recognizing their unique challenges and potential as ELs. Because of this, lessons also included elements from the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model (Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2010).

**SIOP Model**

Originally intended for secondary students, the SIOP Model was designed with the theoretical basis that interaction, relevancy, and meaningful use all enhance the process of
language acquisition and has since been adapted to meet the needs of elementary students as well (Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2010). The SIOP model of instruction has thirty features; however, this particular curriculum framework will focus on six key features: content objectives, language objectives, appropriate content concepts, supplementary materials, adaptation of content, and meaningful activities.

While similar to inquiry learning, developers of the SIOP Model distinguished key elements believed to be critical in helping ELs to be successful. The overarching structure of the SIOP Model follows the principles of backward design in that it moves from goals to activities; however, in this model, there are both content and language objectives, which are displayed and shared with students. By displaying and sharing objectives with students, Echevarría et al. (2010) believed that teachers will not only clarify their own goals but that students will be able to see the direction and purpose of their learning. Furthermore, language objectives are included with content objectives to give the same sense of purposefulness to the instruction of academic language that is given to subject area content.

In addition to creating and displaying content and language objectives, the SIOP Model also extends inquiry learning in its approach to learning materials and instruction. While both methods of instruction are student-based and rely on meaningful activities, the SIOP Model recognizes the role of language acquisition in EL’s learning. Therefore, it requires teachers to consider the content concepts, supplementary materials, and general activities in light of the students’ language proficiency. In addition to supplying adapted resource materials, Echevarría et al. (2010) encouraged teachers to use supplements such as pictures, hands-on manipulatives, and modeling to support learning. In this way, the
SIOP model echoes the format of WIDA’s model performance indicators in a slightly condensed fashion (WIDA, 2007). Through the combination of these features, students are able to engage in relevant activities that integrate content and language in meaningful ways.

The lessons in this curriculum combined the strategies of classroom literacy and language acquisition, by selecting three foundational and interconnecting design methods: backward design, an inquiry-based model, and the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol Model. Through these frameworks, steps were made towards creating an engaging curriculum that answers the question, *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?*

**Setting**

The completed curriculum will be used in a summer program for elementary ELs developed by a large, suburban district in the upper Midwest. The weeklong program takes place shortly after the start of summer vacation and is offered to all ELs who are not already invited to the district’s enrichment camps. The students come from 18 elementary schools with highly varied demographics. While growing across the district, the percentage of ELs at each elementary school ranges from approximately 4% to over 20%. Additionally, the percentage of students who receive free and reduced lunch at each school is even more varied, ranging from 8% to 51%. During the summer program itself, approximately half of the attending ELs receive free and reduced lunches.

Both because of the district’s growing number of ELs and its increasing popularity among students, the EL summer program is growing. For the 2015 program, the committee invited 502 students to attend the camp and of the 323 students who said they
would attend 294 regularly attended. To help meet the needs of these learners, no more than 30 students were placed together in a “home group”. These home groups acted as the students’ classroom; therefore the students stayed with their home group each day and attended activities with the other students in their home group. Each home group worked with two licensed teachers and one high school counselor. The high school counselors were interviewed and hired by the lead program coordinators and were primarily bilingual or multilingual speakers.

In the past, the program committee designed the program to have a camp-like atmosphere that emphasized teamwork, active engagement, and camaraderie among the students. The schedules were highly planned and often included several offsite field trips, lessons led onsite by community experts on topics relevant to the year’s theme, community building activities, and teacher-created lessons aligned with these hands-on experiences. Although the addition of this curriculum to the program will help better align it to the academic school year, the above components of the program will not be changed.

Participants

Teachers

The collected data was from purposefully selected participants: the teachers of the 2015 summer program. To help guide the development of the curriculum, each teacher was given a needs assessment after the program ended in order to aid in the new curriculum’s design. During 2015, there were 18 teachers in the program, and while ten were district EL teachers, there were also six classroom teachers and two resource teachers from the district. Thirteen of the teachers were white females, four of the teachers were white males and one of the teachers was an African American female.
All eighteen teachers from the 2015 program year had the opportunity to participate in this research and provide feedback concerning that year’s program. Of the eighteen teachers, ten agreed to participate. The feedback included in this survey is from two white male teachers and eight white female teachers. Of the ten teachers, one male and one female teacher were also on the planning committee for the program. Although there were a limited number of participants, the teachers’ backgrounds were a fairly accurate cross-section of all eighteen teachers in that two were resource teachers, three were classroom teachers, and five were EL teachers during the school year.

Students

The students who engaged in the designed curriculum were elementary ELs from the district. The program invited most ELs who currently receive EL support and who were entering third, fourth or fifth grade. Due to transportation logistics, the program was offered during the same week as a district-wide enrichment program for students who demonstrate potential for the Gifted and Talented program. In order not to take away from this enrichment program, ELs who were invited to that program were not invited to this summer program.

Research Elements

In order to ensure that the curriculum was developed based on the input of teachers actively involved in the program, a simple, mixed methods approach was used for the initial research in the form of a needs assessment survey. The richness of the teachers’ collective knowledge, experiences, and perspectives was drawn upon to help guide the curriculum planning process. In this way, multiple teachers had input in answering the question, How
can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?

Research Paradigm

Mixed methods procedures are an approach to research that combines the open-ended prompts from qualitative research with the closed-ended data of quantitative research (Creswell, 2014). Researchers use this approach when the combined power of qualitative and quantitative offers a more complete view of the research question than either approach used alone. Within the context of this specific research question, the numerical data that quantitative approaches offer represents what the majority of teachers believed about the current program and curriculum. At the same time, the anecdotal data and explanations that came through qualitative approaches helped provide a fuller picture of the numerical data. Therefore, a mixed methods approach fit the research needs best.

While there are several varieties of mixed methods approaches, the approach used in this study is referred to as “embedded mixed methods” (Creswell, 2014, p.221). This approach allowed the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data simultaneously. Because understanding the teachers’ views within the context of the summer program was important to incorporating their perspectives within the curriculum, the embedded mixed methods design was the most relevant form of data collection (p. 231). In order to collect the data, a needs assessment was designed for this particular group of teachers.

Needs Assessment Design

The needs assessment was intended to provide important feedback while taking as little time out of the teachers’ already busy schedules as possible. The needs assessment had thirty questions and was divided into four sections: participant background,
curriculum design, program design, and student engagement. At the end of the final three sections, teachers were encouraged to write comments explaining a rating or providing additional feedback on an area not addressed in the survey. Of the thirty questions, twenty-five used a one-to-six Likert Scale to gather feedback (see blank form in Appendix A). While the Likert Scale typically includes a one-to-five continuum, a one-to-six continuum was chosen to avoid teachers overusing the middle rating of three (Vogt & Shearer, 2011). Of the remaining five questions, two were short answer and three were multiple-choice. In this way, the data collected was focused while still providing opportunities for teachers to voice concerns, recommendations or praise.

Analyzing the Data

The needs assessment was sent to teachers using a Google Form. This template was thought to be the simplest to retrieve data because the survey could be completed electronically and the results submitted instantly. Although the participants were asked to provide their name to ensure that each form was received, the data was automatically compiled into a spreadsheet where the participant’s names were removed before the data was reviewed. The Likert Scale and multiple-choice data were then compiled into graphs and the short answer data was copied in a simple bullet-point format. These graphs and bullet-point responses were then examined to determine overall teacher satisfaction and input.

Curriculum Elements

The goal of the above research was to answer the question: How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners? To help meet this goal, program and curriculum research was combined
with the teachers’ input to create a week’s worth of lessons that teachers can use as a
“menu” for their teaching, selecting only that which best fits the needs of their current
students. Each lesson included: essential questions, standards, overview, language/content
objectives, modifications, key vocabulary, mentor texts/online resources, needed materials,
share out possibilities, group work/partner options, and journaling opportunities.

Aligning Essential Questions with the Standards

Research indicates that the most successful out-of-school learning programs create
continuity between the school year and the program (Anfinson et al. 2007). In order to
create such continuity between the school year and the summer program, the lessons were
aligned to state standards in the form of one or more essential questions because
curriculum structures such as inquiry learning and backward design state that essential
questions are most effective and relevant when derived from state standards (Wilhelm,
2007; Harvey & Daniels 2009). Therefore, the Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards in
Science, the National Health Education Standards and Minnesota Benchmarks, and the
Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards in English Language Arts were used as the basis for
the essential questions. In particular, the College and Career Anchor Standards for
Speaking, Viewing, Listening, and Media Literacy as well as the anchor standards for
Writing and finally Language were used (MDE, 2010). These anchor standards formed the
foundation for planning and were integrated with the grade-level standards for science and
health. Furthermore, the English Language Development Standards and Model
Performance Indicators developed by WIDA were incorporated throughout the lessons to
ensure they were accessible to all ELs in the program. In order to select the most relevant
content standards, several of Wilhelm’s (2007) criteria for composing guiding questions
were considered: each standard got at the “heart of the discipline” (p. 44), it was relevant to
student interests and needs, it lent itself to further questions, and it was both debatable
and concise. This process created essential questions that helped answer the question:

*How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based
summer program for English Learners?*

**Additional Curriculum Elements**

In addition to developing standards-based essential questions, the curriculum included other elements grounded in the SIOP Model of instruction (Echevarría et al. 2010). Each lesson incorporated both content and language objectives, which allowed teachers to intentionally address both the lesson content and student language. Likewise, the “Modifications” section allowed teachers to draw on WIDA’s model performance indicators to modify the objectives using various supports. Also derived from the SIOP Model of instruction, lesson plans included key vocabulary terms necessary to understanding the topics. Although a separate feature in the SIOP Model, the identification and instruction of key vocabulary aligns with the SIOP principle of ensuring that the lesson activities are developed with the students’ language proficiency in mind. Graves and Fitzgerald (as cited in Echevarría et al. 2010) stated that vocabulary instruction is necessary for ELs due to the complexity of content area texts and the need to accelerate language acquisition (see also Zweirs 2014a and Zweirs 2014b). While using content objectives, language objectives, and key vocabulary in lessons could certainly benefit students, there are additional features derived from inquiry learning that may also help ELs.
In addition to incorporating lesson elements from the SIOP Model, the curriculum also integrated features present in inquiry learning (Harvey & Daniels, 2009). Before students can begin pursuing research or even developing questions, the inquiry model encourages teachers to help students develop background knowledge. During the school year in this particular district, each teacher is provided with a set of carefully selected mentor texts to help activate prior knowledge in students and launch their various units of study. To again encourage continuity between the school year and the summer program, the new curriculum included mentor texts to help teachers launch and extend their lesson. Additionally, teachers received a list of additional resources such as website and video links that they can use to supplement and guide student research (Echevarría et al., 2010).

Following the inquiry model which includes an opportunity for students to “go public” (Harvey & Daniels, 2009, p. 168) with their research, the lessons also specified a list of possibilities for sharing out that teachers can use to help students think of ideas for demonstrating their research results. Furthermore, because student interaction is critical for the process of language acquisition, the curriculum provided teachers with a list of ideas to support peer interaction and small group work (Echevarría et al. 2010). Finally, lessons also included a list of materials that students will need to have in order to engage in the various activities and interactions. By combining all of these elements, the developed curriculum began to answer the question, How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?

Future Implementation Process

Because the summer program is only five days long and takes place in June, the planning team used the 2015 program year to pilot the framework of the units of study
based on that year’s theme of environmental awareness. For the purpose of this study, teacher input was gathered regarding the format of lessons. This updated and modified curriculum framework helped to create new lessons based on the 2016 theme of health and fitness. During the 2015-2016 school year, other members of the planning committee gave input on the curriculum plan and then used the framework and resources as a basis to plan activities and field trips. Because availability of community volunteers and field trip sites change from year to year, the team modified any lessons based on updated contacts and events. Finally, the committee implemented the curriculum during the 2016 program year, and will once again request teacher-feedback regarding the lesson plan format during the 2016 school year.

Ethical Considerations

This study took numerous actions to ensure that the research met the highest levels of ethics and that the participants’ privacy was maintained. First, the researcher obtained permission to conduct research from the program coordinators and administrators in the district as well as permission from the Human Subject Committee at Hamline University. Second, all of the participants reviewed the research objectives before providing permission for their responses to be used in this project (see black form in Appendix B). Furthermore, participant anonymity was maintained throughout the process through the use of pseudonyms for the participants where they are referenced individually. The forms were collected through Google Forms and the names removed from the consolidated data sheet to maintain confidentiality, thus participation in the survey caused no risk to the participants. Finally, participants were notified that they could withdraw their responses from the project at any time without any negative consequences.
Summary

This chapter presented the methods that were used in order to answer the question: How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners? It began by describing backward design, inquiry learning, and the SIOP Model, which acted as frameworks to guide the development of the curriculum. Then, it described the proposed setting for the curriculum as well as the participants that will engage with the curriculum. Next, it described the research elements and critical curriculum elements before explaining the plan to implement this curriculum. Finally, the chapter shared the ethical considerations that the researcher made throughout this research and design process. The following chapter will present the findings of the research as well as the curriculum itself.
CHAPTER FOUR

Overview

This chapter begins by reviewing both the curriculum’s context and the needs assessment before discussing how the information from the assessment shaped the curriculum’s lessons. The chapter will conclude by specifically examining each of the lessons to address which standards the capstone covered and how the specific activities relate to state standards as well as language development. The final section will also discuss the components that will make this curriculum effective in answering the research question: *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?*

Curriculum Context

The curriculum in this Capstone is unique in multiple ways. To begin, the curriculum was intended for a summer program specifically designed for ELs that values authentic, hands-on learning over classroom lectures. For this reason, the planning committee designed the program to have a camp-like atmosphere that emphasizes teamwork, active engagement, and camaraderie among the students. Due to the large size of the district in which the program takes place, the program invites only ELs in third, fourth, and fifth grade further narrowing the intended focus of the curriculum.

In addition to the narrowly selected target participants, this curriculum is also unique in its design and format. First, teachers need only a week to administer the curriculum and yet are able to meet a substantial number of both state and national standards. This is a key component of the curriculum because the intended program takes place within one week. Furthermore, the format of the curriculum can be flexible in how
teachers choose to administer it. While all of the lessons address the theme of health and wellness, they were designed to accompany the various field trips and special guests rather than building on one another. This is another important component of the program because not all of the students will hear the same guest speakers, so the teachers needed to be able to select the lessons most relevant to their schedules without being concerned about missing a component in another lesson. To ensure that considerations such as these were taken into account during the curriculum development process, it was important to collect input from as many teachers as possible using a needs assessment.

Needs Assessment Overview and Analysis

This section will begin by providing general observations of the needs assessment and feedback. It will then follow the format of the needs assessment by examining the background of the participants who took the needs assessment before analyzing the feedback that the various teachers provided. Furthermore, it will discuss how feedback from the instructional design, program design, and student engagement and learning sections impacted the lesson plan template.

General Overview

As discussed in chapter three, the needs assessment had thirty questions and was divided into four sections: participant background, curriculum design, program design, and student engagement with an opportunity for comments at the end of the final three sections. All questions concerned the 2015 program year specifically, during which, the summer program piloted a new lesson plan format that was loosely based on the district’s units of study. The planning team used the existing program theme of environment and sought to find ways to tie it to the curriculum taught during the school year. The team
collected texts used by classroom teachers during the school year that supported the theme and then built upon them using more hands-on activities and online resources.

Overall, teachers gave positive feedback about this model. In each of the twenty-five Likert Scale questions, the majority of responses were in the top two categories indicating a high level of satisfaction with the program. This is an important observation because 2015 was the first year that incorporated the units of study lesson format in the otherwise experience-based program. The following sections will provide an analysis of the instructional design section, the program design section, and the student engagement and learning section. Because the goal of this study is to answer the question, *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?*, the majority of the focus will be placed on the instructional design segment. However, because the instruction should be viewed from the perspective of the program as a whole, the sections on program design and student engagement and learning will be addressed briefly as well. For the purpose of the remaining sections, the same one-to-six Likert Scale was used for all scale questions with a one indicating “Strongly Disagree” and a six indicating “Strongly Agree”.

### Instructional Design

The instructional design section of the survey was designed to provide feedback on the lesson plan format and overall lesson content (see Appendix C for a blank 2015 lesson template and Appendix D for a blank 2016 lesson template). When asked if the lesson plans were easy to follow 50% of the participants responded with the highest mark indicating “Strongly Agree”, 6, and 50% responded with a 5. Furthermore when asked if the lessons provided sufficient guidance, 60% responded with a 6 and 40% responded with
a 5. Because of the positive feedback, the 2016 lesson plans have a format similar to those used in 2015. However, the layout of the template was changed in order to condense the information into fewer pages and make it easier for teachers to find the various sections. Furthermore, the 2016 template includes the categories “Overview” and “Standards” which were not included in the 2015 template. The “Overview” section was added in response to one teacher’s comment in the “Instructional Design Comments” section regarding how it was beneficial to go over the lessons as a group on the program’s training day. Because some teachers were not able to be there for the full training day, the “Overview” section allows them a general guideline to administering the lessons.

Wilhelm (2007) encourages teachers to use state standards to form essential questions that guide the lesson; therefore the “Standards” section was added so that teachers could easily see how the lessons aligned with state standards and school-year instruction. Because teachers will have access to the standards they can better understand how the essential questions relate to the state requirements in the different content areas and ensure that their teaching focuses on the most important features.

The statement that received the most varied feedback in the instructional design section, dealt with the level of teacher choice and creativity that the lesson plans provided. While 80% of participants responded with either a 5 or a 6, 10% responded with a 4 and the remaining 10% with a 3. This feedback resulted in at least two options being provided in the lessons for “Share Out” and “Journaling Opportunities” sections. Furthermore, because the internet resources received very positive feedback with responses in the 5 or 6 range, more internet resources were provided in each lesson plan for 2016 when compared to 2015. Likewise, because 10% of participants indicated a 4 when asked about access to
materials and mentor texts, a new system for checking-out materials was implemented in 2016. Teachers were able to choose from several mentor texts this year rather than given a set text for each lesson, and the planning team organized the hands-on manipulatives into packets that the teachers could check out at designated times to help provide better access for teachers.

The final four statements in the instructional design section dealt with how the lesson plans met the language needs of the students. While the majority of teachers felt that the writing, speaking, and listening needs were met in the lessons, 40% of teachers responded with a 4 when asked if the lessons met the students’ reading needs. To help address this issue, more time was provided for students to reread journal entries with a partner or small group. In this way, students were provided extra reading practice without the need to bring in a large number of texts for the students.

Although the instructional design is critical in this study, the guiding question of *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?* also must take into consideration the overall program design.

**Program Design**

Although it is important to provide additional time for ELs to engage with academic language through curriculum similar to the school-year, research indicates that experiences such as educational field trips and organized extracurricular activities during the summer can also positively impact academic achievement (Alexander et al., 2007; B. Miller, 2007; MDE, 2015c; Larzarín, 2008). Therefore, in designing the lesson plans for this program, it was important that each lesson not only tie to the state standards but to the
scheduled daily activities as well. For this reason, the 2016 curriculum maintained the “Theme of the Day” section from the 2015 template and simply renamed it “Activities”.

To begin the program design section, the needs assessment asked participants if the program fulfilled its mission statement: engaging English Learners through experiences that enhance year-round learning. Because this question necessitated an expanded response, participants were given space in which to provide a rationale. Each participant affirmed the fact that the program met its mission and provided comments that significantly impacted the design of the 2016 curriculum. For example, one resource teacher who taught in the program stated,

“[The program] gave our students rich experiences they otherwise would not have been exposed to [...]. The skills we worked on in our week together align with the expectations of our literacy framework. Some of these included listening to mini lessons, interacting in managed independent learning, and speaking and listening during sharing” (Participant B, 2016).

While a few lessons in 2015 incorporated a workshop model of instruction consisting of a mini lesson, guided practice, and a share out, the goal for 2016 was to include this model in each of the lessons by including the mini lesson and guided practice within the “Overview” section and the opportunities to share learning within the “Share Out” section. By integrating the workshop model of instruction for at least one fifty-minute block per day into an otherwise experience-based schedule, the goal was to complement the school-year rather than recreate it (Anfinson et al. 2007). Further complementing the school-year and honoring the unique needs of ELs, the curriculum ensures a maintained focus on language development in addition to school-year content with the inclusion of
both Content and Language objectives in addition to “Key Vocabulary” in each lesson.

Likewise, the “Modifications” section allows teachers to differentiate content for students who are just beginning to learn English or who would benefit from additional supports.

Perhaps the most telling comments came from classroom teachers and EL teachers who noted that students continued to draw from the experiences and lessons in the summer program throughout the next school year (e.g., Participants D, F, H, & I, 2016). Because several of the lessons and experiences aligned with specific curriculum taught during the school year, students were able to easily make connections because of the prior knowledge developed in the program.

Overall, teachers indicated that the program as a whole was well developed with sufficient time for teacher planning and that the field trips aligned with the program’s theme. However, when asked about the time students had to collaborate and write, teachers had varied responses. When asked if students had time to collaborate, 50% responded with a 5 but 30% responded with a 4 or lower. Participant B (2016) commented that there was more time to collaborate last year and that because students were unable to have sufficient time in 2015, a major project for the week seemed rushed. With this in mind, there were fewer experiences scheduled throughout the week in 2016 to allow time for not only the accompanying lessons but also time for students to collaborate on activities and lesson modifications provided within the “Group Work/Partner Options” section of the lesson plans.

In addition to student collaboration, the second area of discrepancy among teachers regarded student writing. When asked if students had sufficient time to write, 20% responded with a 6, 50% with a 5, and 30% of teachers responded with a 4, indicating a
need to review this area. Participant B (2016) commented, “I don’t think my students had enough time to write, yet they wrote at least three times per day. I just always feel like we could do more.” To address this issue, the 2016 lesson plans included at least two options for writing during each lesson within the “Journaling Opportunities” section.

While teachers’ feedback indicated that the program design lends itself to student learning, the final section of the needs assessment sought to find if the goal of student learning actually occurred.

**Student Engagement and Learning**

Although the planning committee for the summer program sought to create a balance between formal lesson plans and informal field trips and experiences, it was important to determine if students remained engaged throughout the week. When asked if students were motivated to come and if they were engaged during the formal lessons, all of the participants agreed. Interestingly, teachers indicated that students were actually less engaged on the two field trips. When asked if the students were engaged while at a local park 40% responded with a 4 or lower and when asked if the students were engaged at a local arboretum, 30% responded with a 4 of lower. The feedback indicated that the times during which students were most engaged were actually times when they were able to learn at the host site of the program. Because the goal of the program is to offer experiences to students as a means to engage them and further their language development, the committee decided to keep students on-site during the 2016 program year.

In addition to engaging students through lesson plans and field trips, the summer program sought to engage students through relationships with peers and high school
counselors. On the needs assessment, teachers overwhelmingly indicated that students demonstrated positive peer relationships with only one teacher indicating a 3. The teacher explained that there was difficulty with student behavior on the field trips, and so to help foster a team atmosphere in the program a lesson was created for the 2016 year that emphasizes positive affirmation.

Research suggests that partnerships with community members can have a positive impact on student achievement (Weiss et al., 2009). Because the majority of teachers for the summer program are white females, the program committee believed it was important for students to see themselves in the high school counselors and therefore sought students of color who spoke other languages to be in leadership positions during the camp. Overall, the needs assessment indicated that teachers thought that this strategy benefited students. However, 20% responded with a 4, which seems to indicate a need for review as to why teachers felt that way and if more training for the high school counselors is needed.

In addition to student engagement, the final section of the needs assessment asked about student learning. Due to the experience-based nature of the summer program, measuring student learning was a challenge. The needs assessment relied upon anecdotal evidence to understand if students learned throughout the program. When asked to provide evidence to show that students had learned Participant H (2016) stated, “I had a student’s parent who told me about how for that entire summer after [name of program], he was explaining to her everything he had learned about bees.” Furthermore, Participant B (2016) emphasized not only the academic learning that students demonstrated during the program but also the social learning that occurred:
They were engaged in the tasks whether it was individual or group and whether it was hands-on or another activity. Student who had "no voice" on day one, left on day five having made new friendships and speaking, laughing and listening to each other. During sharing, student[s] were able to share details of what they learned from field trips, reading texts, planting, pollination, etc. Students left their week [...] with new vocabulary, increased confidence to speak in a group and a wealth of new experiences”.

While success in the academic school year is important, the goal of the summer program extends beyond academics to the whole child. The hope of the committee is that the experiences offered during the program would “enhance year-round learning” thereby fostering not only stronger elementary students but more capable lifelong learners. To reach this goal, there must be a strong connection between academics and their real-life applications. Therefore, the lesson plans created for this curriculum sought to answer the question, How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?

Curriculum Lesson Plans

The following sections will begin by providing an overview of how the curriculum's lessons were designed before specifically examining each of the six lessons. In particular, they will discuss how the various activities relate to state standards, how the lessons can be modified in reference to WIDA's (2007) method for model performance indicators, and how the lessons will aid in making this curriculum effective. Because the lessons meet numerous state and national standards, only those that formed the basis of the essential
questions and lesson objectives will be addressed in this section, while all of the standards will be listed in Appendix E with their corresponding lessons for reference.

Lesson Plan Overview

Each of the following lesson plans is founded in backward design and were created with the end results in mind first (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). The end results were determined by three factors: the 2016 program theme, state and national standards, and daily experiences or activities. To begin, the overarching program theme of health and wellness had to be considered because it dictated which standards could be addressed in the lessons. After the standards were reviewed and selected, the activities of the day were considered so that the lessons would be specifically tailored to what activities the students would be doing during the week. Once the desired outcomes were determined, the most significant and applicable standards were turned into essential questions to guide the planning of lesson instruction and activities (Wilhelm, 2007).

These essential questions were formed with Harvey and Goudvis’ (2007) concept of “authentic questions” in mind (p. 124). Such questions foster peer interaction and contrast with questions that lead to “pseudo discussions” in which students simply try to answer a question for which the teacher has a predetermined answer (Zwiers, 2014b, p. 123). Rather than creating questions that limit the possibilities of students’ responses, the goal of the lessons was to create questions that inspired students to want to continue learning more about the given topic.

When determining the mentor texts and online resources, the goal of the curriculum was to draw as much as possible from the units of study curriculum provided to teachers during the school year and balancing the resources with online texts and videos that
differed from those used during the school year. Interestingly, very few texts could be found in the units of study that addressed the National Health Education Standards. When classroom teachers were asked what they used to meet those standards, they stated that they relied on old curriculum. Therefore, some lessons have only online resources because there were no mentor texts readily available for the program.

To determine the sequence of lesson activities, Harvey and Daniels’ (2009) mini-inquiry framework and its four fundamental facets were used. To begin each lesson, teachers briefly *immersed* students in a mentor text, online article, or video to develop prior knowledge. Students and teachers then *investigated* the essential question(s) before moving to the *coalesce* stage during which the information was synthesized. Finally, each lesson ended with an opportunity for students to *go public* and share out their new understanding. Because each lesson was designed to only take 50 minutes, some of these stages are condensed to make the timing of the lessons more realistic. However, the one exception is the culminating project which is meant to be spread out over several days, providing additional time for students to interact with the materials and create their final project.

**Lesson One: Health Advertisement**

The health advertisement lesson differs from the other five lessons in a couple of ways. First, this is the only lesson that teachers were asked to teach on a specific day. Because the other lessons are based on activities that their groups will do on different days, there is no set scope and sequence to the lessons. For example one group may choose to do the soccer lesson on Tuesday while a second group may choose to do the lesson on Friday. However, because students would need more time to complete the advertisement for the
program’s culminating project, it was suggested that teachers do this lesson on Monday to allow optimal time for students to work. This leads to the second way in which the lesson differs from the other lessons: it was designed to be completed over several days. In contrast to this lesson, the other lessons for the program were designed to fit into a fifty minute rotation slot. Moreover, many components of the other lessons could be done as isolated activities and time fillers for as little as a few minutes. For the culminating project however, students would need more time to engage with persuasive language before taking the time to work together and develop an advertisement.

Standards. The culminating project is grounded in the National Health Education Standards and Minnesota Benchmarks. In particular, the two standards that served as inspiration for the lesson were from the third and fourth grade standards (MDE, 2007). Standard 3.3.1. forms the foundation of this lesson and states “The student will explain how media influences the selection of health information, products, and services” (MDE, 2007, p. 11). The lesson plan reworded this standard for the essential question How do advertisements influence what I buy? and the content objective I can analyze commercials to understand how they are trying to persuade me. The lesson plan included this standard to demonstrate to students how much influence media and advertising companies have over what interests viewers. To lay the background knowledge necessary for the students to create their own advertisement for healthy foods or activities, students would first view advertisements that specifically targeted children and discuss what tactics advertisers used to make children interested in buying their product. Then the students would engage with the material by creating their own advertisement for health thereby meeting standard 4.8.1., which states “The student will demonstrate the ability to influence and support
others in making positive health choices” (MDE, 2007, p.16). This standard was reworded into the essential question, *How can words be used to persuade others?* and the language objective, *I can use persuasive language to encourage others to make healthy choices.*

This lesson demonstrates an instance in which the content and language objectives are very similar and in fact overlap. In order to meet these objectives, students needed to understand the language involved in advertising. Therefore, students would critically analyze the commercials to understand how word choice can affect consumers and how they too can use language to persuade others in a positive manner. In this way, students met several College and Career Ready Anchor Standards (CCRAS) including reading standard 4 “Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone” and speaking, viewing, listening and media literacy (SL) 6 “Adapt speech to a variety of contexts and communicative tasks, demonstrating command of formal English when indicated or appropriate” (MDE, 2010, p. 13; 31). Furthermore, students met language (L) standard 6 “Acquire and use accurately a range of general academic and domain-specific words and phrases sufficient for reading, writing, speaking, and listening at the college and career readiness level [...]” when they incorporated the generated list of persuasive vocabulary into their own advertisement (MDE, 2010, p. 37).

**Modifications.** This lesson plan includes three modifications to the objectives’ “support” that teachers could easily incorporate into their instruction for students who are just learning to produce English (WIDA, 2007). The first is an example of using WIDA’s MPI strand to modify the supports of a task to make it more accessible for all students. First, teachers have a range of options regarding the list of persuasive words on slide six of the
PowerPoint. For students who are at a higher English proficiency, the teachers can simply show the blank slide five and let them self-generate a list of words used in advertisements. For students who need some additional support, they could either work with a partner, or if they are just beginning to learn English, they could look at the list of terms on slide six. A second place for modification would be to simply turn on the closed captioning option on the toys commercial so that students could read along while listening to the commercial. Finally, teachers could also review the sentence frames with students before they get started on their advertisements to give the students a starting point (Zwiers, 2014b).

**Effectiveness rationale.** Because research suggests that both community and familial involvement in school and extra-curricular programs has a positive impact on academic achievement, the summer program regularly invites families to join in a celebration of learning on the final day of the program. In the 2016 program year, the families were able to view the product of this culminating project as the students shared the advertisements with their families. Students were required to create written scripts for their actors and actresses to read thereby incorporating both reading and writing in this weeklong project. Furthermore, teachers told students that their advertisements were ultimately for their families which provided an authentic context for this project and helped it effectively begin to answer this study's research question: *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?*

In addition to inviting families to come on the last day, the program also regularly partners with the community to bring authentic experiences to our students (Weiss et al., 2009). During the 2015 year, the program invited a principal from one of the elementary
schools to lead a lesson on gardening for the students. To turn the lesson into action, the host school offered to leave space in their gardening beds so that students could actually plant vegetables and herbs that were donated from a local health foods store. In the 2016 program year, a local tae kwon do studio and a combined National Basketball Association (NBA) and Women's National Basketball Association (WNBA) training camp came to the host site to offer discounted lessons to students thereby serving as inspiration for lesson two.

Lesson Two: The Muscular System

For the 2016 program year, the planning committee wanted to find unique opportunities for the students to stay active. Moreover, the committee recognized the need to engage the community in the program and therefore sought participation from local businesses. Fortunately, the local community was only too happy to offer their time and services to work with the students and both a tae kwon do studio and the NBA-WNBA clinic organized by the Minnesota Timberwolves and Lynx were willing to come on-site and work with the students. By combining the College and Career Anchor Standards with the National Health Education Standards, lesson two provides academic substance to these activities and helps students become aware of how their skeletal muscular system works.

**Standards.** Similar to the health advertisement lesson, the muscular system lesson uses a National Health Education Standard for its essential question. In particular, the fourth grade standard 4.1.1. summarizes the purpose of this lesson: “The student will describe the basic structure and functions of the human body system” and was narrowed to How can knowledge of the skeletal muscles help me stay active? for the essential question (MDE, 2007, p.14). Although this lesson provides only a brief glimpse at the muscular
system, the topic is included in the district’s fourth grade units of study, and therefore the lesson could be an introduction for incoming third and fourth graders or a refresher for incoming fifth graders.

Within lesson two, the language objectives act as the “how” to the content objective: *I can describe how my workout helps strengthen at least eight skeletal muscles using at least four key vocabulary terms.* By incorporating the CCRAS language (L) standard L6 “Acquire and use accurately a range of general academic and domain-specific words and phrases sufficient for reading, writing, speaking, and listening at the college and career readiness level [...]”, students are able to gain an opportunity to engage with academic language in a creative way (MDE, 2010, p.37). In order to make the lesson’s objectives accessible to all ELs, there are a couple areas that teachers could modify.

**Modifications.** Teachers could modify two different tasks to make the lesson attainable for all ELs. The first involves the second overview of the muscles in which students are to identify which muscles are used in a given activity. Teachers can modify the supports and provide the students with a labeled diagram that they can highlight rather than the blank diagram on which to write the muscles used. Another task that could have modified supports would be the guided practice section in which students create a workout. While more advanced English-speaking students could explain their workout independently, students still developing their English could practice and present with a partner (Zwiers, 2014b). Teachers could also modify this task’s language function by having students identify which muscle is used in their workout by pointing to it rather than explaining how their workout is effective. In this way, teachers are still able to ascertain if students understood the task without the use of academic language.
**Effectiveness rationale.** Even though teachers could modify the lessons so that students would not have to use academic language, the lesson is still rich in opportunities for students to engage with partners in order to practice oral language and gain important critical thinking strategies such as compare and contrast. By opening the lesson with both a mentor text and a video, teachers are able to guide students in an oral discussion that will help them understand that different text formats, such as print and media, can both contain valuable information. Likewise, teachers give this strategy a real-life application by having the students create a workout which helps them not only stay healthy but also understand that what they learn from a text can be applied to their own lives. By tying an abstract, text-based concept like skeletal muscles to a concrete, everyday scenario, the lesson begins to answer the question, *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?* This strategy of tying the unfamiliar to the familiar was also the basis for lesson three.

**Lesson Three: Soccer and Physics**

For many of the students attending the summer program, soccer is more than a hobby; it is a lifestyle. During the first couple of years of the program, the teachers and planning committee noticed that students spent every opportunity they could playing soccer with their friends. Therefore, the committee decided to include soccer as a designated rotation in the schedule, which then made the challenge become how to add an academic component to this fun activity.

The basis for this lesson came from a lesson on soccer physics created by Dr. Gerhard (2014). While the focus of that lesson was to see *if* air pressure impacted the distance of a soccer ball, the lesson created for this curriculum focuses on *how* air pressure
impacts both the ball’s distance and its movement. Furthermore, components such as the added journaling opportunities help students synthesize the information and solidify their understanding. Additionally, the journals for this particular lesson would be collected so that teachers could provide formative feedback on the language and sentence conventions students used thereby encouraging growth in these areas (Zwiers, 2014b). This small shift in focus helps to better align the lesson with Minnesota’s science standards.

**Standards.** Unlike the majority of the lessons created for this curriculum, which are based in health standards, lesson three is founded in science standards. In particular, the essential questions came from the fifth grade standard 5.2.2.1: “An Object’s motion is affected by forces and can be described by the object’s speed and the direction it is moving” (MDE, 2009, p.13). The lesson reworded this into two essential questions: *How can we describe how a ball moves?* and *How can we change the movement of a ball?* The topic of forces and motion is not limited to the fifth grade curriculum but is also introduced in the district’s second grade units of study and is therefore applicable to the whole range of students attending the summer program.

Lesson three demonstrates a case in which the language objective builds upon the content objective by adding linguistic complexity. The content objective, *I can use scientific terms to describe what happens when you change the amount of air in a ball and kick it,* focuses on academic language thereby drawing from the CCRAS L6 described in lesson two. Likewise, the language objective, *I can compare the different ways a ball moves using comparative language (similar to, faster, longer, etc.)*, requires the more generalized academic language for comparing and contrasting the ball’s movement. To help all
students describe and compare the balls’ movement, teachers can make several accommodations to the tasks.

**Modifications.** Teachers could modify both the introductory mini lesson as well as the culminating journaling opportunity to make them more relevant for all learners. For older students and students with higher reading levels, teachers could organize the students into groups and give each group a different mentor text. Then one student from each group would come together and form a new group where they could compare the texts they read. In this way, students with higher language proficiencies would be offered additional opportunity to engage in oral language practice. On the other end, the language function of the journaling opportunities could be altered in a multitude of ways to accommodate different language proficiencies. While students with higher language proficiencies could write sentences describing the ways that the ball’s movement changed with different air pressures, students just beginning to learn English could demonstrate their understanding using a labeled or unlabeled picture.

**Effectiveness rationale.** In a manner similar to lesson two, lesson three offers students an opportunity to engage with a text’s content. While lesson two simply encouraged students to participate in a hands-on activity, lesson three goes a step further in the journaling section to ask students to record and synthesize their learning in writing. In this way, authentic reading and writing are once again integrated into the hands-on, experience-based summer program for ELs. While lessons thus far have been grounded in reading, writing, or both, lesson four places an emphasis on oral language development.

**Lesson Four: Nutrition Labels**
Lesson four is somewhat unique to the curriculum in that its primary focus is oral language development alongside the health-related content. Before diving into the content, the lesson begins with a review of discussion etiquette. While this could include such practices as taking turns, or responding to a differing opinion, it would also be an opportunity for teachers to model nonverbal communication norms such as smiling and nodding for students less familiar with American customs (Zwiers, 2014b). Another oral language support included in this lesson is sentence frames. Zwiers (2014b) argues that both simple sentence frames and linked sentence frames can help students begin to organize their oral language. By integrating such oral language practice into a lesson grounded in health standards, teachers can balance both language and content instruction.

**Standards.** For lesson four, the fourth grade National Health Education Standard 4.5.1. was used to create the essential question. The standard states, “The student will demonstrate the ability to apply a decision-making process to health issues and problems” and was reworded to *How does a nutrition label help us make healthier choices?* in order to create the essential question (MDE, 2007, p.16). This standard was included within the lesson in order to empower students in making positive health choices. Furthermore, the standard was included because it is not addressed within the district’s chosen units of study curriculum and therefore not necessarily addressed in each of the elementary schools in the district.

As with lesson three, lesson four’s language objective builds on the content objective. While the content objective simply states, *I can read a nutrition label to find out if a food is good for me*, the language objective adds, *I can evaluate nutrition labels and describe why a food is healthy or not healthy.* Like the essential question, both of the
objectives in the lesson were derived from the National Health Education Standard 4.5.1. In this way, the lesson narrows the entire focus to simply aiding students in making healthy food choices by using a nutrition label.

**Modifications.** In order to help all students achieve this focus on making healthy food choices, the lesson plan includes three support modifications teachers can use. First, teachers can use the closed captioning option on the introductory video for students who are at a higher reading level in English than in listening. This is a simple strategy, but it could prove beneficial for some learners. Another option would be to show this video twice to allow students to get more information from the second listen. If teachers chose to play the video twice, they should provide students with a purpose for the second viewing such as listening for three ways sugar is harmful for their bodies. In this way, students are held accountable for gaining more information from the video.

The second and third support modification for this lesson can be used during the class discussions of the PowerPoint and involve the use of the sentence starters. The lesson includes two different types of sentence starters, which could be used to offer different levels of support. The first are simple sentence starters, which offer beginnings of single sentences for students with lower English proficiencies. To help refine the English of more proficient speakers, teachers could use the second type of sentence starters called linked sentence starters (Zwiers, 2014b). These sentence structures add more complexity to the students’ conversations by providing them with a frame of reference for the discussions’ expectations. In both cases the supports are meant to further develop the students’ oral language skills.
Effectiveness rationale. In answering the question, *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners*, a lesson centered around oral language may appear out-of-place. However, research indicates that oral language forms the grammatical, phonemic, and pragmatic foundation for developing those same skills in literacy (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011; Tracey & Morrow, 2012). The truth that oral language experiences aid native English speakers holds true for ELs as well (C. Miller, 2010; August & Shanahan, 2006; Morrow & Gambrell, 2011). Therefore, in a summer program that wishes to foster positive relationships in addition to academic success, structured oral language practice is not only beneficial but also necessary.

**Lesson Five: Positive Self-Talk**

In response to teacher feedback from the 2015 program year, lesson five focuses on positive self-talk as a means to creating positive relationships with others. Although it comes fifth in the curriculum packet, teachers were encouraged to teach this lesson towards the beginning of the week in order to create a sense of teamwork from the start of the program. All too often, teachers have heard students at the program say that they do not have any “good” ideas for writing and that they are unsure of what they are truly “good” at. This lesson provides students with an opportunity to learn more about themselves and at the same time encourage their peers.

The goal of this lesson is to help students realize that they can support their peers because they have something unique to offer just by being themselves. In order to do this, the teacher and students first read *Have you Filled a Bucket Today* by Carol Mccloud (2006) and then discuss how in order to make others feel good, you must recognize that
you have something positive to offer. Students would then complete an inventory of what they are good at and what they want to improve on before creating a self-portrait that reflects who they are as individuals. The inventory and self-portrait for this lesson were simplified for the program using an inventory created by Marilyn Fenichel (2016). In addition to fostering positive peer relationships and self-image, this lesson also addresses health standards relating to mental health.

Standards. While the other lessons in this curriculum address some form of physical wellness, lesson five is unique because it integrates mental health. This lesson uses the third grade National Health Education Standard 3.7.2. as its framework, which states, “The student will demonstrate strategies to improve or maintain personal health” (MDE, 2007, p.12). More specifically, it addresses the first two sample benchmarks, which encourage students to “Describe actions of healthy friendships” and “practice positive thinking such as self-affirmations” (p.12). These benchmarks were put into student-friendly terms to create the essential question: How does knowing and liking myself help me be a good friend?

Furthermore, both the language and content objectives strive to help students articulate what it is about themselves that makes them special. The content objective states, I can use positive words to affirm others and myself and the language objective expands this by saying, I can accurately describe my strengths and weaknesses in order to better understand how I can affirm others and myself. Although these were primarily inspired by the content health standard, the CCRAS speaking, viewing, listening, and media literacy (SL) standard SL1 also played a role in laying the groundwork for them. It states, “Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with
diverse partners, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively” (MDE, 2010, p. 31).

**Modifications.** This lesson allows teachers to modify both the “support” for the personal inventory as well as the “language function” of the self-portrait depending on student needs. To begin, teachers could select only one or two statements from each section of the inventory for students to complete or they could have students work with a partner to discuss the inventory statements. For the self-portrait, teachers could modify the language function by requiring higher level English speakers to write about themselves while allowing students just beginning to learn English to create a collage. In either case, the students are demonstrating their understanding of themselves in a creative way thereby meeting the lesson objectives.

**Effectiveness rationale.** Team-building is at the heart of this lesson, which begins by having students acknowledge the good in themselves and continues by having them acknowledge it in others as well. Research indicates that fostering positive self-images and developing a team-based atmosphere can help improve academic success in struggling learners (B. Miller, 2007; Anfinson et al., 2007). While this lesson includes opportunities for students to practice literacy skills such as discussing the main idea of a text and synthesizing their learning into a final product, the goal of this lesson was much broader. By laying the foundation of the group as a team during the first couple of days, the lesson sought to encourage students to be more willing to take risks in engaging with the authentic reading and writing in the hands-on, experience-based summer program.

**Lesson Six: My Plate**
The final lesson in the curriculum introduces students to the My Plate nutrition guidelines designed by the United States Department of Agriculture ([USDA] 2016). Several of the lesson components were modified from a lesson created by Learning ZoneXpress (2011), which was designed to be spread over several days. In order to better meet the needs of the students and fit within the timeline, certain activities were removed or modified.

One example of a modification was when the students were given the opportunity to try adding different foods into the various categories after the introduction. In order to help motivate students, this was changed to the game “scatergories” in which students work with a partner or team to list the foods, thereby adding an additional language support for the students who are not yet proficient in English. Likewise the final relay game, although included in the original lesson plan was modified to include simpler actions for students to follow thereby requiring a lower language proficiency to participate. Despite these modifications, both the inspiration lesson plan and the lesson plan for the curriculum were based on the National Health Education Standards.

**Standards.** Similar to lesson four, lesson six incorporates the fourth grade National Health Education Standard 4.5.1.: “The student will demonstrate the ability to apply a decision-making process to health issues and problems” (MDE, 2007, p.16). This standard was modified into two essential questions guiding the lesson: *What types of food should I eat to stay healthy?* and *How much of each type of food should I eat?* While lesson four focused on using a nutrition label to determine if a processed food is healthy, lesson six helps students navigate unprocessed foods by using the My Plate template (USDA, 2016) to answer the essential questions.
In the same manner as lesson two, lesson five’s language objective provides the “how” for the content objective. Although the content objective states simply, *I can categorize my meals based on the My Plate chart and make healthy eating choices* the language objective specifies, *I can orally categorize foods based on the My Plate chart and explain healthy eating choices.* In this way, the language objective addresses not only the language function of the objective but also which language domain would be addressed, which in this case is speaking.

**Modifications.** In order to help all students engage in the guided practice portion of this lesson which involves the game scatergories, the lesson includes a couple modifications to the support that teachers can offer. To begin, teachers could offer multiple examples of each food group to give all students the opportunity to have at least some foods listed. Additionally, while students with higher proficiencies could play the game independently, teachers could also have the students work with a partner to increase the opportunity for them to write more foods. Finally, for students who are just beginning to learn English, teachers could give them the relay cards with pictures of different foods and have them sort them into the correct categories. In this way, teachers take the same basic objective and create a strand of objectives similar to WIDA’s strand of MPIs (WIDA,2007).

**Effectiveness rationale.** This final lesson in the curriculum provides students with an opportunity to apply their learning both at school and at home. For the journaling portion for the lesson, students were asked to keep a log of what they ate during the week either for lunch or dinner and then figure out how their eating habits compared to those recommended by the USDA. By encouraging students to document a meal from home, teachers help to create a connection between school and home thereby beginning to
answer the question of how to best integrate authentic reading and writing into the hands-on, experience-based summer program.

Summary

This chapter began by providing the context of the developed curriculum by examining the feedback teachers gave in the needs assessment. Next, it described the curriculum’s six lessons and how they met state standards and ultimately answered the research question: *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?* The final chapter will discuss my new learning as both a curriculum designer and researcher.
CHAPTER FIVE

Overview

Throughout this capstone I have tried to answer the question, *how can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?* Chapter One reflected on my personal journey in selecting the research question. I then reviewed relevant research and literature in Chapter Two, discussed a plan for designing the curriculum in Chapter Three, and finally shared the content of the curriculum in Chapter Four. Chapter Five will summarize the learning and implications of this process.

Chapter Five will begin by revisiting the literature from Chapter Two in order to discuss the overarching connections with the research question and the major learnings gained from previous research. Next, I will discuss the limitations of my data collection and curriculum as well as provide recommendations for areas of future research. Finally, Chapter Five will conclude by discussing both the overarching implications of the capstone as well as the implications it has for my own future work in this area.

Revisiting the Literature

As I reflect on the literature included within Chapter Two, numerous connections and themes emerge. However, there are three guiding themes that I believe are especially relevant to the curriculum and that I will continue to include in any future curriculum. The first theme is the power that summer holds for all students to either propel or stagnate learning. The second involves the importance of connections in summer programming not
only to the academic school year, but also to the world outside of a classroom. The final theme is that ELs are unique learners and therefore require unique instruction to meet their language needs.

The Power of Summer

As a teacher, “the summer slide” is something we discuss in the lunchroom nearly every fall. Students who achieved so much progress the year before come to our classroom with lower reading levels than when they left in the spring. Before this review, I had only a vague understanding of what contributed to a student’s academic success and would often discuss a lack of reading as the key factor. Although I understood that often factors outside of school impacted student success, I did not realize the extent to which this is true.

Though the literature review, I found that research indicates that students considered at risk in the lowest socio-economic status (SES) group make more gains during the school year than students in the highest SES group (Alexander et al., 2007). Additionally, data indicated that the difference in their overall progress across the year can be contributed to differences in their summer experiences (Alexander et al., 2007; Downey et al., 2008). While students in the highest SES group would attend summer programs or had experiences that built skills like teamwork and ingenuity, the students in the lowest SES group did not have these same opportunities. Although it does not seem likely that there would be a high correlation between such nonacademic tasks and academic success, these opportunities form the “conceptual framework and context for learning” thereby continuing learning into the summer months (B. Miller, 2007, p. 7). This continuation of learning from school to summer relates to the second theme I found throughout the literature review: the importance of connections.
Importance of Connections

Within our district, curriculum is organized by topics called units of study. These topics are meant to help students create connections among the various content areas, which research indicates can engage them in higher order thinking as well as increase motivation and rates of learning (Ronau & Karp, 2001; Cunningham, 2010; Hale, 2010; Hayes, 2010; Fogarty & Stoehr, 2008). The journals and articles supported this concept and gave a much deeper understanding of why our district has moved to this style of instruction. Miller’s 2007 study especially interested me as he found that an integrated approach to learning that combines the cognitive physical and social domains has been linked to better grades, improved leadership skills, and even high attendance during the academic year. Before this review, I had understood that connections among content areas and between school and home were important, but I had not realized they had been linked to attendance or leadership skills.

Not surprisingly, such benefits hold true when students see connections between the school year and summer learning (Anfinson et al., 2007; Weiss et al., 2009). However, several articles suggested that rather than recreate the school year, a summer program should simply complement the school year while including more opportunities for inquiry, team building, and experiential learning (Anfinson et al., 2007; Weiss et al., 2009; B. Miller, 2007). Although the summer program that the curriculum was designed for incorporates these elements, the original purpose was to offer them to ELs because they sometimes lack these experiences. As a member of the planning committee, it was good to find that these experiences will help the ELs not only gain rich language experiences, but also hold the potential to positively impact other aspects of their learning as well.
English Learners as Unique Learners

English Learners, like native English speakers, have unique needs and challenges both as a group and as individuals. One of the first concepts addressed in my EL teacher training program was the difference between conversational English and academic language. I learned that it can take 4-7 years to fully acquire academic language and that I must explicitly teach such language (Francis et al., 2006; Hakuta, Butler & Witt, 2000). One such way to do this is by incorporating language functions and supports into objectives, creating what WIDA refers to as model performance indicators (WIDA 2007).

Despite an early introduction to such principles, I often struggle as an EL teacher in this area. Moreover, I know I am not alone in this struggle because the professional development in both our district and state regularly include strategies to boost students’ academic language. The literature review provided an additional opportunity for me to find research-driven strategies to help not only the ELs who attend our summer program, but also those whom I work with during the school year.

The researcher I found most helpful was Zwiers who specializes in academic language in ELs. Within his books, he included several strategies that were easy to incorporate or modify to fit the needs of a weeklong, experience-based program. One such strategy was modeling small group and whole group discussions (Zwiers, 2014b). Although modeling a discussion may not differ from the instruction of native English speakers, Zwiers emphasized the need to model the nonverbal communication expectations such as head nodding and eye contact which students from outside the American, or Western cultures may find different from their own cultural norms. Likewise, he suggested incorporating linked sentence starters to help students expand their language
and incorporate more academic language. Modeling cultural norms and including linked sentence starters are simple supports teachers can add to their instruction that would help meet the unique needs of ELs.

Overall, the literature review not only affirmed many of the components our program already included, but also gave me the confidence to begin answering the question, *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?* Despite my best efforts to maintain the highest standards in developing a curriculum to answer my research questions, several limitations must be acknowledged and addressed.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

There were several limitations of my data collection and curriculum design that other educators or I could improve upon or use for future research, including addressing the number of teachers that answered the needs assessment, gaining input from students, parents and high school counselors, as well as creating a system for collecting quantitative data in the program.

Teacher Input on Program

All teachers who participated in the 2015 summer program were invited to participate in this capstone and had the opportunity to answer the needs assessment. Despite this, only ten of the eighteen teachers provided feedback. I first sent the survey to teachers in November and then resent in February because of low participation. Part of the reason teachers may not have responded could have been because of the time between the 2015 program (June) and when the survey was sent (November). To encourage more feedback from the 2016 program, teachers will be sent the same needs assessment during
their first week of planning in August. My hope is that teachers will be more likely to respond because not only will the program be more recent, but they also will be back to work without students. By sending the same needs assessment for the 2016 year, I hope to see how teachers reacted to the change in curriculum and better plan for the 2017 year.

Outside Input on Program

In addition to a low number of teachers providing feedback on the program, this capstone did not include a survey for the high school counselors who participated in the program, the families of students who attended, or the students themselves. In the past, the program attempted to obtain feedback from the high school counselors by using an online survey, but did not receive much participation. A potential solution to this would be to create a short survey that the counselors could take on the last day of the program before they leave. Because we invite families to the program on the last day, the planning committee could also do this to obtain data from them and the students. Furthermore, the committee could send electronic or paper copies to families who were unable to attend in person on the last day thereby not limiting the participation to only those who attended.

Collecting Quantitative Data

The third limitation of this capstone, and perhaps the most pressing, is the lack of quantitative data to demonstrate academic growth from the summer program. Perhaps the largest obstacle to this is the program’s short timeframe. Because the program is only a five days long with an already full schedule, the planning committee has yet to find a way to successfully collect pre- and post-data that would provide quantitative data supporting the effectiveness of the program. This would make an excellent area for future research and the members of the planning committee, including myself, will certainly consider possible
solutions. In particular, we could address the following questions *Is there a correlation between student attendance at the summer program and school year success?* and *How can we add in a system for collecting quantitative data in such a short time frame.*

Despite the limitations to this capstone, the curriculum I created for the program and the new understandings gathered from the literature review hold implications for education as a whole as well as my own work in the summer program.

**Overarching Implications**

The primary result of this capstone is a research-based curriculum that strives to answers the question, *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?* The inclusion of hands-on lesson plans designed to complement the program’s varied experiences and the district’s units of study allowed an authentic application to the lessons’ literacy components. Therefore, the curriculum successfully answers the research question. However, there are three broader implications that derive from this capstone, which other teachers could apply to their own educational setting.

The first implication is the need to continually assess and improve summer programming effectiveness. If we truly wish to begin closing the opportunity gap that exists for so many of our students, we must ensure that our extended programming curriculum stems from current research and that it includes not only academic components but integrates physical and social aspects as well for our students (B. Miller, 2007). While team building and experiential learning may appear to students and even some staff as merely fun and games, these practices can have a ripple effect on our students’ success (Anfinson et al, 2007; B. Miller, 2007).
The second implication is that curriculum development cannot happen effectively in isolation. Research shows that teachers cannot simply create extended programming curriculum that is fun for students, but rather it must connect to the school year and the students’ home lives (Anfinson et al, 2007; Weiss et al., 2009). It can be so tempting to become invested in the fun activities a program can offer, but if it is not tied somehow to what the students experience in school or at home, the activities lose their substance and academic value. As teachers, we must be intentional in our instruction and ensure that the lessons are not only engaging but also meaningful.

The final implication gained from this capstone is the need to review district or school provided curriculum and ensure that it meets all of the state standards. This was an implication that I never would have expected at the start of my capstone journey. I had always taken curriculum for granted, trusting in the fact that if my school or district provided the curriculum, they had ensured it met all of the state standards. However, in the process of reviewing my district’s curriculum in order to draw resources and ideas for my own curriculum, I found a substantial deficit in the curriculum’s ability to meet the National Health Education Standards and Minnesota Benchmarks. A single fourth grade unit explicitly addressed several of the standards while the third and fifth grade units subtly addressed a few of the standards pertaining to mental health; however, for the most part, health seemed to be overlooked in the provided curriculum. As educators, we should have an active role in ensuring that our instruction meets all state standards, and where deficits are found, we should take actions toward rectifying the issues.
Personal Implications and Action Plan

In addition to the broader implications for educators, this capstone has several personal implications that I have turned into an action plan for continually improving the summer program. The first step is to obtain teacher feedback on my curriculum this fall during the teachers’ workshop week. I will then analyze the data in a similar manner and use it to again form the basis of the 2017 program. Because involving families and the community in the program has been such a motivational factor for students and can have such a large impact on school year achievement, we as a planning committee will continue to find more ways to include them in the program (Weiss et al., 2009).

The final plan of action is to continue to fight for program funding and encourage families to take advantage of this program. By continuing to offer this program free of charge to ELs in the district, we are providing opportunities to students that may otherwise not have such summer experiences. My hope is that as we continue to use research-based practices in our program and continue to align it to the school year in a fun, motivational way, more students will urge their families to sign them up for the program. If our enrollment continues to improve, perhaps one day we can expand the program to all elementary ELs and offer these experiences at an even younger age.

Summary

Within this chapter, I discussed the various learnings and implications of this capstone process. I revisited the literature from Chapter Two and applied it to my own learning, discussed the limitations of the capstone, and provided recommendations for areas of future research. Finally, I discussed the implications of the capstone for education as a whole and for my future work as a summer program coordinator.
Throughout this capstone journey, I have strived to answer the question, *How can I best integrate authentic reading and writing into a hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners?* In this process, I have gained not only the factual knowledge of research-based practices but I have also learned about myself as both a learner and as an educator. I have gained more confidence in developing lessons to be used on a larger-scale than simply within my own classroom. Moreover, I now have the confidence to find and integrate research into not only the district’s EL summer program but for my own school’s after school programming as well. In this way, I can continue to develop my passion for meeting the needs of ELs and struggling learners and more importantly, I can strive to close the opportunity gap altogether.
APPENDIX A

Needs Assessment
2015 XXXXX Survey

Purpose: To gather teacher-directed input regarding XXXXXXX’s instructional design, overall program design, and student engagement in order to develop and improve the curriculum and program for 2016.

This survey should take approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Please answer the following questions regarding the instructional design, overall program design, and student engagement during XXXXXXX by March 2\textsuperscript{nd}.

Participant Background

What is your professional background? (EL teacher, classroom teacher, special education teacher, or other) ________________

What was your role during the 2015 program? (Teacher, Committee Member, Other) ________

How many years have you taught at [program name]? ________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Designs</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The lesson plans were easy to follow.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lesson plans gave me sufficient guidance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lesson plans allowed teacher choice and creativity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had sufficient mentor texts for each lesson.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had sufficient access to the materials I needed to teach</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The internet sites provided were of good quality and</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The video links provided were of good quality and</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing ideas were authentic applications of learning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lessons aligned with school year content.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lessons met the reading needs of the students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lessons met the speaking needs of the students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lessons met the writing needs of the students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lessons met the listening needs of the students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
### Program Design

**Our mission statement at XXXXXXX is:** Engaging English Learners through authentic experiences that enhance year-round learning. Do you believe we met that mission during the 2015 program? Explain.

| Overall, I had enough planning time. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Overall, my students had sufficient time to collaborate. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Overall, my students had sufficient time to write. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| The field trips aligned with the theme and lessons. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| The field trips benefited my students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Overall, I felt the program was well organized. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Comments:

### Student Engagement

| Overall, students were engaged in the lessons. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Overall, students were engaged at Lebanon. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Overall, students were engaged at the arboretum. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Students were motivated to attend. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Students demonstrated positive peer relationships. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Students benefited from the presence of the high school counselors. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

**What did students learn at XXXXXXX? How do you know?**

Comments:
APPENDIX B

Consent Form
February 17th, 2015

Dear Teachers of XXXXX,

I am a graduate student working on an advanced degree in education at Hamline University, St. Paul, Minnesota. As part of my graduate work, I plan to conduct research with teachers who participated in XXXXX held in our district from June 22nd to June 26th 2015. The purpose of this letter is to request your participation.

The topic of my master’s capstone (thesis) is how to best integrate authentic literacy into our hands-on, experience-based summer program for English Learners. The purpose of this survey is to gather input from 2015 XXXXX teachers regarding their perspectives and experiences with the new lesson format, student engagement, and general program design. Once completed, the surveys will be analyzed and data consolidated to guide the development of future XXXXX curriculum and programming.

As a participant, you will be asked to respond to 25 questions using a Likert-scale rating system, select an answer from 3 multiple choice questions, and to write responses to 2 open-ended prompts. You are also encouraged to leave comments at the end of the final three sections. The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete and will be distributed via e-mail. There is little to no risk if you choose to respond to the survey because all results will be kept confidential and anonymous. In order to maintain this confidentiality, all names will be removed before the data is reviewed and pseudonyms for the district, schools, and participants will be used in the capstone. Furthermore, the results will be collected via a Google form, will be privately stored on a password-protected computer, and will be destroyed upon completion of the capstone. As a benefit to you for participating, I will summarize the findings in an anonymous report to be distributed to survey participants and to the program coordinators after completing the capstone.

Participation in the survey is voluntary, and, at any time, you may decline to complete the survey or to have your survey data deleted from the capstone without negative consequences.

I have received approval from the School of Education at Hamline University and from our district office to conduct this study. This research is public scholarship; the abstract and final product will be cataloged in Hamline’s Bush Library Digital Commons, a searchable electronic repository, and it may be published or used in other ways. In all cases, your identity and participation in this study will be confidential.

If you agree to participate, keep this page. Fill out the duplicate agreement to participate on page two and return it to me via inter-department mail by February 26th. You can also copy the form in an email and send it to me no later than March 2nd. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Miranda Gamayunov

XXXXX
XXXXX
XXXXX
Informed Consent to Participate in Qualitative Interview

Please keep this full page for your records.

I have received the letter about your research study for which you will be surveying XXXXX teachers and analyzing any teacher comments. I understand that completing the survey poses little to no risk for me, that my identity will be protected, and that I may withdraw from the project at any time without negative consequences.

___________________________________
Signature

___________________________________
Date
Informed Consent to Participate in Qualitative Interview

Return this portion to Miranda Gamayunov

I have received the letter about your research study for which you will be surveying XXXXX teachers and analyzing any teacher comments. I understand that completing the survey poses little to no risk for me, that my identity will be protected, and that I may withdraw from the project at any time without negative consequences.

______________________________   __________________
Signature                      Date
APPENDIX C

2015 Lesson Template
**2015 Lesson Template**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group schedule for the day: or attach schedule to the backside of this menu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme of the day:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content/Language Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for student participation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for journaling:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work ideas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher working alongside students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to share learning:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

2016 Lesson Template
## 2016 Lesson Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities:</th>
<th>Needed Materials:</th>
<th>Guiding Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Vocabulary:</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Standards:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifications:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mentor Texts/Online Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group work/Partner Options:</th>
<th>Share Out:</th>
<th>Journaling Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

State and National Standards addressed by Lessons
## State and National Standards addressed by Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Advertisement</td>
<td><strong>National Health Education Standards (MDE, 2007):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8.1. The student will express information and opinions about health information and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.1. The student will explain how media influences the selection of health information, products, and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.1. The student will identify characteristics of valid health information and health-promoting products and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8.1. The student will demonstrate the ability to influence and support others in making positive health choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.1. The student will describe how messages from the media influence health behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>College and Career Ready Anchor Standards (MDE, 2010)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reading: (13)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R4. Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R6. Assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and style of a text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R7. Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse media and formats, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R8. Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, including the validity of the reasoning as well as the relevance and sufficiency of the evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Writing: (25)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4. Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W6. Use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing and to interact and collaborate with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W10. Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Speaking, Viewing, Listening, and Media Literacy: (31)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL1. Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL2. Integrate and evaluate information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL3. Evaluate a speaker’s point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL6. Adapt speech to a variety of contexts and communicative tasks, demonstrating command of formal English when indicated or appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL7. Critically analyze information found in electronic, print, and mass media and use a variety of these sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Language: (37)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1. Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L3. Apply knowledge of language to understand how language functions in different contexts, to make effective choices for meaning or style, and to comprehend more fully when reading or listening.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                         | L6. Acquire and use accurately a range of general academic and domain-specific words and
| Muscular System | *National Health Education Standards (MDE, 2007):*  
|                | 4.1.1. The student will describe the basic structure and functions of the human body system |
|                | *College and Career Ready Anchor Standards (MDE, 2010):*  
|                | **Reading**  
|                | R1. Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.  
|                | R2. Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas.  
|                | R9. Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas.  
|                | **Writing**  
|                | W9. Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.  
|                | W10. Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences.  
|                | **Speaking, Viewing, Listening, and Media Literacy:**  
|                | SL1. Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.  
|                | SL7. Critically analyze information found in electronic, print, and mass media and use a variety of these sources.  
|                | **Language**  
|                | L1. Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking.  
|                | L6. Acquire and use accurately a range of general academic and domain-specific words and phrases sufficient for reading, writing, speaking, and listening at the college and career readiness level [...] |

| Soccer | *Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards in Science (MDE, 2009):*  
|        | **Physical Science: Motion**  
|        | 2.2.2.1. The motion of an object can be described by a change in its position over time  
|        | 2.2.2.2. The motion of an object can be changed by a push or a pull force.  
|        | 5.2.2.1. An Object’s motion is affected by forces and can be described by the object’s speed and the direction it is moving  
|        | **Physical Science: Matter**  
|        | 4.2.1.1. Objects have observable properties that can be measured  
|        | *College and Career Ready Anchor Standards (MDE, 2010):*  
|        | **Reading:**  
|        | R1. Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.  
|        | R2. Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas.  
|        | R7. Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse media and formats, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words.  
|        | **Writing:** |
### W9. Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.

**W10. Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences.**

**Speaking, Viewing, Listening, and Media Literacy:**

**SL1. Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.**

**Language:**

**L2. Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English capitalization, punctuation, and spelling when writing.**

**L6. Acquire and use accurately a range of general academic and domain-specific words and phrases sufficient for reading, writing, speaking, and listening at the college and career readiness level.**

### Nutrition Labels

**National Health Education Standards (MDE, 2007):**

- **2.8.1.** The student will express information and opinions about health information and ideas.
- **3.7.2.** The student will demonstrate strategies to improve or maintain personal health.
- **4.3.1.** The student will identify characteristics of valid health information and health-promoting products and services.
- **4.5.1.** The student will demonstrate the ability to apply a decision-making process to health issues and problems.

**College and Career Ready Anchor Standards (MDE, 2010)**

**Reading:**

- **R1.** Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.

**Writing:**

- **W10.** Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences.

**Speaking, Viewing, Listening, and Media Literacy:**

- **SL1.** Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.
- **SL7.** Critically analyze information found in electronic, print, and mass media and use a variety of these sources.

### Yoga

**National Health Education Standards (MDE, 2007):**

- **3.7.2.** The student will demonstrate strategies to improve or maintain personal health.
- **5.2.1.** The student will describe how messages from the media influence health behaviors.

**College and Career Ready Anchor Standards (MDE, 2010)**

**Reading:**

- **R2.** Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas.
- **R6.** Assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and style of a text.

**Writing:**

- **W4.** Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.
- **W10.** Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks,
purposes, and audiences.

**Speaking, Viewing, Listening, and Media Literacy:**
SL1. Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.

**Language:**
L1. Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Plate</th>
<th><em>National Health Education Standards (MDE, 2007):</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8.1. The student will express information and opinions about health information and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7.2. The student will demonstrate strategies to improve or maintain personal health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5.1. The student will demonstrate the ability to apply a decision-making process to health issues and problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* College and Career Ready Anchor Standards (MDE, 2010) |

**Writing**
W4. Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.
W10. Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences.

**Speaking, Viewing, Listening, and Media Literacy:**
SL1. Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.
SL5. Make strategic use of digital media and visual displays of data to express information and enhance understanding of presentations.

**Listening**
L1. Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking.
L2. Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English capitalization, punctuation, and spelling when writing.
L3. Apply knowledge of language to understand how language functions in different contexts, to make effective choices for meaning or style, and to comprehend more fully when reading or listening.
Lesson One: Health Advertisement Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities: Culminating Project: Health Advertisement</th>
<th>Needed Materials:</th>
<th>Essential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMARTboard Notebook File (Language of Persuasion) Journal Pencil Final Project Materials (Varies)</td>
<td>*How do advertisements influence what I buy? *How can words be used to persuade others?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview:**
~This lesson will help students understand how advertisements use persuasive language to encourage people to buy their product
~Begin by showing the students different logos in the notebook file and see how many they can identify (if you’re feeling brave you could sing a few well-known jingles!)
~Ask them how they knew what company went with the logos and tell them that advertisers use certain tricks to help them sell their product (go over tricks and persuasive language in slide)
~Have students watch the toy commercials video and have them identify the language used to persuade
~Introduce the final project for the week and let students choose if they will create an advertisement for healthy food or a fun activity to help keep others healthy. Students may use any materials available for their advertisements, but must write a script for their actors to read during the advertisement.

**Key Vocabulary:** persuasive, advertisements, slogans, jingles, urgent, product

**Objectives**
**Content:** I can analyze commercials to understand how they are trying to persuade me.
**Language:** I can use persuasive language to encourage others to make healthy choices.

**National Health Standards:** 2.8.1.; 3.3.1.; 4.3.1.; 4.8.1.; 5.2.1.
**CCR Anchor Standards:** R4, R6, R7, R8, W4, W6, W7, W10, SL1, SL2, SL3, SL6, SL7, L1, L3, L6

**Modifications:**
*Depending on language level, students can either self-generate the list of persuasive words, work with a partner, or have the notebook file shown to them with the words
*Use sentence frames to help students get started on their ads
*Turn on Closed Captioning for toy commercials

**Mentor Texts/Online Resources**
*Best Toy Commercials 2016 Video [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gsDTKCSkHZw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gsDTKCSkHZw)

**Group work/Partner Options:**
* The culminating project is a group-based activity so students should work with a partner or small group.

**Share Out:**
*What persuasive language did you hear in the toy ad? Junk Food ad? *How do advertisements influence what I buy? *How can words be used to persuade others?

**Journaling Opportunities**
*Have students log the number of healthy/unhealthy commercials they see at home during the week.
*Have students log the type of persuasive language they hear during commercials at home during the week.
How Ads Work
• They are for specific people (kids, moms, dads)
• They make it seem urgent (order now!)
• They make it sound cheap (only $19.99)
• They use famous people
• They use slogans or jingles ("Eat Fresh!")

Most importantly: They choose their words VERY carefully!

Persuasive Language
Can you think of more?

• Introducing the new___________
• Order within the next _____ minutes and get one free!
• I always hated___________but now___________
Lesson Two: The Muscular System Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities: Basketball or Tae Kwon Do</th>
<th>Needed Materials:</th>
<th>Essential Question:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skeletal Muscles Diagrams</td>
<td>*How can knowledge of the skeletal system help me stay active?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pencil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Basketball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview:**
~ This lesson will focus on skeletal muscles but could also touch on smooth muscles depending on time.
~ To develop background knowledge begin with a mentor text and “The Muscular System” video to introduce students to muscles. Have the students compare the text and the video, analyzing what information was included in both and what information was unique to one or the other. (You could also demonstrate the importance of movement by watching the “Why Sitting is Bad for You Video.”)
~ Show students the labeled diagram of the skeletal muscles and discuss which muscles were or will be used when they play basketball or do tae kwon do. (If needed, they can use the basketball to try different moves and isolate different muscles.) Students can then use the unlabeled diagram in their journals and write in the names of the muscles discussed.
~ Have students work with a partner or in a small group to create a workout that strengthens at least 8 skeletal muscles. Have the whole class perform the exercise.

**Key Vocabulary:**
flexible, contract, joint, muscle, skeletal muscles, smooth muscles, sedentary, active

**Objectives Content:**
I can explain the purpose of skeletal muscles and create a workout that helps strengthen at least 8 muscles.

**Language:**
I can describe how my workout helps strengthen at least 8 skeletal muscles using at least 4 key vocabulary terms.

**National Health Standards:**
4.1.1.

**MN CCR Anchor Standards:**
R1, R2, R9, W9, W10, SL1, SL7, L1

**Mentor Texts/Online Resources**
* Why Sitting is Bad for You Video
* Kidshealth.org: The Muscular System Video
* The Skeletal and Muscular Systems: How can I Stand on My Head-Sue Barraclough
* Look Inside: Your Skeleton and Muscles (Time for Kids)- Ben Williams
* What Happens when you Move (How Your Body Works)– Jacqui Bailey

**Modifications:**
* Students who are just learning to write in English could be given the labeled diagram and simply highlight the muscles.
* This activity could be done with a partner to provide more opportunity for oral language practice and support as well.
* Students can point to the muscles that their workout emphasizes instead of explaining how

**Group work/Partner Options:**
* Students can work in small groups or with a partner to create a workout that helps strengthen at least 8 skeletal muscles.

**Share Out:**
* How can knowledge of the skeletal system help me stay active?
* How many hours do I spend sitting? How long do I spend being active?
* Which muscles do my workout strengthen? How?

**Journaling Opportunities**
* Draw a picture/use worksheet of the human body and label the muscles you use during basketball
* How could I add more movement to my day?
Basketball and Muscular System Diagrams

- Chest
- Deltoid
- Bicep
- Abs
- Obliques
- Adductor
- Quadriceps
- Hamstring
- Shin
- Calf
- Glutes
- Triceps
- Latissimus Dorsi
- Supraspinatus
- Infraspinatus
- Trapezius
- Spine
- Rotator Cuff
- Hip Adductors
- Hip Abductors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities: Soccer</th>
<th>Needed Materials:</th>
<th>Essential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3 Soccer balls (each filled with different amounts of air) | Tape measure/ yardstick | *How can we describe how a ball moves?*  
|                   | Calculator       | *How can we change the movement of a ball?*  
|                   | Journal          |                                   
|                   | Pencil           |                                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ~This lesson will help students better understand the forces around them and how to change the motion of objects.  
| ~Before beginning the experiment, review the key vocabulary, discuss different ways a ball could move (bounce, throw, curve, arch, etc.), and read a mentor text to introduce students to the concepts that will be covered including how to find the average.  
| ~Divide students into groups of 5-6 and assign each a role: kicker, measurer, recorders (the kicker should stay the same for every kick/ball to keep the force somewhat constant)  
| ~ Kick the ball three times and record the distance. Pass the ball to the next group. While waiting for another ball, find and record the average of the distance then describe the motion of the ball (did it arch, curve, go straight, etc.).  
| ~Once all three balls have been kicked compare the distances and motions they traveled |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Vocabulary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gravity, force, motion, position, mass, friction, average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Content:** I can use scientific terms to describe what happens when you change the amount of air in a ball and kick it.  
| **Language:** I can compare the different ways a ball moves using comparative language (similar to, faster, longer, etc.).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MN Standards: Physical Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.2.2.1.1.; 2.2.2.1.2.; 2.2.2.2.1.; 2.2.2.2.2.  
| 5.2.2.1.1.; 5.2.2.1.2.; 5.2.2.1.3. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MN CCR Anchor Standards:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1, R2, R7, W9, W10, SL1, L2, L6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifications:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Each group of students could receive a mentor text based on reading level. Then one student from each group would join a new group and share their new learning to compare texts.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Move It-Jamie A. Schroeder  
| *Forces and Motion at the Playground-Stella Graham  
| *The Extreme Zone: Forces and Motion - Paul Mason  
| *Changing Direction-Natalie Hyde |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group work/Partner Options:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*3 groups can be conducting this experiment at a time (each with different pressured ball) while the remaining 2-3 groups can be recording observations/making predictions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share Out:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| * How can we describe how a ball moves?  
| *How can we change the movement of a ball?  
| *What else impacted how far the ball went (gravity, friction) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journaling Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Make a graph to show the different distances the ball traveled  
| *How did the ball travel with low pressure? Medium pressure? High pressure?  
| *Draw a picture of the different ways the ball traveled (curved, straight...)  
| *Collect journals today to give formative feedback |
Lesson Four: Nutrition Labels Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities: Lifetime Sugar Lesson</th>
<th>Needed Materials:</th>
<th>Essential Question:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PowerPoint</td>
<td>*How does a nutrition label help us make healthier choices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence Starters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unifix Cubes (Sugar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutrition Label game cards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stopwatch/Cellphone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal and Pencil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Essential Question:**
*How does a nutrition label help us make healthier choices?*

**Overview:**
~This lesson could either be a preview or wrap up of the Lifetime Fitness lesson on sugar and teaches students how to understand nutrition labels. Because this lesson is discussion based, use it as an opportunity to practice discussion etiquette.

~To begin, show PowerPoint of “healthy” and unhealthy snacks and have students sort them
~After a preliminary sort, discuss how one way to find out is to look at the nutrition label (PowerPoint to cover calories, grams, serving size, and daily recommendations)

~Tie the lesson to the Lifetime fitness lesson by showing the “Sugary Truth” video and explaining that sugar can have a huge impact on our bodies and even our brains
~Go back to the “healthy” and unhealthy snacks that the students sorted, go over nutrition labels, and measure in cubes how much sugar is in even the healthy snacks to resort. Discuss that best bet is unboxed food like fruits and vegetables
~If time you could discuss salt and/or fat content as well or play the nutrition label game
~GROUP GAME: Spread label cards around room/outside (put the same card in the same area so there should be 5 stations). Call out a nutrition component (such as sugar). Students must race (crawl, hop, skip, jump, etc.) to each of the five stations and do that many activities such as push-ups, crunches, or jumping jacks. Each station/card could be a different physical activity. Time how long it takes everyone to complete all 5 stations.

**Key Vocabulary:**
recommendation, nutrition label, serving size, addictive, calorie, grams, evaluate

**Objectives**

**Content:** I can read a nutrition label to find out if a food is good for me.

**Language:** I can evaluate nutrition labels and describe why a food is healthy or not healthy.

**National Health Standards:**
2.8.1.; 3.7.2.; 4.5.1.; 4.3.1.

**MN CCR Anchor Standards:**
R1, W10, SL1, SL7

**Mentor Texts/Online Resources:**
*Sugary Truth Video*
*Food Label Article*

**Modifications:**
*Use the closed captions during the “Sugary Truth” video or play twice with focus

**Journaling Opportunities**
*Make a T-chart of healthy and unhealthy snacks
*How do you know if something is healthy or unhealthy?
*What are your favorite sugary snacks? What could you eat instead?

**Group work/Activity Options:**
*Make measuring the sugar with cubes a jigsaw activity where each group is responsible for finding the sugar in a snack and sharing it out
*Nutrition Label Game

**Share Out:**
*How does a nutrition label help us make healthier choices?
*Were you surprised by the amount of sugar in the snacks? In what way?
*Use linked sentence starters for discussion
Lesson Four: Nutrition Labels Sentence Starters

**Sentence Starters**

*Nutrition labels help by ____________________________.

*I was surprised by ___________________ because _________________.

*In my opinion ____________________________.

*What do you think about ____________________________.

*Could you say more about ____________________________.

**Linked Sentence Starters**

*Nutrition labels help by ___________________ because _________________. Another way they help is ____________________________.

*I was surprised by ___________________ because _________________. Another reason was ____________________.

*I was not surprised by ___________________ because _________________. Another reason was ____________________.

*The book said ____________________________. I think ____________________________.

*You said ____________________________. I think ____________________________ because ____________________.
Lesson Four: Nutrition Labels Game Cards
Lesson Five: Positive Self-Image Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities: Yoga</th>
<th>Needed Materials:</th>
<th>Essential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Inventory</td>
<td>*How does knowing and liking myself help me be a good friend?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pencil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview:
~This lesson will help students understand the importance of not only affirming others, but affirming themselves as well.
~Begin by reading the book Have you Filled a Bucket Today. As a group, discuss different ways to fill others’ bucket. If time, you could also discuss how the book would have been different if a different character told the story.
~Explain that an important part of being a bucket-filler is recognizing that you have something to give others, whether it’s the ability to compliment them, make them something, or give them something.
~Tell students that a big part of being a bucket-filler is making sure you take time to fill your own bucket by acknowledging what you’re already good at and things that you are working on.
~Have students complete the personal inventory to get to know themselves. You could go over it as a class, or just have them fill it out. Discuss what role their family and the media play in how they view themselves.
~Students will then use this inventory to create a drawing, collage, or paragraph illustrating who they are and their unique talents. Once finished bring students together and have them share their written or drawn self-portraits with at least one other person and have volunteers share out to the class.

Key Vocabulary:
bucket filler, bucket dipper, affirmations, positive thinking

Objectives
Content: I can use positive words to affirm others and myself.
Language: I can accurately describe my strengths and weaknesses in order to better understand how I can affirm others and myself.

National Health Standards:
3.7.2.; 3.8.1.; 5.2.1

MN CCR Anchor Standards:
R2, R6, W4, W10, SL1, L1

Mentor Texts
*Have you Filled a Bucket Today – Carol McCloud

Modifications:
*Choose just one or two statements from each of the Personal Inventory categories
*Have the students work with a partner to answer the Personal Inventory statements

Group work/Partner Options:
* Students should share their self-portraits with at least one other person and volunteers can share out to the class

Share Out:
*How does knowing and liking myself help me be a good friend?
*Share out your self-portraits
*What is one thing you love about yourself?
*What is one thing you like about your partner?

Journaling Opportunities
*Glue/Write personal inventory in journal
*How does knowing and liking myself help me be a bucket-filler?
Lesson Five: Positive Self-Image Personal Inventory

**School**
1. I like ________________.
2. I do not like ________________.
3. I am good at ________________.
4. I am not good at ________________.

**Sports or Hobbies**
1. I like ________________.
2. I do not like ________________.
3. I am good at ________________.
4. I am not good at ________________.
5. I like being alone __________ being with others __________. (Check one.)

**Relationships with Friends and Adults (Check the statements that apply to you.)**
1. I am generally well liked: ____________.
2. I am generally not well liked: ____________.
3. I like having a group of friends: ________.
4. I like having only one or two friends: ________.
5. I am a leader: ____________.
6. I am a follower: ____________.

**Food Preferences**
1. I like to eat ________________.
2. I do not like to eat ________________.
3. I do ____ do not _____ eat a balanced diet. (Check one.)

**Relaxing**
1. I relax by ________________.
2. I like relaxing alone _____ or with other people ____. (Check one.)
3. After this activity, I always feel calm and peaceful. ________________.
Lesson Six: My Plate Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities: My Plate Lesson</th>
<th>Needed Materials:</th>
<th>Essential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Plate (color and B/W)</td>
<td>*What types of food should I eat to stay healthy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Timer</td>
<td>*How much of each type of food should I eat?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Plate Relay Cards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pencil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~This lesson will help students understand the different categories represented on the My Plate Chart and which foods belong in those categories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~To begin, have students share with a partner what they ate at their last meal and have them decide if it was a healthy meal. Brainstorm what makes a meal “healthy” or “balanced”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Introduce My Plate chart and have students state what they notice (half of plate is fruits and veggies, smallest portions are for dairy and protein, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~As a group, define what types of food fit into each category. Scattergories: Then have students get with a partner or in a group of three to list as many foods as they can for each category. Set a time and when the time is up have the groups share what they listed. Create a master list. If the teams have the same foods, cross them off. The team/partnership with the most remaining foods wins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Discuss that a variety of foods like this is good for you. To tie to the Lifetime lesson, mention that many vegetables, fruits, and proteins have healthy fats in them. Unlike the fats in things like ice cream and butter (saturated and trans fat), healthy fats (unsaturated fats) give your body energy and help your brain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Depending on time students can play a short online My Plate Game (see Online Resources) or a My Plate Relay: Divide students into teams and line them up at the starting line with a basket of the relay cards. Put a copy of the My Plate chart at the finish line. The students must draw a card from the basket do the activity to the finish line, put the card in the correct category, and run back to the group before the next team member can go. The first team to have the foods in the correct category wins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Vocabulary:</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>National Health Standards:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dairy, protein, fruits, vegetables, balanced, healthy fats (unsaturated), unhealthy fats (saturated fats and trans fat)</td>
<td>Content: I can categorize my meals based on the My Plate chart and make healthy eating choices.</td>
<td>2.8.1.; 3.7.2.; 4.5.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language: I can orally categorize foods based on the My Plate chart and explain healthy eating choices.</td>
<td>MN CCR Anchor Standards:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W4, W10, SL1, SL5, L1, L2, L3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifications:</th>
<th>Mentor Texts/Online Resources</th>
<th>Group work/Partner Options:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* My Plate Scattergories could be done with a partner or in a small group. Provide more examples to whole group if needed.</td>
<td>*My Plate Games:</td>
<td>* My Plate Scattergories could be done with a partner or in a small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Use the relay cards with pictures to help students just learning English in Scattergories</td>
<td>--“Blast Off”: Students create meals based on My Plate Chart</td>
<td>*My Plate Relay—students can be put into teams of 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--“Smash your Food”: Students smash different food to find fat (oil), salt, and sugar content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share Out:</th>
<th>Journaling Opportunities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*What types of food should I eat to stay healthy?</td>
<td>*Glue Student My Plate chart in journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*How much of each type of food should I eat?</td>
<td>*Have students log a well-balanced meal they had at home during the week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chart do I need to improve on?</td>
<td>*Have them log their lunches or dinners in their journal. Are they eating all food groups? If not, which ones do they skip? Does it change? *Collect journal towards end of the week to provide formative feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson Six: My Plate Visuals
### Lesson Six: My Plate Relay Cards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spin</th>
<th>Hop on two feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spinach</td>
<td>Grapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hop on one foot</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td>Eggplant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jump</td>
<td>Skip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrots</td>
<td>Whole-wheat bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spin</td>
<td>Gallop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaches</td>
<td>Milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip-toe</td>
<td>Crawl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grilled chicken</td>
<td>Egg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson Six: My Plate Relay Cards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Roll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>whole-wheat</td>
<td>sunflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasta</td>
<td>seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watermelon</td>
<td>run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low-fat</td>
<td>walk backwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yogurt</td>
<td>walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peanut butter</td>
<td>heel-to-toe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take, big</td>
<td>skip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red pepper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet potato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown rice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheelbarrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walk (with a friend)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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