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Abstract

As the number of English as an Additional Language (EAL) students increases in Saskatchewan schools, there is a need for language and content teachers to work collaboratively. This study describes the implementation of an action research project involving the researcher as an EAL teacher collaborating with three content teachers and another EAL teacher serving as a “critical friend” (Costa and Kallick, 1993). Teachers used the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2008) for structuring specialized instruction. Data included pre- and post-interviews, lesson plans and reflective journals. Grounded theory informed the theoretical framework and the data analysis. In order to reflect upon the progress of collaborative efforts, the Five Levels of Collaboration developed by Davison (2006) were used. Findings show that teachers developed professionally and were able to better support EAL students. One of the primary recommendations includes the necessity of administration to timetable common preparation times or teaching times. Establishing such supportive structures allows for collaborative partnerships to exist which provide teachers with greater opportunities to develop professionally for the purpose of better supporting EAL students.
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CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

All students, regardless of their first language or the number of languages they speak, should have opportunities to excel in academics and have a sense of belonging in the school community. These opportunities are important so they can eventually thrive as productive citizens in our increasingly global world. And yet schools are not always able, or perhaps willing, to support linguistically diverse students in the ways required. Therefore, it is necessary to explore ways to best support secondary students as they develop academically as well as linguistically. After living overseas, adapting to new cultures and learning a new language myself, I am familiar with the ways in which learning occurs in multilingual environments. My previous experiences and the communicative skills that I have developed have helped me to understand that flexibility, adaptability and mutual understanding are of utmost importance when teaching and learning alongside students for whom English is not a first language. Beyond the acquisition of skills and knowledge, it is important for all teachers, those who teach content classes as well as those who specialize in language teaching, to appreciate and draw on the linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds of students. By scaffolding language and content in this way, teachers are able to make subject matter more comprehensible (Cummins et al., 2010; Echevarria et al., 2008).

Collaborative teaching between content teachers (teachers of subject areas) and EAL (English as an Additional Language) teachers is one model which offers possibilities in terms of best supporting linguistically and culturally diverse students as it gives content teachers immediate access to knowledgeable support for the instruction of EAL students (Pawan & Ortloff, 2011). As an EAL teacher in Saskatchewan high
schools over the past seven years, I have often found myself working with colleagues as we endeavour to find better ways to educate students. When I began looking at the related literature, I discovered that my own practices and understandings were reflected in the research and particularly connected with the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Echevarria et al., 2008) and the Literacy Engagement framework (Cummins et al., 2012). In this study examining collaborative teaching practices, I incorporated these models to achieve my goal which was to create change rather than serve as a third-party observer to existing conditions. I chose to use action research methodology as it allowed for a teacher-researcher orientation in which I was able to become involved in the transformation process. In this way, I was able to fully immerse myself in collaborative relationships with colleagues which are essential for supporting the immediate and long-term needs of students from other countries (Fu, Houser & Huang, 2007; Pawan & Ortloff, 2011). The following questions guided me in conducting my action research study:

**Research Questions**

1. How do I understand my practice better as a result of collaborating with content teachers to provide sheltered instruction for EAL students in mainstream classrooms? How can I help content teachers to better support EAL students?

2. How do I attempt to overcome any potential barriers to collaboration? How do we maximize opportunities for collaboration to best support EAL students?
3. Which collaborative activities do we perceive to be most effective for teachers’ professional development and for EAL students’ academic success?

It is important to further explain my own background to understand why I feel so passionately about the importance of this type of collaborative work and the basis for my expertise in the field. I taught English as a Foreign Language in Taiwan at a private language school for four years prior to obtaining my education degree in Saskatchewan. From this experience, I was able to learn a great deal about language acquisition from a practical perspective. Upon returning to Canada, I obtained a degree in education specializing in elementary education. My first teaching job in Saskatchewan was as a grade five classroom teacher in a rural community in which I taught all subject areas less social studies. In that particular year, five students from China with limited English language skills had just arrived at the school and required additional language support. Because of my English teaching experience in Taiwan where I also studied Mandarin Chinese, the school administration asked me if I would like to teach EAL to the Chinese students. I gladly accepted their offer and spent an hour a day teaching English to these five students.

I applied the strategies I had learned overseas with these students, and was also consulted by my colleagues for EAL teaching strategies and advice. Teachers were at a loss with respect to how to teach the new students from China so we had many formal and informal conversations about how to best support them. It was a bit overwhelming as a first year teacher but I enjoyed sharing what I knew and the other classroom teachers were appreciative of the help and advice provided. This experience taught me the
importance of working together as teachers and coming together to support students. The following year, I moved to another rural school where I taught a mainstream grade six class without any EAL students yet this was also a rich experience as I learned that there are challenges with respect to learning language for many students whether they speak English as a first language or as an additional language.

The following year, I obtained a new position exclusively teaching English as an Additional Language at an urban secondary school to students from several different countries with varying educational backgrounds and a wide range of English language abilities. In this context, I taught both immigrants and refugees. Hearing their stories triggered my own personal growth as I came to appreciate how fortunate we are to live in Canada where we have a good education system and countless freedoms. I have been profoundly affected by many EAL students over the years because of their stories, resilience and gratitude. Their lives are truly humbling and inspirational. These experiences have motivated me to give back and advocate on their behalf. Working alongside these students is what has driven me to pursue more education and training in the field of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and what ultimately led to the motivation behind initiating this action research study. As an EAL teacher isolated at times within the confines of my own classroom, the level of assistance I can provide students is limited. By going beyond these walls and reaching out to my colleagues, I am able to further support EAL students to ensure that they are not only provided with appropriate instruction but also more compassion and understanding.

Since 2007, when I began teaching EAL at secondary schools, I have had opportunities to speak with content teachers but interactions have typically been informal
and student-specific. Opportunities to share strategies in a meaningful way over longer durations of time have been rare. According to de Jong and Harper (2005) and Echevarria et al. (2008), to implement effective instruction for EAL students, content teachers require additional knowledge and skills. However, there is no expectation by the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, or local school divisions for educators who work with students from other countries to receive any formal TESOL training. While collaboration allows for sharing of expertise, this form of teamwork seldom occurs. Franson (1999) describes the autonomous nature of EAL teachers based on interviews with content teachers as follows:

> Despite the generally held view that EAL teachers should be working collaboratively with their classroom-based colleagues, there is an impression from the interviews that the EAL teacher works relatively autonomously in the provision of support for the bilingual EAL pupils. (p. 66)

The autonomous nature of the EAL teacher which Franson describes compares with my own personal experiences where EAL students primarily become the concern of the language specialists and opportunities to work collaboratively to support content teachers are limited. Unfortunately, the result is that content teachers lack the understanding necessary to implement appropriate instructional practices effectively and, consequently, EAL students are deprived of an equitable education (Cummins et al., 2012).

One goal of this study was to address this gap in communication by developing positive collaborative relationships between EAL and content teachers to build a supportive culture with EAL students’ needs in mind. Further, the urgency of this kind of approach is evident with the number of EAL students in Saskatchewan schools
continuing to increase in correlation with the growing number of immigrants coming to
Saskatchewan each year. For example, the number of school-aged newcomers ranging
from 5-19 years old increased by 23% from 2009 to 2011 (Government of Saskatchewan,
2011) and these numbers correlate closely with the classroom composition at the school
in this study where approximately 20% of the students are from other countries. Students
at the school in this study originate from dozens of different linguistic backgrounds
including Mandarin Chinese, Urdu, and Arabic and the school provides for all levels of
language support for immigrant and refugee students from varied cultural, linguistic and
educational backgrounds. EAL teachers provide three types of courses for EAL students
which are locally-developed EAL credit courses, non-credit literacy classes, and tutorial
support periods. At the time the study was conducted, with the exception of locally
developed EAL courses and Grade 10 English, students were integrated into mainstream
classrooms to complete all other high school credit requirements.

Because students are attaining the majority of their high school credits in large
mainstream classrooms (courses with content teachers and native English speakers),
content teachers need to introduce language along with curriculum content (Creese, 2005)
to accommodate EAL students’ unique learning needs (de Jong & Harper, 2005).
However, most content teachers are unprepared to teach language (Franson, 1999; Pawan
& Ortloff, 2011) so collaborative efforts between EAL teachers such as myself and
content teachers are important and sheltered instruction (specialized teaching strategies
for learning English as an additional language) needs to be reliably implemented as
students perform significantly better academically when this occurs (Short, Echevarria, &
Richards-Tutor, 2011).
For teachers to be effective using the SIOP model of teaching in particular, it requires one to two years of support such as coaching, lesson planning, workshops, and other assistance (Short, Echevarria, & Richards-Tutor, 2011). In other words, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) professional development and changes in instructional practice take time and continued support. As a language specialist in the study, I was able to share knowledge based on my experiences as described but also theoretical knowledge acquired from graduate courses in TESOL including courses related to grammar instruction, writing skills and the general theory of second language acquisition. I have also completed the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol Virtual Institute (Pearson, 2015) associated with the SIOP model and used this as a basis for collaborative interactions.

With respect to my own language abilities and personal and professional background, I am a Canadian of European ancestry, English is my native language and I can speak Mandarin Chinese fluently and French at a basic level. During the nine month duration of this study beginning in October 2013 and concluding in June 2014, I taught a variety of classes to EAL students over two semesters including EAL Science, EAL Social, EAL Literacy and EAL Tutorial. I also co-taught a mainstream Science 10 course with one of the participants of this study and we were able to formalize a collaborative opportunity. With the exception of the Science 10 course which included both EAL students and native English speakers, all of my students were EAL students and varied in level from beginner to advanced abilities. Students ranged in age from 14 to 20 years old and came from numerous countries including China, Pakistan, Korea, Bangladesh, and the Philippines.
Finally, the motivation integral to any type of action research study is a certain passion which motivates one to act and pursue change based on the identification of an issue (Yendol-Hoppey & Dana 2008). Using this paradigm, the problem which existed at the study school was the lack of collaboration between EAL and content teachers and my intention was to narrow this gap to ensure that newcomers who require EAL support are provided with language learning opportunities in all classes. Collaborating with content teachers provided a way to share knowledge related to language acquisition such as sheltered instruction. Action research methodology was an effective approach to initiate collaborative relationships at the secondary school in the study with the intention of continuing with these interactions beyond the timeline of the study itself.

For the purpose of the study, I recruited four participants including three content teachers and one other EAL teacher. In this thesis, all teachers were given a pseudonym to ensure confidentiality. Two of the content teachers were secondary English teachers and these included Rebecca who teaches Grade 12 English courses and Kayla who primarily teaches Grade 10 English. The other content teacher was Scott who teaches science courses to students in Grades 10 and 11. The EAL teacher in the study was Beth who served as a “critical friend” (Costa and Kallick, 1993) and taught both language-based courses to EAL students, and supported EAL students in a tutorial class. As a result of my collaborative interactions with each of the participants, I learned a great deal and was appreciative of the time, effort and commitment that each teacher contributed to this study.

In the next chapter, I will review the considerable amount of research supporting the importance of teacher collaboration for EAL students (Arkoudis, 2003; Creese, 2006;
Davison, 2006; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010; Fu, Houser, & Huang, 2007; He, Prater & Steed, 2011; Peercy & Martin-Beltran, 2012) as well as several studies citing barriers to productive collaborative relationships between EAL and content teachers (Arkoudis, 2003; Creese, 2002; Dellicarpini, 2009; Franson, 1999; Gleson, 2012; Leonard & Leonard, 2003). An explanation and analysis of these studies will be provided followed by a section explaining teachers’ perspectives towards collaborating with EAL teachers as well as their views of related professional development (Creese, 2005; Franson, 1999; Harper & de Jong, 2009; Reeves, 2005). The final section of the literature review chapter will feature an explanation of instructional models intended for supporting EAL students including the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Echevarria et al., 2008), the Literacy Engagement Framework (Cummins et al., 2012), and the Conceptual Framework for Integrating Content and Language in Foreign/Second Language Classrooms (Snow et al., 1989).
CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW

An extensive amount of literature exists concerning teacher collaboration for the purpose of supporting students who are learning English as an additional language. I was able to relate to and identify with many of the research studies and the situations described in each. In many circumstances, I could envision myself in the role of the author and personally connected with the research which brought an authenticity to the process. Most studies I encountered originated in the United States and England. Research in the Canadian context was less common but each of the studies was relatable and relevant to my own teaching context. Four major themes were identified in the body of literature including the importance of collaboration, barriers to collaboration, content teachers’ perspectives towards EAL students and towards TESOL professional development, and models of collaboration for sheltered instruction. The first section provides a discussion regarding the benefits of teacher collaboration and how this research informed my study.

Importance of Collaboration

Collaboration is important for all teachers but even more so for EAL teachers and content teachers as they both provide specific expertise in supporting EAL students. Peercy and Martin-Beltran (2012) examined the inclusion of EAL teachers in the mainstream classroom and found that “when pairs envisioned their work as collaborative, they created a synergy that constructed a broader network of resources for ELLs [English Language Learners] by bringing together more people, materials, ideas, and abilities than either teacher was able to generate alone” (p. 657). When teachers bring their expertise to
a teaching partnership, they are able to build upon the strengths of each team member to provide effective instruction for students.

Creese (2006) explored the dynamics of collaborative relationships by conducting an ethnographic study which looked at the collaboration of an EAL teacher and a secondary geography teacher. She suggested that different professional pressures exist and that these result in somewhat different roles. For example, the content teacher is responsible for ensuring that students learn content and meet the required outcomes while the EAL teacher seeks to ensure that metalinguistic needs are being met. The implication of this research for my study is to acknowledge that content and language teachers enter into collaborative teaching relationships with relevant specialized knowledge and this may lead to differing responsibilities.

While varying roles may exist, Creese (2006) recommends that, “bilingual children have access to pedagogies that allow them to negotiate meaning in their classroom interactions and to the full range of linguistic functions rather than predominantly the referential” (p. 461). In other words, rather than teachers working autonomously, creating a collaborative team in which expertise can be shared and built upon is advantageous. In conducting this study, my goal was to create this type of collaborative team in order to meet the needs of EAL students in the school. Based on these studies, a legitimate rationale exists for collaboration between EAL and content teachers from a theoretical perspective. Next, more specific examples presenting the benefits of collaboration will be identified.
Fu et al. (2007) performed a study in which an EAL teacher and content teacher collaborated at a primary school in New York to help EAL students develop literacy skills. The authors described several specific benefits of collaboration as a result of the teaching partnership. The teachers worked together collaboratively by observing each other’s teaching, planning joint lessons, assessing students’ progress and setting goals. Several observations were made by both teachers as a result of the study. First, after the content teacher observed the language teacher, she realized that EAL students behaved differently in a sheltered instruction classroom where lessons were taught at the students’ level. The content teacher in the study desired to have a similar relationship with EAL students in her own classroom. This perspective was important to contemplate as it demonstrates that students might behave differently with language and content teachers. In terms of collaborative teaching, planning for the empowerment of students and the establishment of a welcoming classroom environment are important considerations.

The teachers in Fu et al.’s (2007) study collaborated for over a year, and as a result, the teachers felt that their shared EAL students gained confidence and were more willing to take risks in the mainstream classroom. They also benefited from the teachers’ shared planning as the educators worked together to set common goals and, as a result, their EAL students were publishing and producing writing of higher quality than in prior years. These teachers’ experiences contributed to my understanding that collaborative teaching should involve joint planning and the development of common goals. If these occur, then students’ academic success could improve as a result which is a worthwhile goal.
Not only did students benefit from the collaborative relationship between the teachers, but the teachers also discovered that they learned a great deal about teaching and about themselves as teachers. Fu et al. (2007) further explains that the teachers previously assigned blame to their counterparts for EAL students' slow literacy and language development. However, after participating in the collaborative project, both teachers learned to appreciate how committed the other was in trying to help their students and further recognized the expertise that each was able to contribute to the joint effort. The teachers in the study were both extremely committed to supporting EAL students’ academic success and spent lunch hours and additional time after school to find common planning time. They possessed specific collaboration skills such as responsiveness and negotiation as well as knowledge of facilitating language learning processes. This particular research study raised my awareness towards the possibility that content and language teachers might have preconceptions about the other. Furthermore, it raised the notion that committed teachers might have to find time to work together outside of the school day when time is not readily available. Finally, it specified that collaboration itself requires specialized competencies such as effective communication skills in addition to the content knowledge or language instruction expertise which research participants already possessed.

The concept that collaborative skills are important as teachers instil curricular knowledge into a new language is common in the literature. Creese (2006) stressed that, “Facilitative talk is a pedagogic skill of great importance in multilingual classrooms. It needs to sit equally alongside other dominant classroom discourses, such as transmission of subject knowledge” (p. 451). This notion of facilitative talk was important to reflect
upon in conducting my study as communication and negotiation skills would be an essential factor in collaborative interactions. As a researcher-participant, I need be cognizant of the way I related to colleagues. It is important to understand that effective skills in collaboration, leadership and critical reflection are necessary in addition to possessing knowledge about language and culture (He, Prater, & Steed, 2011).

Arkoudis (2003) expands upon this concept by noting that policies assume that EAL teachers have the authority to influence content teachers in curriculum planning. She refers to a transcript of a planning conversation between an EAL teacher and a content teacher in Australia. She noted that content teachers come into collaborative relationships with their own prejudices and biases such as a belief that the use of sheltered instruction teaching methods results in a less demanding curriculum. Hence, Arkoudis (2003) emphasizes the importance of pedagogical relations between teachers and urges educators to remain open to constant negotiation where understandings emerge as they develop. This study raised my awareness of the possibility that content teachers might perceive that sheltered instruction is less rigorous; thus, collaborative efforts should reflect the high expectations desired by content teachers.

The teachers in this study all possess a significant amount of knowledge in their respective areas yet the literature indicates that effective collaborative relationships are about more than shared knowledge and teachers must also exhibit effective communication and facilitation skills. To reflect upon whether teachers are working together effectively and exhibiting the skills necessary for effective partnerships, it is useful to have a frame of reference to evaluate and reflect upon the success of the collaborative effort. Davison (2006) developed a framework with collaborative
descriptors in the form of a continuum describing the effectiveness of EAL and content teachers’ partnerships (See Appendix A). At the highest level of collaboration, described as “creative co-construction”, teachers experience many benefits such as positive attitudes towards partnerships and a feeling of normalization towards collaboration. Also at the highest level, practices such as action research and critical reflection become routine practice and are often accompanied by extensive reading to further understand theoretical and practical concepts. Teachers may even choose to formally receive training in the other’s area of interest. Conflicts are considered inevitable and are accepted and embraced as a way in which to develop greater understandings (Davison, 2006).

Davison’s levels of collaboration served a dual purpose in my research study. First and foremost, the descriptors at each level provide a tangible way to view the varying levels of effective collaboration for myself and participants. Second, for myself as the researcher, they provided a useful way to categorize each participant’s collaborative partnership and not only define which level had been attained but also consider the reasons for each result. Evidently, the rationale for collaborating is undisputable yet barriers exist which prevent such relationships from flourishing. As such, these obstacles must be discussed and addressed to allow for the positive aspects of collaboration to transpire.

**Potential Barriers to Collaboration**

DelliCarpini (2009) identifies several barriers to collaboration in a study which examined the collaborative experiences between EAL and content teachers who worked together in creating thematic units on a piece of literature. The goals of the study were to
create supervised, structured opportunities for teachers to discuss the issues of EAL students in mainstream classrooms, to problem solve, and to create a literature unit that would be appropriate for an EAL or mainstream classroom. Through interviews, focus groups, and reflective journals, the following barriers were identified: (1) lack of time, (2) a culture of isolation, (3) teacher positioning with respect to power relationships, (4) EAL teachers’ lack of content knowledge and (5) lack of experience or preparedness for collaboration (DelliCarpini, 2009). These barriers are important to consider and discuss when setting norms with research participants at initial meetings to try to alleviate any difficulties they may present.

Several other researchers have cited the same barriers to collaboration between EAL and content teachers. For instance, Franson (1999) conducted interviews with content teachers in England and drew comparable conclusions with respect to the lack of time available for teachers to collaborate. Participants in the study stated that planning time for collaboration was limited as teachers already had busy and demanding schedules. As such, teachers were unable to develop positive working relationships necessary for collaborating effectively. Based on these studies, I realized that finding time to collaborate with study participants might be challenging.

Creese (2002), also reported a difficulty in collaborative efforts with respect to teacher positioning. She learned that EAL teachers who worked directly in mainstream classrooms were viewed in a support role rather than as equal teaching partners. Furthermore, content teachers perceived EAL teachers as having an easier job since they were supporting a small number of students and were believed to be simplifying the curricular content. Content teachers should be encouraged to go beyond the referential
and recognize the importance of metalinguistic support for all students. In this study, I would have an opportunity to demonstrate how valuable the complex roles of the EAL teacher were as a mediator, specialist, and facilitator (Gleeson, 2012).

A similar observation regarding imbalances in power relations was made by Arkoudis (2003) who explored the communicative predispositions between a secondary science teacher and an EAL teacher, both of whom had many years of teaching experience. The EAL teacher asked the majority of the questions allowing the content teacher to take ownership over the subject curriculum. Arkoudis suggests that the teachers were unable to achieve equality because of their differing power relations within the secondary school context. By questioning and deferring to the content teacher, the EAL specialist was able to sustain the conversation and “attempt to gain some epistemological authority in their joint planning” (p. 171). In this way, the EAL teacher experiences some success by at least having a conversation about science and language. This research provides a good perspective as it shows that EAL teachers can make a difference by listening and contributing in conversations with teacher participants. The goal of my study was not to strive for equitable status or to concern myself with power relations. The focus was to embrace opportunities to engage in meaningful pedagogical discussions.

While having opportunities to communicate is important as Arkoudis suggests, accepting a marginal level of collaboration inherent with unequal power relations will not result in long-term productive teaching relationships. As a result of her observations, Arkoudis stresses that inclusion of EAL students in mainstream classes requires an emphasis on pedagogical relations. Therefore, new practices are recommended to better
facilitate productive dialogue to support EAL students whereby teachers must put aside their own prejudices and be open to creating a new paradigm in which to collaborate. Recognizing these inherent prejudices is an important stage when engaging in a collaborative process. Again, awareness of the dynamics of power relations is important in my study but does not represent the primary focus. The concept of equitable relationships connects back to Davison’s Levels of Collaboration for Teaching Partnerships where a mutual level of respect is necessary for successful collaboration.

Additionally, Davison (2006) maintains that successful collaboration can occur between teachers with different statuses and roles when they are able to negotiate either explicitly or implicitly and develop a sustainable partnership. That is, teachers’ dispositions and communicative discourses are of utmost importance in determining the overall effectiveness of collaborative efforts. Discrepancies in power relations and positioning are not only detrimental to teachers’ collaborative efforts but they also affect students’ opportunities to learn (Gleeson, 2012). Undoubtedly, teachers want to provide the best learning experiences possible for all students but the responsibility for EAL students is often assigned solely to EAL teachers to the detriment of all involved (Gleeson, 2012). Therefore, teacher participants in the study including myself are responsible for how we choose to approach collaboration and our behaviour will largely impact the effectiveness of collaboration rather than any potentially inherent power differentials.

With respect to discrepancies in positioning, Creese (2002) cautions that “associating certain teachers with certain groups of pupils and not others does little to promote the inclusion and valuing of different language and ethnicities in multicultural
and linguistically diverse classrooms” (p. 607). When EAL students are attributed to EAL teachers, the same sense of belonging with content teachers is lacking. Dove and Honigsfeld (2010) describe how various co-teaching models encourage teachers to not only share physical space but also responsibility for the students. In other words, “‘my students’ and ‘your students’ turn into ‘our students’” (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010, p. 9). The concept of “our students” helped me to create a more comprehensive vision for my work with research participants. That is, content and language teachers would strive to lessen the divide between the educational experiences of EAL students and native English speakers.

Consistent in the research is the idea that implementing a collaborative initiative requires careful planning to garner support from teachers who are willing to participate to work towards building new partnerships. Dove and Honigsfeld (2010) make several recommendations for teacher leaders to consider with respect to collaborating. They suggest that teachers should start small, have realistic expectations of colleagues, be creative in finding time to plan together and consider means of electronic communication. In time, teachers can consider more collaborative planning initiatives such as joint planning or parallel teaching. Finally, they should, “advocate for establishing collaborative teaching practices as an accepted form of professional development. (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010, p.19). Teachers in this study, therefore, should understand that it takes time to develop effective collaborative relationships. Furthermore, we must support teacher leaders in collaborative teaching practices to work towards the formalization of teaching partnerships because collaborative activities which are formalized have a better chance of becoming permanent (Pawan & Ortloff, 2011). The concept that collaboration
must be formalized supports the goal of my action research study where content teachers and language teachers jointly plan sheltered instruction on a long-term basis.

How can administrators in particular overcome these barriers to collaboration? Leonard and Leonard (2003) conducted a study on teacher collaboration and elicited responses from teachers about how administrators can support collaboration. Recommendations that may help overcome barriers at the division-level are collaboration training for teachers and provision of substitute teachers to allow teachers the time required for shared planning. At the school-level, administrators can help arrange common planning time, increase opportunities for collaboration, and better utilize professional development time (Leonard & Leonard, 2003). This literature highlights the importance of administrative decisions regarding teacher time allocation and the effect this has on a teachers’ ability to collaborate.

School administration is interested in ensuring the success of all students which aligns with the intention of my research study. He et al. (2011) found that student performance data demonstrated the effectiveness and impact of a professional development program with a collaborative design. Implications from that study were drawn to further advance collaboration between EAL and content teachers for the improved achievement of EAL students.

**Content Teachers’ Perceptions of EAL Students and TESOL Training**

Thus far, I have examined literature which emphasizes the importance of collaboration between content teachers and EAL teachers and potential barriers thereof. Now, I will review literature that explores content teachers’ perceptions towards teaching
EAL students, as well as their attitudes towards acquiring TESOL professional
development.

Franson (1999) explored content teachers’ perspectives by conducting interviews
with three content teachers who shared their knowledge of and attitudes towards EAL
students. The interviews included questions about the initial assessment and
identification of student needs, pedagogical approaches with EAL students, collaboration
with EAL teachers, professional knowledge, and issues regarding the presence of EAL
students in the mainstream classroom. First, with respect to the initial assessment
procedures, none of the teachers were able to define the procedures for assessment of a
new EAL student. This realization raised my awareness to the possibility that content
teachers in my study might also be unaware of this type of data. Second, when asked
about their pedagogical approaches to teaching EAL students, the teachers suggested that
they expected the students to be accommodated within their regular planning with some
slight modifications. To support this practice, they offered the rationale that EAL
students would feel excluded if they provided too many modifications in the subject
content. Inferences for my study are that research participants might be apprehensive to
make significant changes to teaching practices and I may need to provide participants
with reassurance that adapting materials should not result in the exclusion of any students.
In fact, providing subject matter which is comprehensible will create the opposite effect
and permit EAL students to more fully participate in the class.

Franson (1999) also reported that when language activities are differentiated, EAL
students are typically grouped with the lower ability group where writing tasks are
performed with more structured supports. When questioned about specific strategies
taken to respond to the needs of multilingual EAL students, the teachers described strategies that reflected generally accepted teaching practices rather than any evidence to demonstrate an understanding of sheltered instruction. Furthermore, the teachers all stated that there were no commonly agreed upon approaches used to teach EAL students and implied that changing teaching practices was too challenging and time consuming. The implication of Franson’s findings for my study is both practical and theoretical. That is, teacher participants might have questions about how to group students effectively. With respect to the non-differentiation between generally accepted teaching practices and sheltered instruction, the teacher participants in my study may hold similar beliefs and this is important to consider in our interactions. It provides me with the impetus to substantiate how effective sheltered instruction is planned and delivered. The next topic discussed in Franson’s study was content teachers’ thoughts on collaborating with the EAL teacher. The teachers in this study had limited EAL teacher support and reported that when they did find time to work together; planning was inefficient as teachers’ ideas conflicted at times. The implications for my study are that it is necessary to be receptive to others’ ideas and suggestions and to maintain honest and open communication to address differing viewpoints.

Finally, teachers in Franson’s study made several noteworthy suggestions for what they believed was most necessary for supporting EAL students in their classrooms. These recommendations included the following: additional materials, more teaching support, smaller class sizes, and language-specific teaching. Franson noticed and remarked upon the teachers’ lack of reference to appropriate assessment materials, a language-specific curriculum, or knowledge of EAL students’ initial assessment data.
According to Franson, the comments and omissions suggested that teachers did not possess the knowledge to discuss issues regarding EAL students and had accepted a singular model of support which limited the conversations. Franson (1999) resolved that, “[I]t would also seem that there continues to be an expectation that the EAL teacher will take a leading role in responding to the needs of the EAL learner” (p. 67). There must be a change in viewpoint among both content and EAL teachers to redefine our roles as professionals in order to collaborate effectively to support EAL students. This transformation involves a shift in our existing paradigms which requires both a willingness to change and ongoing support for that change from administration. The observation by Franson that teachers lacked the specialized knowledge to appropriately discuss EAL students was interesting. Similar to Franson’s study, my study involves three content teachers but I also included an EAL teacher which allowed for comparisons between participants based on expertise.

Reeves (2006) explored teachers’ attitudes with respect to the inclusion of EAL students in the mainstream classroom. In contrast to Franson’s qualitative study, Reeves took a quantitative approach using a survey completed by 279 content teachers in the US. The survey explored four categories of secondary teacher attitudes including the following: “(a) ELL inclusion, (b) coursework modification for EAL students, (c) professional development for working with EAL students, and (d) perceptions of language and learning” (Reeves, 2006, p. 131). For “ELL inclusion”, the data showed that teachers generally felt positive about welcoming students from other countries into their classrooms. However, the researcher found that when asked about more specific elements of inclusion such as English proficiency, benefit to all students and time to
accommodate EAL students, teachers’ responses were less favourable. Reeves (2006) differentiated between various modifications in the survey and discovered that content teachers were more likely to feel positive about making certain modifications. For example, they were willing to allow additional time but were opposed to changes perceived as impacting the integrity of the curriculum such as reducing or simplifying coursework.

Equitable instruction means expectations for EAL students must be the same as those for proficient English speakers and that EAL students must be granted equivalent access to the curriculum (Reeves, 2006). It is important to consider the attitudes and perceptions of teacher participants in my study as they could affect our collaborative interactions specifically with respect to types of teaching or learning adaptations. Furthermore, teacher participants in my study need to ensure that all students are given equivalent opportunities to access curricular content. To ensure this is possible, Reeves (2009) suggests using “linguistically appropriate instructional models” such as the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) developed by Echevarria et al. (2008). This model focuses on maintaining grade-level content while building both academic and language proficiency. SIOP is designed to be used in mainstream classrooms with both EAL students and native English speakers. As such, it would provide a useful model for collaborative planning in this study.

Reeves (2006) cautioned that implementing this type of instructional model with content teachers could be problematic considering the teachers she surveyed perceived that while they did not have adequate TESOL training, they lacked an interest in receiving relevant professional development. Citing various research, Reeves (2006)
suggested three possible reasons for this finding. One was that content teachers believe that EAL teachers are responsible for EAL students, another is that teachers become cynical towards professional development as a whole; and therefore, any professional development initiative must be accompanied with a long-term commitment from administration. A final reason is that some teachers do not believe that any professional development is needed and essentially consider differentiated instruction for EAL students as inappropriate or ineffective.

Despite the fact that teachers felt they did not require additional training, Reeves found that content teachers were in agreement with respect to how an additional language is acquired. For example, many teachers thought that two years should be sufficient to become fluent in English when research has shown that full proficiency may take more than seven years (Cummins, 1979). Additionally, survey respondents believed that EAL students should avoid using their first language while learning English in school. Reeves general findings were that content teachers want to welcome EAL students in their classrooms but struggle with how to best do this. She encourages further research studies to explore teacher attitudes and to also examine teacher education and professional development initiatives which would contribute to more successful inclusion of EAL students. These recommendations helped me to develop more focus on the aspects mentioned such as teacher perceptions, attitudes, training and models to support student learning.

In a similar study regarding teachers’ perceptions, Creese (2005) made reference to content teachers’ perspectives based on observations and interviews with 26 teachers (12 EAL and 14 content-area) in three linguistically diverse secondary schools in England.
She observed that content teachers considered additional EAL materials as irrelevant even when carefully planned by EAL teachers. She believed this attitude existed because the school structures and systems in place did not allow for opportunities for teachers to participate in joint planning. While collaborative activities have occurred at the schools in this study (e.g. co-teaching, parallel teaching), the opportunities lacked long-term vision or planning. Creese (2005) states that schools lack models of sheltered instruction and are slow to consider the possibilities of combining content with language curriculum in the classroom. A lack of long-term planning is an issue in the system in which I conducted my study. Administrators are struggling to find the best way to accommodate the increasing number of EAL students and teachers are uncertain how to teach language to convey meaning and many do not possess the knowledge required to teach the concepts.

Considering this lack of knowledge, it is important to consider content teachers’ attitudes towards acquiring TESOL professional development. It is interesting to examine the situation in Florida where the state government mandated TESOL professional development with the underlying assumption that teaching EAL students required specialized knowledge and skills. The initiative received varied responses with some districts viewing the mandate as an opportunity while others “adopted a compliance mentality” (Harper & de Jong, 2009, p. 142). In the schools where training was viewed with a compliance attitude, EAL teachers found themselves conducting workshops after school and on weekends with disgruntled content teacher colleagues. In response, the EAL teachers sought ways to simplify the content knowledge, and inadvertently led
content teachers to conclude that EAL teaching does not require specialized expertise based on the basic workshops.

To avoid making the same mistakes with colleagues by simplifying, overgeneralizing and essentially mollifying colleagues, this is an important case study to reflect upon in conducting my research. Harper and de Jong (2009) recommend finding “more sophisticated approaches to integrating language and content instruction” (p. 147) and stress that EAL students must be fully included in mainstream classrooms (rather than merely being physically present) with support from specialist EAL teachers and content teachers (Harper & de Jong, 2009). In order for such collaborative interactions to exist, administrative support is essential so that teachers have the time and resources to implement well-planned instruction integrating both language and content.

**Ways in Which Administrators can Promote Collaboration**

First, administrators need to support collaboration as this assistance results in more positive attitudes towards participation in teaching partnerships (York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). While informal collective activities are effective, collaborative activities that are formalized have a better chance of becoming long-lasting (Wehman, 1992). Additionally, collaboration needs to be formalized with appropriate coordination and communication mechanisms in place. For example, collaboration may be impeded if administration takes a top-down approach rather than making decisions by consensus (Pawan & Ortloff, 2011). While some barriers have been identified, different groups of professionals experience collaboration in unlike ways and may require customized professional development to support their unique situations (Pawan & Ortloff, 2011).
The following recommendations are presented for teachers, administrators, and school districts to address job-embedded professional development needs. A major responsibility of administrators must be to advocate for the importance of language learning within the context of mainstream classrooms. Langman (2003) emphasizes the importance of basing such initiatives on knowledgeable linguistic theory of second language acquisition to avoid uniformed decision-making that could actually limit EAL students’ academic success. This finding came from a case study of a principal who decided to train all the teachers in her school in TESOL strategies; and, subsequently, placed all EAL students into mainstream classrooms with the presumption that 12-15 hours of related training was sufficient in ensuring quality sheltered instruction was being taught by content teachers. The principal based her plan on personal theories about second language acquisition rather than well-researched linguistic theories.

Langman (2003) proposes that the results of her case study should serve as a reminder to EAL teachers to advocate for EAL students, and serve as the experts to inform educational leaders on accurate second language acquisition theories and EAL teaching methods. Likewise, content teachers need to understand cultural influences, the impact of policy and programs for requesting resources, and how to involve EAL parents in their students’ education (Newman et al., 2010). When teachers have opportunities to work together, they can decide which practices can serve as a foundation for collaboration with colleagues. This research provided me with the viewpoint that language teachers have a responsibility greater than providing expert advice and can serve as an advocate for EAL students. Content teachers, on the other hand, provided with opportunities to learn more about EAL related topics can become empowered when
meeting the unique needs of EAL students. Understandably, change takes time and my action research project will primarily serve as a starting point for collaborative efforts at the school in the study.

**Models of Collaboration for Sheltered Instruction**

For transformation to take place, referring to the research and resources available to guide collaborative activities for teachers of EAL students is valuable. In this section, I describe in detail three models which serve as frameworks for collaboration including the Conceptual Framework for Integrating Content and Language in Foreign/Second Language Classrooms (Snow et al., 1989), the Literacy Engagement Framework (Cummins et al., 2012), and the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Echevarria et al., 2008).

First, the Conceptual Framework for Integrating Content and Language in Foreign/Second Language Classrooms (Snow et al., 1989) is the only model which focuses primarily on the importance of integrating content and language through a collaborative lens. This model defines different types of academic language required by EAL students in detail and provides useful terminology. Second, the Literacy Engagement Framework, an important model to consider as it was developed from a Canadian perspective, presents a model from a social justice perspective in which students’ backgrounds and identities must be recognized and power relations are considered. Finally, the SIOP Model is a comprehensive model of instruction which will be used because of its current relevance and practical applications for collaboration.

Snow et al. (1989) proposes a conceptual framework for integrating language and content in various instructional settings including the mainstream classroom and sheltered
instruction classroom. Their model recommends that language and content teachers work together to set objectives for learning while taking the following into consideration: “(a) content-obligatory language (language essential to understanding of content material) and (b) content-compatible language (language that can be taught naturally with the context of a particular subject matter and that students required additional practice with)” (Snow et al., 1989, p. 201). In this model, both EAL and content teachers maintain their respective priorities, though areas of responsibility are expanded as teachers work collaboratively to increase language learning opportunities for EAL students. For example, a content teacher collaborating with an EAL teacher would first identify the content to be taught and discuss which ideas will be new for all students as compared with those concepts that will only be new for EAL students. Next, they identify the linguistic needs unique to EAL students and create materials, manipulatives and appropriate activities to provide opportunities for students to relate language to curricular objectives.

As a result of these discussions, the EAL teacher can help to facilitate the tasks of the content teacher, which might include implementation of pre-reading strategies, vocabulary development, paraphrasing, and oral examples. In this model, Snow et al. (1989) state that, “the content determines the language objectives” (p. 209). Content teachers share in the planning with respect to ensuring that content is accessible to all students regardless of limited language skills and by planning for and implementing strategies to address language needs through content-compatible language. Several implications can be made related to the integration of language and content teaching. Snow et al. (1989) state that, “ESL/foreign language teachers and content teachers must
They refer to this collaboration as a reciprocal relationship in which the language instructor may consult with content teachers about what is being taught, with special attention given to any content that requires specific language requirements. As a result, the EAL teacher is then able to incorporate meaningful curricular content into language instruction. Other notable implications mentioned are the introduction of difficult language structures prior to when they would be typically be introduced sequentially, the use of higher order thinking skills, and the relationships between teaching and learning with respect to second language acquisition (Snow et al., 1989).

The second model used in my study is the Literacy Engagement framework developed by Cummins et al. (2012). This framework was developed in a Canadian teaching context similar to the school in my study and was based on teachers’ experiences with EAL students in Ontario. The basic premise of this framework is that literacy engagement is of utmost importance for both non-EAL students and EAL students; therefore, the major goal is to engage student learners by “scaffolding meaning, connecting with students’ lives, affirming student identities, and extending their awareness and knowledge of language across the curriculum” (Cummins et al., 2012, p. 25). Scaffolding meaning can occur in the form of graphic organizers, visuals, and enabling students to use resources from their first language. Teachers should also make efforts to connect with students’ lives and can do so by activating background knowledge from students’ own experiences and language(s). Cummins et al. (2012) specifically stresses the importance of affirming students’ personal linguistic and cultural diversities and challenges the dominant power relations. They contend that “the more power one
individual or group gets, the less is left for others” (p. 32) and, in contrast, “collaborative relations of power are additive” (p. 32). When teachers value and celebrate the diversity and linguistic abilities of students in their classrooms, they build upon the collective power of the group and, consequently, build a stronger, more collaborative community of learners in the school and beyond.

Lastly, this model encourages learning language across the curriculum through instructional strategies such as comparing and contrasting students’ first and second languages. For example, Pakistani students in a Toronto area middle school created bilingual e-books using Urdu and English to tell about the process they went through when moving to Canada. The students first wrote the story in Urdu, then translated it into English and provided illustrations to reinforce comprehension. As a result of this process, the students’ linguistic skills were acknowledged thereby affirming their identity and recognizing the valuable background knowledge they possess. Additionally, the teachers were able to use bilingual instructional strategies where students’ languages were viewed as important tools within the classroom without knowing how to speak the students’ languages themselves.

Considering the many languages spoken by students at the school in my study, teachers can employ these types of bilingual instructional strategies even if they are unable to speak the language themselves. Multiple linguistic backgrounds, often represented in classrooms, are frequently perceived as a challenge for teachers to overcome. However, linguistic diversity should be viewed as an opportunity for learning where teachers can connect to the students’ background and integrate with curriculum objectives. There are also implicit opportunities for group learning projects among
students who share a language and possibilities for heterogeneous groups where students learn to respect and value each other’s linguistic identities and backgrounds. To summarize, the Literacy Engagement framework asks teachers to focus on affirming students’ identities through scaffolding meaning and building upon their background knowledge including their first language or languages in order to increase academic engagement and performance in English. Cummins et al. (2012) encourage teachers to attempt the framework and judge its usefulness while keeping in mind that it is intended to be adapted depending on each teacher’s unique educational context.

The model used as the primary instructional framework in my research is the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol developed by Echevarria et al. (2008). It is an instructional strategy for “organizing classroom instruction in meaningful and effective ways” (Echevarria & Vogt, 2010, p. 8). The SIOP framework consists of eight components and thirty features considered necessary for effective instruction of EAL students. The eight components are, “Lesson Preparation, Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction, Practice & Application, Lesson Delivery, and Review & Assessment” (Echevarria et al., 2008, p. 155). “Lesson Preparation” involves determination of content and language objectives, “Building Background” consists of creating links with previous knowledge while “Comprehensible Input” refers to the process of making the content manageable by speaking clearly and providing explanations. The next component is “Strategies” which includes scaffolding and questioning techniques followed by “Interaction” where students have opportunities to work in group discussions, and “Practice & Application” at which time the content and language are practiced. The final two stages are “Lesson Delivery” when students are
engaged in appropriately paced lessons, and finally a “Review & Assessment” to conclude the process at which time content and language objectives are assessed, progress is evaluated and feedback is provided (Echevarria et al., 2008).

These eight components are supplemented by thirty features required for effective sheltered instruction. One of the main features is that student engagement is essential to academic success for EAL students and SIOP developers cite the expectation that students be engaged 90-100% of the time to make progress. To support engagement, they describe six major principles of instruction that increase student engagement including providing opportunities for EAL students to develop oral language competency, linking EAL students’ background knowledge to content, teaching vocabulary explicitly, making lessons comprehensible, providing activities to demonstrate learning, and conducting regular assessments in order to plan purposefully. Similarities exist between the SIOP model and the Literacy Engagement framework as both models build upon students’ background knowledge, feature meaningful comprehensible input and require students to practice skills. The explicit sequential nature of the SIOP framework provides a useful guideline for collaborative planning with colleagues. A sample SIOP lesson plan template is provided in Appendix B which shows the systematic way in which lessons are designed.

While the SIOP Model is a useful guide for collaborative activities, its effectiveness as a framework for improving EAL students’ academic achievement has yet to be recognized by the US Department of Education. Despite Echevarria et al.’s findings that when teachers implement SIOP with fidelity (Echevarria, Richards-Tutor, Chinn, & Ratleff, 2011), EAL students’ student academic success increases, the What Works
Clearinghouse (WWC) evaluation of the SIOP Model states that “it is unable to draw any conclusions based on research about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of SIOP on English language learners” and that “additional research is needed to determine the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of this intervention” (U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse, 2013). While there are potential limitations of the model, the SIOP design is a useful resource for collaborative interactions between EAL and content teachers and it provided a valuable structure with which to provide TESOL professional development in my study.

According to Martin-Beltran and Peercy (2014), using common tools helps collaborating teachers to mediate collaboration and make teachers’ learning processes visible. As a result, teachers are able to “articulate and reconceptualise teaching goals, co-construct knowledge and ultimately transform teaching practices to meet the needs of cultural and linguistically diverse students” (Martin-Beltran & Peercy, p. 721). The implications for my study are that common tools are beneficial for collaborating teachers. I primarily used the SIOP lesson planning template as a tool for collaborative interactions. In continued collaborative activities with one participant, I explicitly used Davison’s Levels of Collaboration as well.

In conclusion, developing and sustaining positive collaborative relationships among content and language teachers is a worthwhile endeavour providing much needed professional development for collaborating teachers and beneficial learning opportunities for EAL students. The body of literature associated with collaborative teaching between content and language teachers was relatable, interesting, and beneficial in informing my action research study. I was able to draw upon four main themes including the
importance of collaboration, barriers to collaboration, content teachers’ perspectives towards EAL students and towards TESOL professional development, and models of collaboration for sheltered instruction. Each of these areas provided me with many ideas and suggestions for guiding my own collaborative interactions with colleagues in an attempt to develop productive working relationships in order to implement improved instructional practices for students who are learning English as an additional language. The next chapter provides a detailed explanation of the research methodology used in this study to employ the strategies and suggestions established as a result of reviewing the literature on collaborative teaching practices.
CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

Rationale for Methodology

This study employed a qualitative approach, using action research as the methodology. According to Strauss and Corbin (1997), action research is the process whereby colleagues come together on the basis of a commonly identified problem to share knowledge and experience in an attempt to enact change. The problem identified at the school site was a lack of collaboration between content and language teachers. The goal of this study was to address this issue by initiating collaborative relationships using a researcher-participant orientation.

The need for improved collaboration was becoming increasingly evident at a provincial level when the Ministry of Education providing additional funding to school divisions for EAL teachers to become trained in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) framework. The SIOP instructional method is intended to provide content teachers with various strategies with which to teach sheltered instruction in mainstream classes. However, SIOP training was only provided for interested EAL teachers within the school division with the intention that language teachers could guide and support content teachers implement the sheltered instructional strategies. Both Beth and I, the EAL teachers in my study, completed The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP®) Training for Teachers virtual institute which was a 4-week institute consisting of 11 sessions requiring the completion of weekly assignments and a fully developed SIOP lesson plan (Pearson, 2015). Content teachers were not provided with the same opportunity to acquire the education, thus a further reason that collaboration is necessary to allow content teachers access to the expertise that EAL teachers possess.
More recently, the Government of Saskatchewan announced a reallocation of education funding to provide school divisions with additional funding to support EAL students (Government of Saskatchewan, 2015) demonstrating that provision of EAL support is currently a priority in the province.

The research questions intended to address teachers’ reflections on learning through collaboration, opportunities and barriers associated with collaborative relationships, and specific instructional strategies found to be most effective from a pedagogical perspective and those perceived to be most effective for students. The research questions for the study were:

**Research Questions**

4. How do I understand my practice better as a result of collaborating with content teachers to provide sheltered instruction for EAL students in mainstream classrooms? How can I help content teachers to better support EAL students?

5. How do I attempt to overcome any potential barriers to collaboration? How do we maximize opportunities for collaboration to best support EAL students?

6. Which collaborative activities do we perceive to be most effective for teachers’ professional development and for EAL students’ academic success?

**Context of the Study**

To conduct my study, ethics approval was required by both the University of Regina (See Appendix C) and Regina Public Schools (See Appendix D). The study took
place at a large secondary school in Saskatchewan in which approximately 20% of the students are from other countries. Thirty-six different nations are represented by students in this school from thirty-two diverse linguistic backgrounds including Arabic, Tagalog, Chinese, Korean, Urdu, Vietnamese and Russian. The school provides for all levels of language support for immigrant and refugee students from varied cultural, linguistic and educational backgrounds. EAL teachers provide three types of courses for EAL students in sheltered instruction classrooms including locally-developed EAL credit courses, non-credit literacy classes, and tutorial support periods. At the time the study was conducted, with the exception of locally developed EAL courses and Grade 10 English, students were integrated into mainstream classrooms to complete required high school credit requirements.

**Participant Selection**

To support productive and positive collaborative interactions, it was important to consider teacher participants’ dispositions. According to Arkoudis (2006), specialized skills such as “repositioning” are required for cross-disciplinary planning conversations. Arkoudis (2006) describes “repositioning” as a way in which teachers commit to learning about each other and thus redefine positions in relation to each other. Correspondingly, cross-disciplinary interactions require special skills which not all teachers possess (Arkoudis, 2006). In consultation with school administration, the collaborative teaching partners were selected based upon the concept of “repositioning” as well as each participant’s ability to advance the research effort as described by Strauss and Corbin (1997).
According to Strauss and Corbin (1997), certain colleagues may be chosen for a collaborative action research project for a variety of reasons such as their sensitivity to emerging educational issues, creativity, problem solving skills, or concern about a particular issue. Furthermore, the authors refer to the process of action research as an unsystematic process where difficulties require participants to “share a commitment to inquiry, offer continuing support throughout the research process, and nurture a community of intellectual and emotional support” (Strauss & Corbin, 1997, p. 236). Therefore, considering the importance of understanding partners in action research, participants were selected based upon an expressed interest and the existence of supportive collegial relations.

To recruit participants for the study, I had informal discussions with school administration regarding potential candidates. Consulting with administration was necessary to keep school leadership informed of my research process and to potentially encourage the future allocation of time and resources towards my study. It is important to note that I personally chose which colleagues I felt would be the best candidates to participate in the study based on the philosophy of Strauss and Corbin (1997). These were teachers whom I thought would appreciate an opportunity to participate in the study to learn how to provide more effective teaching strategies for EAL students. I took an informal approach to recruiting participants in that I spoke directly with teachers who I considered potential participants to gauge their reaction to possibly participating in such an opportunity. These were informal conversations which gave a general idea of the concept of the study and the potential time requirements involved.
If a teacher was receptive, I asked for permission to e-mail a more detailed description of the study, what it involved and stressed that participation was completely voluntary. The Letter of Recruitment for Participants can be found in Appendix E followed by a participant consent form which can be viewed in Appendix F. As a result of these informal conversations and subsequent e-mails, I recruited three content teachers and one other EAL teacher with appropriate dispositions (Arkoudis, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1997) to participate in the study. The content teachers included two mainstream English teachers and one Science teacher. No participants withdrew from the study.

**Action Research Methodology**

As mentioned, this study used action research methodology which, according to McNiff et al. (2003), is different than other forms of research for several reasons. First, action research is practitioner-based where the researcher is in the situation and will, therefore, influence what happens. In this study, I was a researcher-practitioner in this way and situated my study at the school I work at as an active participant. This type of research focuses on learning and embodies what McNiff et al. (2003) refer to as “praxis”. Again, in collaborating with other teachers, the focus was on teacher learning in order to better support EAL students by using “praxis” or good professional practice characterized by informed knowledge and, more importantly, actions supported by motives or values (McNiff, Lomax, & Whitehead, 2003). As described earlier, my education and personal values have greatly influenced my practice and how I communicate ideas about effective professional practice for EAL students.

Other important factors involved in action research are that it leads to personal and social improvement, is responsive to social situations, demands higher order
questioning, and is intentionally political (McNiff, Lomax, & Whitehead, 2003).

Personal and social improvements were both intended results of the study for both teacher participants and the school. With respect to responding to social situations, this is really at the core of the study where social situations at the research site did not support extensive collaborative relationships between participants so this study addressed this lack of structure to some degree. Higher order questioning was possible as a result of conversations between collaborating teachers and pre- and post-interviews where teachers reflected upon their own practice and considered teaching practices. Naturally, with regard to being intentionally political, the collaborative nature of this study inherently caused administration to consider the possibilities related to collaborative teaching practices. It was my intention to introduce and promote collaborative teaching between EAL and content teachers at the school in the study.

Finally, McNiff et al. (2003) state that in action research “the focus is on change and the self is the locus of change”, practitioners accept responsibility for their own actions and it is “value laden”. In other words, the practitioner researcher begins by changing themselves and then attempt to make a social change through collective learning. Because they are leading change and directly involved in the research, it is very important for researchers to be aware of their own values and reflect upon how these might affect others in the study. That is, in conducting my research, it was important to focus on my own professional development and consider how I could best support my colleagues with their learning. I also maintained an awareness of my own beliefs and values and how these might influence the other teacher participants in the study. This relates to the concept of action research being “value laden” in contrast to other types of
research which are often neutral. Specifically, researchers perform their actions in a way that they feel is appropriate (McNiff, Lomax, & Whitehead, 2003).

Action research processes feature several concepts that researchers should take into consideration according to McNiff et al. (2003). First, action research involves a commitment to educational improvement which was unquestionably the intent of this study where improved collaboration was a desired result. Next, the research questions should be written in first person showing that “I” is at the centre of the research. The research questions listed previously fulfil this expectation and show this type of orientation as I am learning about my own professional practice and specifically with respect to how to most effectively support teachers in their professional development for supporting EAL students. Another important factor is to ensure that actions are “informed, committed and intentional”. In this study, actions taken fits this description yet it is important to note that there were a limited number of actions taken due to the brief study timeline and participants’ level of commitment.

Action research processes also include the following factors as outlined by McNiff et al. (2003): “systematic monitoring to generate valid data”, “authentic descriptions of the action”, “explaining the action”, “new ways of representing research”, “validating action research claims” and “making action research public”. The next section describes the methods in which I collected data for this study in order to provide the systematic monitoring. Chapter 4 provides descriptions of the actions taken, explains the actions, and I then reflect upon what I have learned from attempting the actions including some insights on how to make improvements in the future. Finally, this thesis serves as a way in which I can communicate any research claims and makes this action research
public as required in action research. As for creative ways of representing, I will be presenting this information at an international language conference which also serves as another way to make the research public and provide opportunities to have claims validated.

**Data Collection Methods**

Information for my study was gathered by conducting pre- and post- interviews, documentation (teacher participants’ lesson plans) and reflective journals.

**Pre- and post-interviews.** I conducted semi structured open-ended interviews with participants individually prior to collaborative efforts taking place and at the conclusion of the study. The interviews at the beginning provided me with additional data for the action research plan, and for creating initial categories with respect to grounded theory. Interviews were conducted at noon-hours early in the month of October 2013. Sessions were scheduled for one hour each and were digitally recorded and transcribed (Creswell, 2009). The interview protocol followed can be found in Appendix G. The interviews conducted at the conclusion of the study to assess the perceived success of the action research study took place during the month of December 2013 either at noon or after school. I conducted one additional post-interview in June 2014 with a research participant I continued working with during the second semester of the school year. Participants completed an interview transcript release form which can be found in Appendix F.

**Lesson Plans.** Research participants created SIOP lesson plans as way to specifically focusing on both content and language objectives as well as sheltered instructional practices. We used the SIOP lesson plan template provided in Appendix B.
Since the other EAL teacher was conducting a project of her own using the SIOP mode, she independently developed and delivered a SIOP lesson plan using her own format.

**Reflective journals.** Initially, I had hoped that all participants would write in journals about their personal thoughts and feelings related to the collaboration. Due to the lack of time allotted for collaborative activities, this became an unrealistic expectation. Fortunately, I did receive some reflective journals from my fellow EAL teacher, Beth, as she wrote thorough journal entries about her SIOP teaching experiences. I also wrote reflective journal entries about my impressions of the collaborative activities. Janesick (1999) states that, “journal writing allows one to reflect, dig deeper if you will, into the hearts of the words, beliefs, and behaviours we describe in our journals.” According to Davison (2006), “collaborating teachers may benefit from more action-orientated research with built-in opportunities for critical reflection and discussion of different views and perceptions of the nature of learning and teaching” (p. 472). Journalizing provided teachers with the opportunity to write about their views of learning and teaching in order to reflect upon the progress of collaborative efforts. Since journal writing was a voluntary activity, the amount of information collected in this manner was limited due to time constraints and existing demands on teachers due to high workloads.
## Timeline

The following table shows the timeline of the research study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Study Components</th>
<th>Steps in Action Research</th>
<th>Data Analysis using Grounded Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/19 – 4/9</td>
<td>- SIOP Training for Teachers Virtual Institute</td>
<td>Developing a plan for change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/28</td>
<td>- Submit first draft of research proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>- Submit second draft of research proposal with revisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5– 4/30</td>
<td>- Meet with thesis committee to review research proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Submit an ethics approval to the University of Regina and Regina Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Revise research proposal further</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1-9/30</td>
<td>- Participant selection in consultation with school administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1-10/7</td>
<td>- Pre-Interviews with content teacher participants</td>
<td>- Initial coding and categorization of data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/26 – 8/30</td>
<td>- Initial meetings with collaborative partners</td>
<td>- Take action and make observations</td>
<td>- Concurrent data generalization or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>collection and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Writing memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3 – 9/30</td>
<td>Planning and collaboration</td>
<td>- Take action and make observations</td>
<td>- Theoretical sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher participants’ lesson plans and reflective journals (including researcher)</td>
<td>- Reflect upon actions and adapt as needed</td>
<td>- Constant comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Revise plan</td>
<td>analysis using inductive and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Follow cyclical nature of action research</td>
<td>abductive logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Theoretical sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1 – 11/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Intermediate coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Selecting a core category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Theoretical saturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10-12/18</td>
<td>Post-Interviews (All Participants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1-6/15</td>
<td>Planning and collaboration</td>
<td>- Take action and make observations</td>
<td>- Concurrent data generalization or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher participants’ lesson plans and reflective journals (including researcher)</td>
<td>- Reflect upon actions and adapt as needed</td>
<td>collection and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Revise plan</td>
<td>- Writing memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Follow cyclical nature of action research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Research Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/14</td>
<td>Second Post-Interview with Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/14-8/31/14</td>
<td>Data analysis and begin research report</td>
<td>- Advanced coding and theoretical integration - Generating theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/14-3/8/15</td>
<td>Write thesis report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5-1/30/15</td>
<td>Write drafts of thesis and submit to thesis committee to review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30/15</td>
<td>Deadline to apply for convocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/15</td>
<td>Submit thesis to committee to review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28/15</td>
<td>Meet with committee to review thesis submission and make additional revisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5/15</td>
<td>Meet with thesis committee to discuss final revisions and edits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/15</td>
<td>Thesis Submission Deadline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grounded Theory Methodology**

While the research did not strictly employ grounded theory methodology (Strauss & Corbin, 1997), I used some grounded theory methods to examine the information as this approach to enquiry aligns well with the process involved in action research. Birks and Mills (2011) consider several characteristics as essential components of grounded theory including the following:

…[I]nitial coding and categorization of data; concurrent data generalization or collection and analysis; writing memos; theoretical sampling; constant comparative analysis using inductive and abductive logic; theoretical sensitivity; intermediate coding; selecting a core category; theoretical saturation; and theoretical integration. (p. 9)
Fundamental to both grounded theory and the action research model is the practice of being recursive. Thus, the pre-interviews served as a “purposive sample” (Birks & Mills, 2011, p. 10) and the information gathered in pre-interviews was taken into consideration before proceeding with the action research process. Initially, it was my intention to formally transcribe and code the pre-interviews before proceeding with the study but, in retrospect, this was an unrealistic expectation due to time constraints and a desire to proceed with the actual collaborative interactions immediately following the interviews.

However, the pre-interview discussions guided decision making with respect to how to proceed in our collaborative interactions. The pre-interviews served as initial observations to determine any changes required in the action research process. The next component of grounded theory is the practice of writing notes or memos and such notes do not follow a set format and vary in subject, length, content, intensity, and overall usefulness towards the final product. The memos served a useful purpose for recalling the content of meetings as well as my own perceptions throughout the study. They were an important source of information and contributed greatly when discussing the collaborative experiences between myself and the participants. These writings served as the reflective aspect intrinsic to action research whereby adaptations are made. Since action research is cyclical (McNiff, Lomax, & Whitehead, 2003), analysis was ongoing and often informal in nature yet the ongoing data contributed to guiding collaboration.

The next part of the grounded theory process is constant comparative analysis which is related to the reflective nature of action research whereby researchers go through a cyclical process of observing, acting, and reflecting. In constant comparative analysis, there is ongoing comparison between incidents, codes, and categories until a grounded
theory is entirely cohesive. In my study, I considered the information provided by participants in an ongoing manner and made comparisons between different levels of the data. In doing so, I was able to use both inductive and abductive reasoning. Using abductive reasoning, in particular, can be very useful since it recognizes that there may be several possible reasons for an event’s occurrence. When discussing teacher collaboration and human interactions, many variables exist and are necessary to consider when examining phenomena. The next component is called “theoretical sensitivity” which is “deeply personal; it reflects their level of insight into both themselves and the area that they are researching” (Birks & Mills, 2011, p. 11). “Theoretical sensitivity” takes into consideration a researcher’s academic background with respect to the literature they have read, engaged with, and consequently use in everyday thought. A specific example of this is how my knowledge of TESOL literature or SIOP Training inherently influenced my interactions with others in the study.

The next aspect of grounded theory involves the researcher becoming immersed in the data, making meaningful connections during concurrent data generation and constant comparative analysis then subsequently beginning to use intermediate coding techniques. This comprises of creating sub-categories of ideas and themes and further defining characteristics for each and it also involves linking categories together to indicate similarities. Once links have been made, core categories are identified which “encapsulates the grounded theory as a whole” (Birks & Mills, 2011, p.12). Therefore, further theoretical sampling will focus on learning more about core category until the researcher has achieved “full theoretical saturation” of the category and its sub-categories.
In conducting the study itself, concerns and topics of interest were evident once we began collaborating and we spent our time discussing the most relevant areas of concern.

**Data Analysis**

Upon conclusion of the initial study timeline, I transcribed the interviews while continuing to collect additional data as a result of the co-teaching opportunity. Listening and re-listening to each interview as I transcribed them was beneficial as those thoughts and opinions resonated with me and I was able to apply these ideas while continuing to collaborate. In this section, I will describe the technical aspects of the data collection for this study beginning with the interviews.

The first step of my data analysis was conducting initial coding in order to identify important words or groups of words and label them accordingly. These initial codings developed as a result of the pre-interviews conducted with teacher participants. I recorded each interview on two devices, a phone and a laptop, to ensure that the audio was captured. I re-listened to each interview several times while transcribing verbatim in a manner suggested by Humble (2015). With respect to general formatting, I typed a page number on each page at the top right hand of the page, wrote a title indicating it was a pre-interview then the name of each participant. I used the letter “P” for participant responses and the letter “I” for the interviewer and used single spacing with a blank line between each comment.

To organize the pre-interviews, I followed guidelines from The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers by Saldana (2013) who prescribes a structured way of organizing interview data. For each interview, I created charts with two columns and placed the interview data in the left two-thirds of the page and left the right hand column
blank for writing codes and notes. I then separated the text into short paragraph-length units with line breaks between each section when the topic changed. These appeared like a stanza of poetry and made the information much easier to read and code. Once I had entered all the data into these charts, I re-read the interviews thoroughly and jotted down facts and notable comments in the right column along the sections of text. I also highlighted text which I felt was particularly thoughtful or interesting and some of these highlighted sections were used as direct quotations in the findings chapter of this paper.

After coding the interviews, I made another chart with five columns as a way to collate the data to compare and contrast the participant’s responses. In this chart, I used the interview questions as a guide to define each topic and placed the questions in the left column on the page. I then placed each participant’s names at the top of the page and typed in the handwritten comments and codes I had made for each in the row with the corresponding interview question. This method of formatting allowed me to see the noteworthy information from each participant at a glance and I was then able to proceed with discussing the collaborative relationships of each individual while also observing similarities and differences.

Once codes were fully explored, I proceeded with the next stage called “advanced coding and theoretical integration” at which time a storyline technique was used. This involved finding grounded theory in the context of existing writings and theories and placing the research study appropriately in the body of related literature. I provided an extensive literature review which served an important role in this aspect of the data analysis and complemented the research information collected through interviews, reflections, and lesson plans. I also added additional perspectives from relevant literature.
prior, during, and after the research study in order to continue informing the research. As a result, the final product of grounded theory is situated in the theoretical body of knowledge and represents an integrated and comprehensive theory associated with collaborative interactions between teachers. Because of the nature of this study, the results can be drawn upon but cannot be found as specific or explicit units of information to be replicated. For that reason, this study used grounded theory analysis processes but the interpretive design did not intend to produce a grounded theory. The narrative style of the discussion presents recurring themes and an abundance of practical strategies and thoughtful recommendations made by the remarkably dedicated teachers who participated in this study.
CHAPTER FOUR - FINDINGS

Introduction

This action research study involved five participants including myself as researcher-participant. I collaborated with the four other participants individually to explore ways in which to support EAL students at a secondary school. The extent of the collaborative efforts involved with each participant varied based on factors such as attitude, level of commitment, previous knowledge, specific interests, and availability. Even so, the collaboration with each participant was valuable in contributing towards the eventual conclusions and implications of the study. The experiences I had interacting with each brought about the realization that collaborative teaching experiences are especially fluid in nature, need not be prescribed and are greatly dependent on the individuals involved.

As mentioned, the participants were two EAL teachers and three mainstream or content teachers. Because collaboration with each participant was unique, I communicate each collaborative story on its own while incorporating my own observations as well as connections to the related literature. I first write about Beth, my fellow EAL teacher, since we were able to relate on a different level based on our shared expertise in the field of TESOL. In many ways, our interactions served as a comparison for the other collaborative partnerships and she essentially played the role of a “critical friend”. According to Costa and Kallick (1993), a “critical friend” is “a trusted person who asks provocative questions, provides data to be examined through another lens, and offers critique of a person's work as a friend” (p. 49). Moreover, they listen well, offer advice and value judgments upon request and are an advocate for the success of the effort (Costa
and Kallick, 1993). Beth fit this depiction in the study as is evidenced in the description of our collaborative interactions to follow. Her ongoing support was important throughout the study as she was a friend who encouraged, a confidant to share experiences with and a knowledgeable expert with whom I could discuss specialized knowledge.

Next, I explain my interactions with the three content area teachers who participated in the study including specific actions taken, descriptions of these actions, reflections with respect to what we learned and potential future recommendations. The first of these is Rebecca who taught me that collaborative experiences are about mutual understandings and shared wisdom. Following, I provide a description of my interactions with Kayla who I had limited time to work with but this provided me with valuable insights into factors affecting collaborative relationships. Finally, I discuss the collaborative interactions I had with Scott who I was fortunate enough to work with for a much longer duration.

For each participant, I provide some background information and each participant’s thoughts and perceptions towards EAL students, relevant pedagogical approaches, and collaboration itself. This introductory information was gathered through the pre-interviews with participants which occurred prior to beginning our collaborative interactions. Next, I describe the collaborative interactions I was involved in with each participant including formal meetings, lesson plans, and reflections. Initially, I had planned to arrange regular meetings with participants but as the action research project unfolded, it was evident that finding time whenever possible was the best approach and collaboration could not always be formally planned. I also understood early on that each
participant’s disposition would affect our collaborative interactions and, not surprisingly, the level of engagement and commitment varied. Finally, I will conclude each section with reflective thoughts on the collaborative opportunity primarily using the post-interview data.

**Collaborating with Beth**

As mentioned, Beth was the other EAL teacher who participated in this study. She has been teaching in the public education system for over twenty years, is a Canadian of European ancestry and is able to speak French at an intermediate level. Beth described her teaching philosophy as thematic using a variety of resources and realia and stressed the importance of communication. Beth has pursued formal training through a university program and was completing the last required course towards a TESOL Certificate program during the study. She also chose to complete the SIOP virtual training institute (Pearson, 2015) and carried out a final project for the TESOL certificate using the SIOP model. This assignment involved both the creation of SIOP-based lessons, implementation of these plans and reflective journals which I included portions of in this study.

Similar to myself, Beth truly enjoys teaching English to students from other countries and shared fond memories of teaching her first EAL student. She told me that she taught a boy from El Salvador in her first year of teaching and felt compelled to help that student by doing things such as labeling the items in her classroom. She felt excited to find ways to help him and her attitude towards teaching English remains unchanged as she thoroughly enjoys her position as an EAL teacher. She feels that EAL students help create a positive classroom environment since they are motivated and eager to participate
in class. She expressed that “I just find them really a pleasure.” Over the years, Beth has had opportunities to teach EAL students at both elementary and secondary schools in a variety of situations. During this study, she was teaching an EAL language development class and EAL tutorial class to students from countries such as China, Pakistan, Korea, and India. The students in these classes had varying levels of English ability ranging from beginning to advanced proficiency.

Beth’s pre-interview. In the pre-interview, we discussed various issues regarding the teaching of EAL students. First, she mentioned the importance of EAL students’ home culture and how the level of respect and value towards education in their families is very important. Beth explained that it was important for Canadian students to be exposed to different values and behaviours and felt that it was necessary because “…[O]ur world is getting a lot smaller and we need to learn about each other and [I] find that working together, we can achieve more.” This idea connects with the views of Cummins et al. (2012) who assert that teachers should celebrate students’ identities and value the diverse experiences of EAL students by drawing upon previous background knowledge.

As an EAL teacher, Beth had a good knowledge of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages as her own personal interest had prompted her to seek educational opportunities in the field. She explained that limited resources were available locally for supporting EAL students and recommended university courses for professional development. She had personally pursued formal training through a university TESOL certificate program which she was near completion and has since achieved. She also completed the SIOP training (Pearson, 2015) and was excited about the model which is
evident in the following excerpt: “It’s a way that content area teachers would be able to work with EAL teachers to make things work for those in mainstream classes.” She further asserted that SIOP strategies help all students by providing clear expectations and considered it good, solid teaching practice.

Because Beth is an EAL teacher, she was able to explain relevant strategies using specialized language based on research. She began by stressing the importance of communication including the four strands of speaking, listening, reading and writing. She explained the importance of “making content comprehensible” and relevant to students’ lives as well as making connections with different subject areas. These phrases and terms are commonly used in the SIOP Model of instruction and her recent training in the model was evident in our communications. Beth went on to explain that when content is too difficult for students, it creates a stressful environment so teachers should ensure that content is challenging yet attainable. When asked what she perceived the biggest challenges for content teachers to be, Beth again referred to the concept of making content comprehensible and talked about the importance of smaller class sizes. Her frequent references towards making content accessible reinforced its importance which was reassuring as I prepared to engage in collaborative interactions with content teachers.

With respect to previous collaborative experiences, Beth had extensive experience working with other teachers after job sharing for approximately ten years. She not only collaborated with another EAL teacher to fulfil the requirements of her regular teaching position, but she also worked with a grade group team for Grades 6-8 in which she discussed students and described the purpose of the collaboration as “doing what was
good for students”. She said the advantages of this system were that it was clear where students needed to go when they needed specific support. For example, an EAL student with a learning difficulty would be referred to a learning resource teacher or a speech pathologist. However, there were also disadvantages such as a lack of structure or guidelines for collaboration and EAL students were not a priority (at-risk students were).

She also cited several other challenges such as no clear leadership, lack of protocols, and fitting in meeting times because there were “lots of teachers with many students and many levels”. She also explained that a barrier was “time to get together and time to plan. It’s the time factor.” Interestingly, among all these negative aspects, she wanted to assure me that the collaboration was “good” and was worried that her comments were too negative. She summarized her feeling towards collaboration in the following excerpt which also demonstrates her passion and enthusiasm for supporting EAL students:

I think that collaborative team members need to recognize that these are all of our kids and they are not just the EAL teachers’ responsibility and if you have them on your class list, you need to treat them like you treat everybody else. I also feel like …if the work is too difficult, then it’s your responsibility to make it more accessible for your kids so you have to highlight key terms or I know that more one-on-one time for them or assign a buddy to them…something that the classroom teacher should have to do so I think we all need to come together and talk about, you know, the special needs that our EAL kids have.

Beth’s remarks connect with the research of both Creese (2002) and Dove and Honigsfeld (2010) in that teachers should be careful not to associate certain groups of students with
certain teachers as this association does not support the inclusion or valuing of students from varied language and cultural backgrounds in the classroom. Additionally, content and language teachers in co-teaching models should not only share physical space but also responsibility for students and move away from using terms like “my students” and “your students” and to rather use the term “our students”. Content and language teachers must share responsibility for EAL students to ensure equitable learning opportunities for all students.

Collaborative interactions with Beth. Beth and I shared an office during the study so we had frequent opportunities to discuss teaching philosophy, lesson plans, specific students, the SIOP teaching model and life in general. Beth and I held similar beliefs about the importance of providing sheltered instructional strategies to EAL students whether they are in EAL-specific classes as we typically teach or mainstream courses with content teachers. Comparing notes with Beth was worthwhile since Beth had decided to use the SIOP approach to teaching for a final project required for a TESOL certificate course. She provided me with the project in its entirety as well as her thoughts and reflections on this particular teaching methodology. These contributions were important as they gave me a basis for comparison with respect to implementation of the model as well as a respected colleague’s review of the model as practice.

In Beth’s project for her university TESOL certification course, she first outlined the detailed demographics of the class in which she planned on using the SIOP model as well as the content and rationale. The following is an excerpt from her project which was a fully developed unit plan on farming that culminated in a field trip to a large farm show:
The teaching context for this professional project is at my high school. I teach EAL Literacy to this group every day for 60 minutes. This class is made up of 12 students that are 14-18 years old. There are 10 boys and 2 girls. These students are at the Basic User A1.1 and A1.2 and Basic User (Advanced) A2.1 and A2.2 levels of the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education’s Common Framework of Reference (CFR). They have been placed in this class because their listening, speaking, reading and writing skills are below grade level. These students have been in Canada between 3 and 18 months. They are from China, South Korea, Philippines and India. All of the students have been educated in their home countries. They speak Chinese, Korean, Tagalog and Hindi. Some have had limited English taught to them in their home countries, while others have had no prior experience with English. I decided to use the SIOP Model with these students because at the high school level, English Language Learners are integrated into content area classes. These students need to develop learning strategies that will help make the content comprehensible and to build their academic language. I chose to use a subject integrated approach based on a theme. I used agriculture as the theme because these students will be attending the agricultural trade show, Agribition, in November. I also felt that it was important information for them to have because they now live in Saskatchewan and agriculture is important for our economy. (Beth, Using the SIOP Model with high school EAL students, 2013)

Beth developed several lessons for her project about farming and the importance of agriculture to the economy and local culture and one of these lessons can be viewed in
Appendix I. Beth used a SIOP Lesson Plan Template to ensure that she covered all aspects of the model. Her lesson plan included both content and language objectives as well as all SIOP features in the areas of preparation, scaffolding, group options, integration of processes, application, and assessment. An example of a content objective is “to distinguish between livestock, oilseed, pulse, and cereal crop farming” and a related language objective is “to summarize the different types of farming in Saskatchewan in a flip book using drawings and key vocabulary”.

The lesson plan she created is extremely detailed and thorough and presumably took a significant amount of time. In fact, in Beth’s reflections on the lesson, she states that “the lesson was lengthy to plan and deliver” and an additional challenge was the newness of the SIOP strategies to her students which required extensive modeling and guided instruction. However, she stated that while establishing new routines was time consuming, students became comfortable with the procedures after a few lessons and explained that “student engagement ha[d] improved”.

In the conversations we had, Beth explained that while she felt that implementing the SIOP model was effective, lesson planning was time consuming and required a lot of research and material development. Because lesson planning is comprehensive, it takes more time and requires teachers to provide ways of making the content meaningful. Initially, she found that writing the content and language objectives required by the SIOP model was challenging; however, through research, she developed her own list of key words that complemented content and language objectives. She believed that it would be useful to develop lesson plans over time so they were readily available but the preliminary creation was laborious. She believed that the lessons were effective as they
encouraged students to interact and they were showing growth as a result of the increased communication. As such, she believed that the additional planning time was worth the time and effort involved.

Because Beth shared her SIOP lessons and teaching reflections with me, this helped to reinforce the effectiveness of what I was planning to do in collaborating with the mainstream teachers. While I felt confident in my abilities to implement sheltered instructional strategies, I appreciated the structure and guidance provided by the SIOP model. Therefore, having a colleague to share the SIOP model with helped to develop my knowledge of the approach so I could better communicate sheltered instructional practices to mainstream teachers. Another example of this was with respect to daily self-assessment in which students used a 1-2-3 method to represent the level of understanding of the lesson. This rating system is a simple yet effective practice that I later used while co-teaching a science class with Scott.

Our collaboration also provided me with a basis for comparison for lesson plan development and the outline that I used with content teachers can be found in Appendix B. Our templates were similar but the one I chose included some aspects she did not explicitly account for such as considering higher level thinking, explicitly stating ways to build upon background knowledge and clearly identifying how both the language and content objectives would be assessed. As an EAL teacher, Beth does many of these things implicitly and did not feel the need to write down these additional headings.

Upon completion of her project, Beth provided an in-depth reflection regarding her thoughts on the SIOP method as well as future plans for using these specific sheltered instruction strategies. She described SIOP as “an effective and motivating way to teach
subject area content and the target language simultaneously.” She saw benefits with respect to student achievement, communication skills, applying curricular outcomes and professional development.

The following excerpt from her reflections further explains the successes she had with the SIOP model:

The SIOP Model positively influenced my EAL Literacy students’ participation and achievement. I noticed that my students were more actively engaged in each of my lessons. Prior to using the SIOP model, I struggled to involve my students in speaking activities. They were very self-conscious and preferred English reading and writing activities over speaking and listening ones. Since I have been preparing and teaching SIOP lessons, my students are now getting used to the structure and routine of the lessons and seem to enjoy working in cooperative groups where there is always purposeful interaction in English. Even though there are four different first languages in our classroom, Chinese is the only one still being used in class. However, my Chinese-speaking students seem to be explaining and discussing things that are related to the lesson. They are less reliant on their translators and are using more English to collaborate with their peers.

Beth felt positively about the benefits of the SIOP model and stated that she planned on continuing to these specialized strategies as the SIOP lesson planning resulted in greater teacher effectiveness and improved student achievement. I appreciated the feedback she provided me with as it gave me the confidence to use the model myself and in my interactions with the mainstream teachers involved in the study.
In addition to our discussions about SIOP instructional methods, we also talked about a variety of other topics such as the need to provide additional language classes to fill in gaps in the EAL program at the secondary school in the study. As most teachers do, we discussed common students, compared their progress in each of our classes, and suggested ways to support them. Lastly, Beth was very supportive of my action research study and encouraged me to attempt co-teaching in the following semester so I could directly support teachers in mainstream classrooms. In fact, without her encouragement, I may not have had the opportunity to take part in the team teaching in Semester 2.

**Beth’s post-interview.** Beth said the biggest successes for her as a result of our collaboration were the sharing of ideas, gaining perspectives on students, teaching methods and ways of doing things. She was eloquent in expressing what she had learned in the following excerpt from the post-interview:

> I think that no matter what you’ve been teaching, I think that you learn there are ways, other ways of doing things. I think this whole process helped me to kind of streamline what I’m doing and why I’m teaching and it kind of gave me two big questions that I ask myself for teaching and that is like what are they going to do with this information and how am I going to make it that they’re going to understand it. So it’s two big things. I think it’s vocabulary and comprehension that came to me through these kinds of lessons.

For Beth, the most valuable aspects of participating in this collaborative relationship were working together toward a common goal. Because we were sharing ideas and themes for lessons, we both had opportunities to teach complementary content, reinforce ideas and, consequently, the students benefitted from the consistency. We spoke similar academic
language with respect to concepts such as the content and language objectives from the SIOP Model. Beth believed that training content teachers in the SIOP model would be helpful as it is important for all teachers to ensure that content is comprehensible. However, she found it was a challenge to speak with colleagues on a daily basis and added that there is limited time to develop detailed courses and comprehensive lesson plans. She predicted that the role of EAL teachers would transform into more of a support/training role for content teachers to accommodate the large number of EAL students in schools.

When asked if the collaborative opportunity presented by this action research study met her expectations, Beth explained that sharing was enjoyable and compared our collaborative efforts to unstructured professional development. She also referred to the newness of the SIOP Model as a tool being used in our division and appreciated having someone to communicate with who understood the framework and the rationale. Beth viewed increased collaboration as a necessity considering the increasing number of EAL students in mainstream courses. She stated that “all of the teachers are going to have to definitely start thinking about what they’re teaching, are they able to learn from me [as the teacher] and how did they understand it.”

Obviously, Beth and I share many similarities in our views about language acquisition and sheltered instruction practices. Collaborating with Beth and learning about how she was implementing the SIOP model of instruction was beneficial for me as I had also been recently trained in the framework and still felt uncertainty about how to plan appropriate SIOP lessons. I was still considering the model’s usefulness and appreciated the feedback she provided regarding the effectiveness of the strategies while
also communicating her concerns about the amount of work involved in using it. We were able to communicate using specialized language from the TESOL literature which I enjoyed so I was able to discuss the relevant literature with a receptive, interested colleague.

We also discussed challenges such as time limitations for collaborating and planning and the idea of all teachers embracing and accepting EAL students as their responsibility to allow for equitable educational opportunities for all students. Finally, Beth suggested that EAL teachers’ jobs may be evolving where language teachers take on a consultative role with content teachers to support EAL students in mainstream classes. This prediction again reinforced the relevancy of this action research study and the effort to initiate collaborative relationships with content teachers. Her participation in the study was significant as her role emerged as “critical friend” in that she listened to my concerns, reinforced my knowledge and beliefs, provided suggestions and guidance and offered ongoing support, both personal and professional. In the next few sections, I will describe my collaborative interactions with the three content teachers who participated in this study and what was learned in each of these unique partnerships.

Collaboration with Rebecca

Rebecca is a high school English teacher, who primarily teaches senior level courses. Rebecca has been teaching for more than twenty years in the public system, speaks English only, and is also of European ancestry. While Rebecca did not have any formal training in teaching EAL, she did have some practical experience as she had taught English in Japan previously. Rebecca described her teaching philosophy as “bound to her subject area of English” and defined herself as a teacher of reading and
believed that the writing would follow. She valued the importance of modeling and demonstrating skills and asked students a lot of questions. Most importantly, she wanted students to feel that they were capable readers. Rebecca’s Grade 12 English classes had three or four EAL students and the majority were Chinese or Korean and their ability to speak English was “quite good”.

**Rebecca’s pre-interview.** She expressed positive feelings towards teaching EAL students and recalled coming back to teaching after a break to find her classroom was a much more diverse place. She specifically referred to how valuable the inclusion of EAL students was when teaching the World Perspectives theme which is part of the Grade 12 curriculum. She said that student diversity helps to broaden the viewpoints of all students when EAL students shared their experiences from their own educational backgrounds and mentioned that shy students who “aren’t forthcoming” can be wonderful contributors. Rebecca reported that EAL students provided a model of engagement for others, described them as academically serious and diligent and that they “live for learning”. She also described the difficult lives of some of her students and how they were sleep deprived yet diligent, focused and earnest. She commented on their level of maturity and said that she had “never seen students work so hard”.

Considering the issues that she said some EAL students have, she was worried about her own ability to fulfil their needs which is evident in the following interview excerpt:

I understand what resiliency is and diligence and how far it can get them and I find their stories really remarkable but I must admit, I was initially nervous
because I think, gee, so I know how to help them? Sure, I can help them where to put a comma but is that really helping them. I wasn’t sure.

Other challenges Rebecca mentioned are the varying school systems and how they experience different expectations in Canada. She suggested that some students do not necessarily place a high value on learning English and place more importance on the sciences with the goal of being an engineer or doctor. She also thought the biggest challenge for content teachers was the unrealistic expectations of EAL students and their families and stated that for parents, low marks were indicative of failure. In her opinion, students were not pausing to reflect on their learning and viewed external measures of success as their assessment which leads to increased stress and was unhelpful. She concluded, “They don’t fully appreciate that once they learn, the marks will come.” To address these difficulties, Rebecca suggested the importance of smaller class sizes, broadening the EAL program such as hiring more EAL trained teachers, providing support from EAL teachers and providing clarification on specific issues such as fair assessment and evaluation for EAL students.

To help EAL students, Rebecca used various strategies such as providing clear instructions, detailed assignments and explicit goals each day. She said a personal goal was to focus more on visual learning in the year in which data were collected. With respect to evaluation, she was making an effort to focus on one or two skills in an essay, and base evaluation solely on these aspects. She made an effort to speak one-on-one with students after classes to assist them with their speaking and listening skills. She also mentioned some strategies she attempted which she felt were unsuccessful such as the
inclusion of EAL students in class discussions as she described many EAL students as shy and reticent so she was hesitant to put students in that difficult position.

When asked about experience with collaboration specifically, Rebecca explained that she had relatively limited experience with more intensive collaborative relationships until recently when she began co-teaching a Grade 12 English course. She explained that she and her co-teaching partner had set goals together and consulted each other regarding assessment. She enjoyed having someone to share the joy of literature with which exemplified that shared interests are an important aspect when working together. She also had informal opportunities to work together with educational specialists for different purposes and she explained that collaboration lessened isolation and stated that teachers maintained a focus on what was to be achieved. When asked if she had any negative experiences with collaboration, Rebecca asserted that “all the contributions are valuable” and she was “learning something here and I will benefit from the learning of others and their guidance and just a willingness to try some new things.”

While Rebecca felt strongly about the many advantages of collaboration, she pointed out several potential barriers or challenges teachers face when attempting to work together. For example, there were general challenges such as a potential lack of communication and time. With respect to EAL and content teachers specifically, she suggested that content teachers tended to delegate their own responsibilities on EAL teachers rather than allowing EAL teachers to focus on language therefore expecting too much of them. Rebecca listed some qualities she felt contributed to successful collaborative relationships such as commitment, open mindedness, willingness to try new things, and an appreciation and understanding of different teaching methods.
Interestingly, at the conclusion of her pre-interview, Rebecca asked to make some additional comments to better represent the dispositions of all of her EAL students. She said that during the pre-interview, she realized that she was focused on the students who want to achieve but she also has EAL students who are “invisible and blend in”. She was not sure what those students’ experiences in her classroom were but explained that they were not behaviour problems and were, in fact, very quiet and reserved. She disclosed that she felt she was failing them as she did not give struggling EAL students equivalent time.

**Collaborative interactions with Rebecca.** While it was challenging to find common times to meet with Rebecca, I learned a great deal from her as a result of the interactions we did have. She is a well-respected teacher for her knowledge and expertise in teaching senior-level English Language Arts and working with her was a privilege. What I perhaps appreciated about Rebecca the most is that despite her knowledge and experience, she was still willing to learn more about good teaching practices and was an enthusiastic participant in this study. She genuinely wanted to expand her expertise with respect to supporting the EAL students in her English classes and was accordingly receptive to suggestions.

I met with Rebecca for the pre-interview where she provided me with the many thoughtful insights provided in the previous section. In addition, we met three times during my EAL tutorial time as we were both busy at noon or after school with other commitments. Each teacher has one hour of preparation time a day but my preparation time unfortunately did not align with any of the teachers in this study. However, it made sense to discuss strategies during my EAL tutorial class as we had a student in common
and were able to focus our initial collaboration on specifically trying to support this student.

Our first meeting was a conversation to determine some mutual goals and I explained a little bit about the SIOP model. Even in these early interactions, I realized that fully introducing the content teachers in this study to the SIOP model was an unrealistic expectation. We simply did not have enough time to go through the various components and strategies involved. However, I was able to discuss some aspects of the model with Rebecca such as the importance of considering students’ unique background knowledge and ensuring that content was comprehensible. Rebecca was already doing an excellent job of scaffolding lessons for all students in her class. Our collaboration came down to extending upon the good practices being implemented and building upon those.

**Actions taken and explanations of the actions with Rebecca.** An example of an action I initiated was finding supplementary materials with key vocabulary and chapter summaries for a novel study she was teaching as she had discovered that some EAL students were struggling with comprehension. Because we were communicating more frequently as a result of this study, I was able to better support our shared students who were both in her Grade 12 English class and in my EAL tutorial. Rebecca was receptive to the idea of using the supplementary materials but did not use them directly with the student. I attempted to use them with one of the EAL students in my tutorial with limited success since attendance and effort were issues. Therefore, this particular attempt was never fully realized. From this occurrence, I learned that pre-planning with content teachers is important and we could have found supportive materials prior to reading the
novel rather than being reactive. Additionally, integrating these types of resources into the class as a whole could potentially benefit a number of students.

At another point during the semester, I initiated another action by e-mailing Rebecca about an EAL student who was struggling in her class and needed more time to work on an essay. Normally, students were deducted 10% per day for late assignments but she agreed to allow additional time so the student could create a more polished end product. Because we had developed a collaborative relationship and an understanding of EAL students’ challenges and the need for extra time, she was agreeable to making the exception. This action was very successful as the student benefitted from the additional time. I learned that content teachers could be receptive to requests such as providing time extensions and our collaborative interactions had been a catalyst for this conversation.

We were able to find an additional time to meet and co-created a SIOP lesson plan together during my EAL tutorial time. This was not my preferred time to meet as I was unable to assist students but considered this opportunity an investment in ultimately helping more EAL students. I had informed Rebecca in advance that we would attempt to develop a lesson based on the SIOP model using the template available in Appendix B. This outline served as a useful guideline to include various components of the SIOP model. She brought materials to base the plan upon the poem *I am Canadian* by Duke Redbird (Redbird, 2015) where students would learn about clichés, and then write their own identity poem using a similar style to the poem while avoiding the use of clichés. I typed out the lesson plan as we talked through it together.

The lesson we developed together can be found in Appendix J. While Rebecca had not typed out a formal lesson plan, the concept of the lesson was well developed to
begin. That is, she did not assume that students would know what clichés were and explicitly taught the concept first by defining the word itself and then by using a simple cloze procedure assignment. Examples of some of the clichés were: “I never stopped ________ you” or “What goes around ________ around”. Students were asked to complete the sentences with the correct words which are obviously “loving” and “comes”. Once students had a good understanding of what clichés were, she elaborated on the idea by asking students to identify clichés in movies or television and write down several they could recall from their own viewing experiences. Once the understanding of cliché images was understood, the class read the poem *I am Canadian* together to learn how Duke Redbird chose to present his identity as a Canadian. Rebecca’s intention was for students to avoid using clichéd language in creating their own identity poem using a format similar to Duke Redbird’s poem. She provided an exemplar written by a previous student and a list of steps on how to complete the poem along with additional dialogue to remind students to avoid the use of clichés. Again, this intentional and deliberate scaffolding provided students with a clear understanding of the lesson.

In listening to Rebecca’s ideas for her lesson, I was impressed that she was already using many important strategies for EAL students such as providing key vocabulary and building upon background knowledge especially with creation of the identity poems. Even though she had an excellent lesson plan, I was still able to find some ways to contribute to improving it. First, we brainstormed together some additional complex vocabulary she had not initially planned on defining explicitly such as “tone, concrete language, sensory language, and parallel constructions”. We also took some time delineating between content and language objectives. Rebecca had a good
understanding of the content objective of the lesson which was for students to understand the concept of clichés and complete the phrases with the appropriate words. However, she was less certain about how to write language objectives. I was able to help her develop the language objective which was simply for students to write down the clichés in words and images.

Next, we considered some higher order questions which included: “How do the images create a particular tone (ex. critical, admiring, objective)?” which required students to think with more complexity. Demonstrating that sheltered instruction is not meant to simplify content was important and we were still able to fulfil the expected outcomes at the level required. Lastly, I suggested a review activity for the key vocabulary as none were planned beyond the assignment of writing the poem. That is, student would create a colour coded system to identify the vocabulary in their own pieces of writing to reinforce new concepts. For example, they might highlight three words that identify the tone in their writing or underline phrases which showed parallel constructions.

After this specific planning, we were able to improve upon the lesson which is how I envision collaboration with content teachers. Rebecca was open to learning and, as a result, we both benefitted from our interactions.

To conclude, planning with Rebecca was an extremely valuable experience as she has a lot of experience teaching English at a high school level and I learned a great deal about the curriculum content at the Grade 12 level during our discussions. In addition to specific lesson planning, we also talked about our general impressions of writing for high school students as a whole. For example, they tend to use general cliché-like language when writing essays rather than unique, specific language relevant to the topic hence the
previous lesson plan to encourage the use of unique descriptive language. I agreed that I see the same thing and stressed the need for students to be concise in their writing and focus on main ideas. She further explained how she expects students to address tone in their writing, use sensory descriptive language and incorporate concepts such as clichés. She has a lot of knowledge to share and always considers the needs of the learners. I appreciated the opportunity to have these conversations with an English content teacher as we came to common understandings about our students. As a result, this strengthened the level of mutual respect between us which is important according to Davison’s Levels of Collaboration in Teaching Partnerships (2006) in which the second most effective level called “Convergence” requires that a “high degree of respect for other [is] evident.” It was a pleasure to collaborate with Rebecca as she helped me to understand that while mainstream teachers were participating in the study to improve their understanding of sheltered instruction, I was learning a lot from their perspectives as well.

Co-creating the lesson plan with Rebecca was an important action taken as it helped me to reflect upon how I interacted with colleagues and appreciated the reciprocal learning that resulted. I also learned that I had a lot to offer and the expertise I have to offer content teachers does not always need to be planned or rehearsed and can often be shared naturally through authentic professional conversations. Another important learning for me in working with Rebecca was that even the most knowledgeable of teachers can be open and willing to learn and can improve upon their own personal expertise to reach even higher levels of teaching effectiveness.
**Rebecca’s post-interview.** For Rebecca, our interactions helped her to gain a new perspective and point of view from an EAL teacher’s eyes. She explained the following with regard to the discussion we had about the lesson on clichés:

I’ll just think of all my students as the same and I won’t sort of attend to the specific needs or the perspectives of an EAL students so when you’re doing that one assignment and you were looking at the language issues or the vocabulary, it made me sort of revisit the way I set up assignments and what I perhaps need to attend to when I give an assignment to a student where English is not their first language.

Rebecca enjoyed the ability to see assignments from another “point of view” and was more able to clearly understand “what is there but also what isn’t there”. An additional perspective allowed her to better reflect on how to ensure assignments are clear and comprehensive since much work is done at home and outside of class time. She stressed the importance of making directions and expectations clear and explicit and also be sure to use repetition to reinforce significance.

When asked about the biggest challenge in collaborating, Rebecca’s said the biggest challenge was finding the time to collaborate and work together. She describes this difficulty in the following excerpt from her post-interview:

Well, I think that we try to accommodate each other. Uh, but we give up a lot of our time. The truth is that both of us are sitting here during our lunch hour and we just perceive that now as part of our working day. If we take breaks, it’s only for five minutes here or there. I’m glad to do it but I think that teachers do give up a
lot of their time and I wish there were some way that we could fit collaboration into the day itself.

In addition to a general lack of time, Rebecca stated an additional unique challenge. She suggested that it would be helpful for her as a content teacher to receive more feedback from EAL teachers who have her English students in tutorial classes so that she can do a better job of instructing students in her class. That is, she observed that many ELL's were quiet and shy in her class and EAL teachers would have a better understanding of which specific skills students require more assistance with. The idea that content teachers would accept my suggestions for instruction in the mainstream classroom was remarkable because I usually consider how EAL teachers can best support students with content in mainstream courses and not vice versa. This comment made me realize that we must also communicate with content teachers about specific skills we see EAL students struggling with based on our one-on-one interactions. We have the opportunity to work more intensively with EAL students and can discover specific skills which students need more assistance with.

Rebecca mentioned that her favourite thing about the collaboration was having opportunities to discuss specific students or situations as she found that helped her to relate to what she was learning better. She explained that “EAL teachers have that broader knowledge and understanding of their students and I learn from that and I’ve got great advice.” Rebecca had a few ideas for future interactions and began by suggesting there needs to be more time so she can have opportunities to collaborate with EAL teachers and have feedback on the structure of assignments and expectations. Interestingly, she also expressed her concern that content teachers are turning over too
much responsibility to EAL teachers and called this an “unfair distribution of work”. She felt that we could alleviate EAL teachers’ workload if we share strategies so that content teachers are more capable of supporting EAL students.

Rebecca made a similar observation with respect to what she had learned about herself and her teaching. She had been giving attention to one type of EAL student and not others. That is, she was providing a greater amount of assistance to EAL students who were already succeeding and desired to improve. She promised to “attend to the students who are not seeking attention and that are truly struggling.” She continued saying that, “They deserve as much if not more attention than the students who are succeeding.” Again, collaborating with Rebecca was a pleasure and I feel fortunate to have had that experience. She taught me that while I have a lot to learn, I also have much to contribute and I appreciated the mutual respect and professional yet collegial nature of our collaborative interactions. The next content teacher who I will discuss my collaborative experiences with is Kayla, another high school English teacher.

**Collaboration with Kayla**

Kayla mainly teaches Grade 10 English and has been teaching for eleven years in public schools. She does not speak any additional languages, is a Canadian of European ancestry and did not have any specialized training in TESOL. She stated that she had three or four EAL students in each of her Grade 10 English classes and was unsure of what languages students spoke or which countries students were from. Kayla believed that if students attended school and put their best effort in, then she would support them every step of the way.
Kayla’s pre-interview. Like the other participants, Kayla also communicated her positive feelings towards EAL students although she did admit that she was a bit intimidated by the language barrier the first time she taught a student from another country. However, she also felt that once overcoming these feelings, adapting for EAL students was empowering for both her and her students who felt a sense of accomplishment in their academic achievements. Kayla explained:

I think it’s positive. I think it’s made me a better teacher and it makes me more diverse. Not all students fit the mould of what a Canadian student should be and I think that, as a teacher, it challenges you. It can empower you and there’s so much you can learn from them.

Kayla thought EAL students’ inclusion was a good way for Canadian students to learn about other cultures and sometimes EAL students’ experiences can be inspiring, scary or even shocking which makes us gain a greater appreciation for our own country. She feels more confident now when teaching students from other countries and has a better understanding of how difficult learning another language is which allows her to be more empathetic and make adaptations. She described her students’ English levels as strong and said they were comfortable with the language but their “road blocks” to writing differed from the other students. Kayla said she would welcome more EAL students into her classes but was concerned about class sizes in general since EAL students often require more support. She also expressed concerns about accommodating the varying language levels of students in the classroom.

With respect to student readiness and learning needs, Kayla believed that students were put into mainstream classes before they were ready and suggested the need for some
sort of entry-level English requirement. She found that “deciphering” EAL students’ written work was a challenge and also said it was difficult for her to personally communicate instructions clearly. She further questioned the usefulness of students translating text word-for-word and suggested that the language loses meaning and wondered what amount of translation was appropriate. That is, many students were simply coping with language far beyond their comprehension levels and relying on translation could potentially interfere with the ability to acquire the target language.

Kayla explained that she did not have any formal EAL training and had initially learned by adapting and doing whatever she could. As programs developed and EAL specialists were hired, she was able to have informal conversations with EAL teachers who provided suggestions. She considered the one-on-one tutorial support that students received to be important. Her preference for learning about teaching EAL students is through discussions about specific students rather than general presentations on TESOL teaching practices. She explained that there are times when administration allows EAL teachers to present to staff about specific strategies but Kayla was not aware of any formal training opportunities available.

When asked how administration could specifically support content teachers with EAL students in mainstream classrooms, Kayla suggested ongoing professional development at staff meetings and opportunities for EAL teachers to present to content teachers. She also believed it was important to have administrative support when she believed that a student was struggling due to lack of language readiness and should be moved to a more appropriate class.
Kayla said that effective instruction for EAL students should include “lots of kinds of learning” rather than simply having students read, memorize and regurgitate. Her belief that this type of rote learning is inferior is not uncommon. Chan and Elliott (2004) state that “education in western countries (such as North America) tends to emphasize reflective and analytical thinking, and constructive learning rather than rote learning and memory work that might be associated with a belief in authority.” Thus students, who prefer reading and memorization, might be learning in a way that is culturally-appropriate from their perspective. In considering this possibility, teachers can exhibit more cultural sensitivity towards EAL students which connects to the concept of building upon students’ background knowledge, a key component of sheltered instruction.

Other effective practices she described were the importance of visual learning and choosing content which was easier to understand. She grouped EAL students together so they could learn from each other and read the same materials. She also adapted activities and assignments based on students’ strengths and weaknesses. An area which she hoped to improve upon was explaining assignments more clearly so that all students had a good understanding of the expectations.

Of the four participants, Kayla perhaps had the most structured, intensive collaborative teaching experience as she had previously worked in an interdisciplinary group in which a team of teachers taught classes at the same time and shared a common preparation time. She enjoyed that experience and shared some positive aspects such as the ability to observe and learn from other teachers and opportunities to interact with other professionals. She was honest about some difficulties such as different personalities or expectations and a struggle to be on the same page with respect to these. When
discussing collaboration with educational specialists in particular, Kayla had great experiences and found that the support made assignments and projects better. She listed challenges as time constraints, large class sizes, and a lack of common preparation time to work together and felt it was important to timetable collaboration. Her advice to team members would be to keep an open mind and be ready to contribute ideas about goals and philosophies. She summarized with the following: “Being alone in your classroom is a lonely feeling once you’ve experienced collaboration and it’s scary. All change is scary but very, very beneficial.”

**Collaborative interactions with Kayla.** Kayla and I met four times and found that getting together after school worked the best for us as, similar to the other participants; we did not have a common preparation time. We had both previously worked at a different secondary school so some of her remarks make comparisons between the two schools and the varied experiences. Kayla had extensive experience working in a team teaching environment at this former school and, as a result, felt very comfortable working with other teachers and appreciated the benefits of that opportunity. With that said, we had great difficulty finding times to meet and our two consultations mostly centered around discussing specific students and their learning needs.

**Actions taken and explanations of the actions with Kayla.** With respect to an action taken, we discussed some lesson ideas for the novel study *Tuesdays with Morrie* (Albom, 1997) and possibilities for pre-teaching new vocabulary or focusing on specific words within the text. I had recommended that she ask students to identify difficult words but she chose to provide the vocabulary with the rationale that some words students chose might be unimportant to the main idea of the story. While this approach
has value, having students identify difficult vocabulary independently allows the teacher to check for reading comprehension before proceeding with the story. It also allows students to take ownership and personalize their learning. This interaction caused me to reflect upon how I could better communicate the desired action in order for a colleague to attempt the suggested instructional practice. Perhaps in a similar meeting in the future, I might provide more rationale for students identifying words on their own and suggest that this would be a good pre-assessment and teaching tool. In reality, this approach is less work for the teacher and allows for more learner autonomy. One more thing I might suggest is that Kayla could have found a balance between students producing their own vocabulary lists while she ensured they included the words that she deemed to be most important. During our meeting, Kayla also noted that one student pre-read the novel but their level of understanding was questionable which supports the notion of doing a comprehension check before proceeding with the novel.

While I would not expect a colleague to accept and attempt all recommendations provided, her unwillingness to take suggestions placed our collaboration lower on Davison’s Levels. The potential existed for a more productive relationship in the future but the time duration and level of commitment during this study would place our collaboration at Level 3 of Davison’s Levels which he refers to as “Accommodation”. Kayla was a very positive and enthusiastic participant in the study but, in my opinion, we did not reach a level of ease or trust which could have allowed us to fulfil the criteria in the higher levels representing the most effective collaboration.

Another action taken as a result of our collaboration was related to a discussion we had about whether it would be appropriate to ask EAL students to read aloud during
class time. Kayla was hesitant to do so as she did not want to make the EAL students feel uncomfortable but this opinion is likely far too generalized. That is, many EAL students are able to decode words and being able to read aloud in class might be an opportunity for them to experience some confidence in mainstream classrooms. In order to test this theory, we chose a student who was in my tutorial class to read for me during her tutorial class time to ascertain her oral reading proficiency. Upon listening to the student read, she had great difficulty decoding the words and, in fact, likely would not have been comfortable reading aloud in class. Kayla had made the right judgment in this case and avoided an awkward situation for the student. This led us to discuss the possibility of having EAL students read in smaller groups if it is intimidating for them to read in front of the entire class. This would also provide Kayla with opportunities to assess students’ oral reading skills in order to respond accordingly with appropriate instructional strategies. This would also help her to recognize that reading levels vary greatly for all students. Ultimately, EAL students need to feel empowered so they do not view their lack of English proficiency as a deficit when they speak at least one other language fluently. In future interactions with content teachers, I would encourage them to facilitate an understanding of who EAL students are, where they came from and recognize their many skills and abilities. This may help peers be more accepting, less judgmental and more willing to assist.

Similar to Rebecca, Kayla provided me with valuable information from the content teachers’ perspectives. In general terms, I asked Kayla what she felt EAL teachers should focus on with EAL students to help them succeed in mainstream English classes. She recommended teaching about how a story is written (ex. plot, setting, conflict,
resolution) as well as teaching literary devices (ex. imagery, metaphors, alliteration).

Understanding what is important for content teachers helps me to improve my own practice as I can then pre-teach subject matter considered most essential.

Another part of our conversation which helps informed my practice was Kayla’s recognition that EAL students need additional time to revise and edit their writing assignments to ensure that the proper process was being used. The idea that EAL students may require more time was not unexpected but I appreciated hearing a content teacher acknowledge that extra time can be beneficial and was willing to accommodate students’ needs. This interaction showed me that content teachers potentially have this understanding and it is something I can feel comfortable recommending.

At a subsequent meeting, we had a follow up discussion with respect to the “Tuesdays with Morrie” novel study in which students had been provided with vocabulary to learn and questions to answer and memorize. This type of assignment is often quite easy for EAL students as they are able to memorize the required materials but it may not reflect their actual comprehension. I did not feel comfortable expressing this concern and reflected upon how different collaborative relationships seem to allow for different levels of openness as I used my judgment to sense the readiness of my collaborative partner to hear the information. The following is an excerpt from Kayla’s post-interview which illustrates her perception of this particular collaborative interaction:

As I was saying, starting a novel with my Grade 11s, I was able to think about how I wanted to approach sort of the vocabulary with the book or the novel and kind of go about it in a different way than maybe I have before. I think that
maybe it allowed me to address the vocabulary which in Tuesdays in Morrie isn’t particularly tough…one of the things I learnt through the process is that it’s not just EAL students who struggle with vocabulary because my other students did terrible on their exam on vocabulary. They didn’t even read the vocabulary that I gave them because it was just glanced over because it was just vocabulary and we don’t need to learn this so I really had an eye opening experience. It was nice to set out the vocabulary and sort of work through the ideas that we had come up with, and the next go around, I will probably spend a lot more time focusing on that vocabulary because it was quite apparent that regardless of the student’s background, vocabulary was something they were all really weak at.

While she did not accept the suggestion to allow students to self-identify difficult words, Kayla had tried something new in beginning to focus on vocabulary and realized that vocabulary instruction was important for all students, not only EAL students.

All students should have equitable opportunities to take part in class and I know that Kayla has that same belief but she is somewhat apprehensive to challenge students as she does not want to embarrass them or make them uncomfortable. Content teachers can gradually encourage EAL students to attempt difficult tasks such as public speaking by providing appropriate scaffolding. If we had had more time to collaborate, I think the trust between us could have developed more and we would have been able to take additional actions such as challenging students more and then reflecting upon the results together. We did not have an opportunity to follow up with an action regarding the comprehension questions. However, one potential idea would be to provide more open-ended questions for students or to ask student to write and share their own comprehension
questions. These interactions led me to believe that sensitively developing mutual ideas to be reflected upon later is preferable to making formal recommendations which imply improved instructional practice.

This realization relates to Davison’s Levels of Collaboration as teachers must exhibit a mutual level of respect involving recognition of each other’s professionalism and expertise in their respective areas. While this mutual level of respect existed, we lacked the openeness and vulnerability needed to collaborate with a high degree of success. Even though we did not have an opportunity to fully realize our potential as a collaborative team, my interactions with Kayla were very positive in general and I enjoyed the conversations that we had as they ranged from general to specific with regard to both students and instructional practices. I learned a great deal about how I can better communicate with colleagues in encouraging them to take action for the purpose of supporting students who speak English as an additional language.

Kayla’s post-interview. The first question I asked Kayla was about her successes as a result of this study. However, she cited an experience with another EAL teacher who did not participate in this study but had supported her in understanding that one student’s learning issues were related to personal issues. She stated that she found this information to be valuable. I attributed the lack of connection to our interactions as an indicator that our collaboration simply had not been overly effective due to time limitations, lack of readiness or level of commitment. Later in the interview, she did provide an achievement and explained that the collaborative efforts made her focus more on vocabulary and come to the realization that all students were struggling with new vocabulary, not just EAL.
students. As a result, she plans on spending more time in the future focusing on vocabulary development with all students.

When asked about challenges, Kayla said that a challenge for her was the act of having to withdraw a student from her class so he could be more successful in others. She explained that her assumptions about students were not correct and she came to a realization that there were a variety of different levels in one class and that “even though it’s an academic school, we still have kids who need help and extra support.” For challenges related to collaboration, she said the biggest obstacle for teachers was that they are very busy and she felt that collaboration was not a priority even though it is important. Kayla stated, “I believe that a common prep is really imperative” indicating there is a need to plan for collaboration and timetable accordingly. She suggested that teachers should be provided with time to collaborate on professional development days. She also recommended that perhaps EAL teachers could provide content teachers with an in-service on EAL students by providing information such as who students are, where they are from, what supports are required, and what kinds of supports are available.

When it comes to envisioning future interactions with EAL teachers, Kayla admitted that “she wasn’t quite there yet” and would collaborate more if she had a greater number of EAL students. She would like to know how to make class content more applicable to students’ lives and think of different ways that EAL students can meet outcomes. I had hoped to develop a lesson plan with Kayla to demonstrate how this goal would be possible but we were not able to meet an additional time. She thought that EAL teachers were in a difficult position because so many students require supports and there has to be a balance between providing tutorial classes and potentially co-teaching with a
content teacher. She continued on to say that it all comes down to timetabling by administration and what they are choosing to support. From our interactions, I learned that collaborative efforts occur with different levels of success and some take more time to develop than others. With more time, it is possible we could have come to common understandings and had more opportunities to address mutual topics of interest related to EAL student learning. In contrast to my collaborative relationship with Kayla where interactions were limited, I am now going to describe my collaboration with Scott who I had more opportunities to share with and thus explore sheltered instructional practices and collaboration itself.

Collaboration with Scott

Scott is a senior science teacher who had been teaching for 17 years in public school systems, is a Canadian of European ancestry and a native English speaker with no second language. Scott had 12 EAL students in total in his classes mostly originating from China and Pakistan and was uncertain which languages his EAL students knew but assumed they spoke Mandarin and Urdu. Scott said that his teaching philosophy was still evolving and had changed from simply transferring information to a more inquiry-based approach. He believed it was important to connect interests to learning and desired to be more student-centred.

Scott’s pre-interview. Scott appreciated the broader worldviews and cultural knowledge that EAL students brought to his classes. He also enjoyed the interesting discussions that came about as a result of the different cultures and backgrounds and felt these benefitted all students. He said his first time teaching an EAL student brought
about feelings of interest and excitement as he viewed it as both an opportunity to help broaden his personal worldview and as a way to build relationships amongst students.

With regard to TESOL training, he had received infrequent training sessions done by EAL teachers at the school and said he could recall being provided with general suggestions such as providing visuals. While he felt these presentations were useful, he questioned the effectiveness because no follow up occurred and suggested ongoing sessions at staff meetings. Scott said he tries to meet the needs of all learners by providing varied instruction rather than sticking to one approach and focused on student-driven inquiry. He grouped EAL students together so they could learn with and from each other, did regular check-ins for comprehension and attempted to speak more slowly. He mentioned that he allowed students to use electronic translators but wondered about their reliance on the translators so was not clear whether this was a successful strategy or not.

Scott also had some experience with collaboration and had worked with Learning Resource Teachers (LRTs) for planning adaptations and differentiation. He has shared activities with other teachers in the science lab and described his collaborative experiences as “fantastic”. With respect to learning resource teachers, he said they have more specialized knowledge and were able to help him out. He also liked that team teaching allowed teachers to take a step back and observe the lesson as it unfolds so he can monitor the “engagement level”. He did not state any negative aspects to collaboration itself but did mention several barriers. For example, collaborative partners being pulled away to fulfil other responsibilities, the need for adaptability, no protocol for collaboration, and the educational model not supporting teachers desire to work together.
He asserted that the “positives outweigh the negatives” and collaboration needs to be explicit to be more effective. He commented that collaboration happens when people are interested in doing it but there is no protocol so it is important to “timetable it in”.

When asked what the role and responsibilities of team members were, he said that it depended on whether the collaboration is planned, assigned, or timetabled. Teachers need to “be present, engaged, they need to be part of the process of planning.” Interestingly, more specific responsibilities he attributed to content teachers were the students, marks and grades. The implication here is that a specialist teacher is providing support whereas the mainstream teacher is maintaining authority over these factors. Scott concluded, “I just think it’s important that if we want that collaboration to take place then we need to set that structure in place.” Because establishing more formalized collaboration was one of the objectives of my action research study, our philosophies were similar and Scott’s disposition lent itself well to the nature of the study.

**Collaborative interactions with Scott.** Similar to other participants, we did not have a common preparation time, and therefore, met either at noon or after school to collaborate. Our collaboration was far more extensive than the other participants as we were able to collaborate by co-teaching a grade ten science class during the second semester of the school year. This arrangement allowed us to work together on a daily basis and, as a result, we were able to jointly implement the SIOP model of sheltered instruction and share the planning, instruction and assessment responsibilities of our class. In this section, I first discuss the collaboration which took place from October to December 2013 which aligns with the other participants. Then, I describe our
collaborative efforts which took place from January to June 2014 while we were co-teaching the Science 10 class.

**Actions taken and explanations of the actions with Scott.** During the initial stage of the research project, I taught an EAL science course so our discussions were often related to his classes or my EAL science course but we also discussed general topics such as Common Framework of Reference (CFR) levels (Government of Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, 2015). For my course in particular, we looked over a list of science laboratory vocabulary words which I had found on Quizlet.com (grimezkidz, 2015) to determine whether or not they were appropriate. Once we eliminated a couple items and added some others, I borrowed the science supplies and shared them with my students. This activity allowed me to ensure that I was teaching relevant information so students would be adequately prepared for a mainstream science course. We talked about other possible ways to support students and considered the possibility of doing a science lab together so that could students could learn how to conduct a science laboratory experiment. While we did not arrange a time for this particular activity, we had several opportunities for regular communication and discussed what we were doing with our science classes which helped both of us more effectively scaffold students’ learning.

Another practical application as a result of our collaboration was replicating a Chemistry 20 assignment in my EAL science class comprised of beginning EAL students. The assignment was to create a presentation on an element from the periodic table and provide a detailed list of information about that particular substance. I essentially gave the same assignment but simplified the vocabulary. The EAL students were able to successfully complete the project and produced good quality presentations. For this
experience, both Scott and I learned that higher level subject matter was achievable with students who had limited English skills and it reinforced my own belief that we can provide relevant, challenging, curricular-based content for students at various levels of English.

Beyond these practical applications, we also talked about the CFR levels for EAL students and the potential of using the “I can” statements available on the Ministry of Education website so that students are aware of what level they are currently at and know the expectations of progressing onto the next. As a result of this collaboration and the conversations involved, Scott expressed an increased awareness of how to better support EAL students. Using this knowledge, we co-created a SIOP lesson plan. Scott did not feel confident developing the lesson plan independently using the SIOP Lesson Plan Template especially with respect to language objectives so we worked together to write the lesson plan found in Appendix K.

Scott completed the lesson template himself while I provided some suggestions or prompting especially with respect to the key vocabulary and language objectives. The template served as an effective guide for Scott as he was able to complete each section in detail which helped him to consider all aspects of the lesson and expand upon it accordingly to fulfil the expectations of the SIOP model. This action showed me that content teachers could effectively use a SIOP lesson template to develop a sheltered instruction lesson and only required a bit of guidance with language-related aspects of the lesson. This lesson planning was essentially the end point of our collaborative interactions prior to co-teaching the Science 10 course. At that time, with respect to Davison’s Levels, I would have placed our work together as Level 4 or “Convergence” as
we made efforts to engage with the other’s ideas, exhibited a positive attitude, sought opportunities for peer interaction and adopted the other’s ideas and strategies “with still limited understanding of rationale and theoretical basis” (Davison, 2006).

With a strong base of collaboration already established, we had the opportunity to continue working together during the following semester as we co-taught a Science 10 class with 15 EAL students in a class of 35 students. We worked together daily, and as a result, we were able to implement more SIOP strategies such as explicitly stating the content and language objectives at the start of each lesson whereby students would write down these objectives along with key vocabulary. At the end of each class, students completed a self-assessment using a rating scale from 1 to 3 to report their levels of understanding. I borrowed this idea from Beth. It was an excellent way for us to engage students in reflective self-assessment while gathering student feedback on their learning. Students were also asked to comment on their progress in order to clarify the self-assessment they had provided. An example of the objectives and key vocabulary students were provided with and a template students would complete each day can be found in Appendix L. I created these based upon the SIOP Model as a way to establish a structured, consistent approach to implementing sheltered instruction.

At the beginning of the co-teaching experience, I was responsible for creating and communicating the daily lesson objectives to students. However, after a month or two, Scott began writing objectives as well and became more comfortable with differentiating between the content and language objectives with the help of an excellent website document entitled Writing and Using Content and Language Objectives (Shoreline School District, 2015). This document was created by teachers using the SIOP Model as
a guide and includes useful verbs and information on how to write effective language and content objectives. I used the same website and learned that sharing valuable planning tools such as this was important so content teachers would have the ability to plan sheltered instruction on their own.

Collaborating on an ongoing basis brought about many opportunities and a few challenges. A few opportunities were being able to share the teaching duties which allowed the other teacher to circulate around the classroom and monitor students’ attentiveness and comprehension. As the EAL teacher, my lessons tended to focus more on vocabulary whereas Scott’s lessons focused more on the science content and technical aspects of the subject matter. As time progressed, we began sharing lessons and splitting up the tasks for each day and sometimes taught together or assisted with tasks such as writing examples or vocabulary on the whiteboard while the other instructed.

With respect to the actual planning, we were able to plan together using various means including meeting in person, e-mailing or text messaging. At times, we planned certain sections separately and found that both of these methods were effective. Because two teachers were planning lessons, students experienced a variety of instructional strategies. For example, Scott felt more comfortable with direct instruction, inquiry-based lessons or conducting laboratory experiments whereas I felt more comfortable teaching literacy-based lessons, conducting group activities or using technology-based activities. We looked over all lessons, assignments, and exams together before providing them to students to ensure the content was relevant and accurate and to confirm that the vocabulary and context of the classwork was appropriate for all students including EAL students. To assess student work, we often shared this responsibility by first correcting
some student work together to establish norms. We were then able to complete the
remainder during individual preparation times.

Regarding challenges, the biggest obstacle was the lack of a common preparation
time which meant we spent a lot of time during noon or after school discussing our class.
Another challenge was negotiating our own roles in the classroom and ensuring that we
both felt like equal partners. That is, I wanted to feel like a co-teaching partner and not
an assistant so these were discussions we had on a couple of occasions. To help address
this, we used Davison’s Levels of Collaboration to discuss our work together and found
that it was a good guide.

Using these levels of collaboration was beneficial as we had a framework to refer
to that allowed for honest conversations. We discussed which level we felt we were at
and how we could make changes to try advancing to a higher level. During the early to
middle stages of co-teaching, we agreed that we were at Level 4 or ‘Convergence and Co-
Option’ where participants are engaged in the collaboration, enthusiastic and have a high
level of respect for the other’s expertise. As time progressed, we were able to have
straightforward conversations about our interactions, and we believed that we had
achieved some criteria at Level 5 or ‘Creative Co-Construction’ such as “a very positive
attitude, collaboration normalized and seen as preferred option for ESL teaching” and
“teachers’ roles become much more interchangeable, yet more distinct, high degree of
trust of other evident, responsibilities and areas of expertise continually negotiated”
(Davison, 2006).
While we felt we had been successful in accomplishing these criteria, we both agreed that we would have more work to do to make this form of teaching normalized as required at the highest level of collaboration. Therefore, effective collaborative teaching partnerships require a long-term commitment to fully realize the criteria described in Davison’s Levels. Specifically, we would need to learn more about each other’s subject areas perhaps by formally exploring educational options that would enrich the interactions. Overall, our collaboration was productive and an excellent opportunity to expand upon the foundation we had established during the first few months of the research project.

Scott’s post-interviews. Because our collaborative efforts occurred over a longer period of time, I did two post-interviews with Scott. The first took place in December 2013 at the same time as the other participants. The second took place in June 2014 after our co-teaching experience.

Scott’s post-interview (December 2013). After the first three months of collaboration, Scott said he thought that his biggest challenge was that he had a lot to learn in order to increase his awareness of EAL students’ learning needs. He spoke about what he had learned already and said that he thought that every content teacher would have more awareness “especially in a building like this one, our province right now” if they an opportunity to acquire similar knowledge. Scott mentioned the usefulness of using the SIOP lesson plan in particular as it made him think more about the specific parts of the lesson and being able to highlight these areas for EAL students. Additionally, he said that incorporating more language helped all students and making terms in the content area explicit was important. Lastly, he saw importance in having an opportunity
to learn about CFR language levels (Government of Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, 2015) and other procedural information he was not previously aware of.

Scott expressed the need to schedule common collaborative times for teachers to work during the school day. He felt that while the collaboration had met his expectations, he wished there had been more time and would have liked to have my assistance delivering a lesson or unit in the mainstream classroom. Scott expanded upon this concept by suggesting that content teachers and EAL teachers could co-teach and deliver lessons together as he thought this process would be beneficial. He enjoyed being able to share ideas with another teacher about how to teach a topic or communicate ideas to students.

Scott stressed the importance of scheduling collaboration and trying new structures such as team teaching or EAL teachers supporting a group of content teachers so that teachers can develop capacity in each other as a result of working together. The concept of developing capacity is described by Egbo (2011) as a way to address the growth and development needs of teachers and the institution in order to achieve excellence within an education system. Thus, Scott was looking at the concept of collaboration from an administration perspective and, comparable to other participants, recognizing that it must be a formalized endeavour with the implementation of supportive structures such as team teaching, common preparation times, and relevant training.

Scott’s post-interview (June 2014). In this final post interview with Scott, I asked the same questions as the first post interview but added a question about Davison’s Levels of Collaboration and comparisons between the two phases of the study that he had participated in. That is, the consultative nature of the collaboration in the fall and the
team teaching which followed. With respect to collaboration, Scott said it was a learning curve for him with respect to SIOP planning as well as the basic collaborative nature of the work. For example, the planning and trying to negotiate within a daily lesson or unit required some adjustment but he said it was a good experience overall. Specific successes he cited were that we were able to meet the needs of all students including the EAL students and collaborating and co-teaching was a great learning experience. Challenges were the same as before with respect to time for planning and setting out lessons or unit plans. He explained that a lot of lunch hours and after schools went into planning because the common preparation time did not exist.

We had another specific challenge at the start of the semester with some timetable changes because of the lack of pre-planning for the class. The decision to co-teach the class was made at the last minute and was only possible due to the addition of staffing in the EAL programming at the school. As a result, this lack of planning affected student timetables after the semester had begun which was disruptive. To address these issues, Scott suggested that timetabling and pre-planning accordingly for this type of project would be preferable. However, he mentioned the positive way in which we were able to exhibit flexibility to make everything work successfully.

This flexibility was necessary during the team teaching process as well and he said that teachers have to “roll with things”. As a result of the experience, he said that he realized he may be more flexible than he thought he might be. The most valuable part of the collaboration was going through the planning process together and becoming accustomed to thinking and planning with EAL students in mind. The team teaching format allowed both of us to take turns monitoring students while the other teacher taught
for the purposes of classroom management and assessment. In comparing the consultative nature of the first semester with the team teaching during the second, Scott explained that we got more into the actual lesson planning and felt that regular planning with an EAL teacher was way more effective than the “one off collaboration every few weeks or so…” Some of the ideas he was able to expand upon as a result were the incorporation of the language and content objectives, student self-reflection and using a variety of instructional practices including more technology.

Because we had more time to collaborate and had explicitly discussed Davison’s Levels in our work together, Scott was familiar with the framework. When asked where he would place our collaboration, he responded with the following: “Based on the levels and we’ve reflected on this throughout the semester but I’d say a high level 4, low 5 probably at times. We worked into 5 probably towards the end.” In other words, he perceived that our collaboration was very effective and evolved over time. Once again, I asked him if he thought that the experience had met his expectations and he confirmed that it had. He predicted that if we had an opportunity to work together again, it would be easier because a lot of the planning pieces were in place. Therefore, we would be able to take the collaboration to another level with respect to planning and assessment and perhaps focus more on details.

While he had a desire for continued interactions, he did not foresee continued collaboration occurring but mentioned a potential for consultation or team planning time with an EAL specialist. Advice he would give future collaborative partners is: “Don’t be tied to your own thing. There are other ways of doing things and other good ways of doing things and it’s okay to do other things.” He also said that teachers should be
prepared for a huge time commitment. I added that honest communication and conversations about the collaboration were necessary which he agreed with specifically pertaining to our regular reference to Davison’s Levels which served as a goal we strived towards achieving.

Compared to my collaboration with the other participants, I learned the most from the more intensive collaborative interactions with Scott as a result of the co-teaching structure and daily communications. We were able to successfully implement sheltered instructional strategies to support all students and regularly reflected upon our own professional practice with respect to collaboration using Davison’s Levels. As a result, I learned that continued collaboration with frequent opportunities to work together is much more beneficial than irregular meetings. Consequently, it is of the utmost important for administration to recognize the many benefits of this type of collaborative opportunity for teachers and their professional development so that they structure programming in a way which supports this type of synergistic educational practice.
CHAPTER FIVE – REFLECTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

When I first decided to conduct this action research study, I had certain expectations of how it would evolve and eventually transpire. However, it did not take long to realize that when one is involved in an action research study, the process has to be flexible and fluid especially in the role of a researcher-participant. This position required adaptability and an open-minded outlook towards every aspect involved in the study. While the process was laborious and challenging at times, the result was extremely worthwhile and rewarding. Conducting this research has taught me an incredible amount about teaching and learning, the amazing professionalism of my colleagues and, most importantly, about myself as a researcher, a teacher and a person.

In my study, I sought to answer the following research questions:

1. How do I understand my practice better as a result of collaborating with content teachers to provide sheltered instruction for EAL students in mainstream classrooms? How can I help content teachers to better support EAL students?

2. How do I attempt to overcome any potential barriers to collaboration? How do we maximize opportunities for collaboration to best support EAL students?

3. Which collaborative activities do we perceive to be most effective for teachers’ professional development and for EAL students’ academic success?

First, I begin by discussing how I came to understand my practice better including reflections upon how I can better support content teachers in the section entitled
“Teaching Learnings”. Next, I explore opportunities and barriers to collaboration revealed in my study. Lastly, I review the most effective collaborative activities for teachers and those perceived by teachers to be most effective for students.

**Teacher Learnings**

Teachers in this study learned a great deal about themselves and each other. First, mutual respect existed between teachers not only for their knowledge in their areas of expertise but also for their willingness to do whatever was possible to support all students in their classes. By participating in this study, the teachers showed they were committed to supporting EAL learners as demonstrated by the meetings that occurred primarily outside of the school day either at noon or after school. Teachers learned that they could be open to trying new things and accepting of supports available.

For example, Rebecca, was an epitome of a master teacher but still willing to learn new strategies and we were able to improve upon a lesson that was already extremely well structured. We worked together enthusiastically in a non-judgmental way, and as such, we were successful at supporting each other’s professional growth. From Rebecca, I learned that I had much to learn. That is, I realized that I could learn a great deal from the perspective of the content teacher in the same way they had hoped to learn from me by participating in the study. That is, we developed a relationship whereby professional development was reciprocal rather than either teacher viewing themselves in a consultative role.

The study resulted in many realizations for the other research participants as well. First, Beth discovered that she found it valuable to communicate with a fellow EAL
teacher as we could share relevant and stimulating conversations about TESOL research and related pedagogy. I shared the same view and appreciated sharing information regarding language acquisition as we feel equally enthusiastic about this area of study. She served the important role of “critical friend” and our discussions about teaching and student learning were important in providing me with the confidence and reassurance to take on a role of teacher leader.

Kayla realized that she still has some work to do when it came to prioritizing collaboration for the intention of supporting EAL students. She mentioned that she would be more willing to take the time if she had more EAL students in her classes. From Kayla, I learned that every collaborative relationship is different and that several factors that can affect the success during any point in time. For example, we might have made more progress with a common preparation time or fewer other commitments in our lives. Our lack of collaboration was not necessarily a reflection of our ability to work together productively. Because time was limited, we were not able to share specialized knowledge or build a relationship of trust which would presumably allow for more risk-taking.

Finally, Scott and I learned the most about ourselves and each other as a result of our comprehensive interactions and the opportunity to co-teach a class together for five months. Scott mentioned in his interview that the most important thing he learned about himself was that he could be much more flexible than he had expected with respect to giving up some control. For myself, I learned that I did not feel comfortable viewing myself in a teacher support role and wanted to be considered an equal teaching partner. Even though we both obviously had different roles in the partnership because of own
unique areas of expertise, this was important to me. Therefore, we had to be open and candid with each other regarding what we wanted our teaching to look like and Davison’s Levels of Collaboration for Partnerships in Teaching became our benchmark for reflection. Additionally, I learned that I enjoyed the challenge of teaching a mainstream course and that co-teaching was an excellent way to develop professionally. This form of collaboration inspired me to be a better teacher and provided me with a confidant to share reflections with regarding planning, teaching and assessing.

Opportunities

Participants found many opportunities possible when content and language teachers collaborate. First, the most obvious was the shared expertise coming together to plan effective sheltered instructional practices. Another gain was having opportunities to communicate about specific students to provide immediate supports. Discussions took place about specific knowledge and skills and the need to communicate with each other regularly. For example, Rebecca mentioned the issue of students overusing clichés in their writing and asked that EAL teachers inform her when skills are lacking so she could focus on teaching to those gaps in her own classroom. Kayla also suggested that EAL teachers could pre-teach certain topics such as story structures or literary devices. These conversations were beneficial and would not have taken place without intentional formalized collaboration. Similarly, all teachers had opportunities to learn more about each other’s expertise and acquire new knowledge accordingly. Sun et al. (2013) conducted a study which showed that this type of collaboration is an effective way to receive professional development. They refer to this professional development as a spillover effect where expert teachers collaborate with others to share their knowledge.
Barriers

With respect to barriers, two main themes dominated the research. The first major concern was the lack of time available for collaborative interactions. Teachers desired to meet more frequently but we did not have shared preparation times which limited our interactions. The second barrier was the lack of formal TESOL professional development amongst the content teachers. Because time was limited, I was only able to introduce some aspects of the SIOP model such the importance of background knowledge, content and language objectives, and the important of explicitly stating key vocabulary. In some cases, I was able to briefly discuss other aspects but infrequently except with Scott as a result of the co-teaching. Related to the time issue was the lack of administrative support to allow for teacher release time which would have allowed teachers to meet during the school day.

To overcome these barriers, teachers did what they often do best. We were creative and made time when possible which often translated into giving up lunch hours or meeting after classes had ended for the day. Rebecca and I managed to meet during my tutorial time which was the best option possible for us. As for the lack of TESOL training for content teachers in the study, I was able to provide a brief introduction to the SIOP model for Rebecca and less so for Kayla. Scott became quite familiar with the model as a result of our longer collaborative time period but a more intensive training period would have been beneficial.

Most Valuable Collaborative Activities for Teachers

For teachers in this study, taking time to have meaningful discussions about EAL teaching and learning and working with a colleague to share expertise were the most
valuable activities. For Scott and me in particular, the most valuable activities were the shared planning, instruction and assessment opportunities. We learned a lot from each other by co-teaching as we had opportunities to observe each other teach which provided us with ideas for instruction, teaching methods and even classroom management. An extremely useful reflection tool for our interactions was Davison’s Levels as they gave us a guideline to work towards improving our interactions for the benefit of all of our students.

**Most Valuable Collaborative Activities for Students**

The most effective part of the collaboration from the perspective of the teachers involved in the study was the implementation of the SIOP model of instruction. Specifically, going through the lesson plan components and considering the various aspects that should be considered when planning for EAL students. Teachers valued the inclusion of both content and language objectives and found that explicitly stating the key vocabulary was beneficial.

Again, because our co-teaching allowed us to interact on a long term basis, Scott and I thought there were many benefits for all of our students as a result of the collaboration. Students benefitted greatly from our team teaching as a result of the shared planning and instruction. We provided content and language objectives each day along with key vocabulary. We focused on this key vocabulary and ensured that assignments and examinations used consistent language. As much as possible, we attempted to incorporate multiple components of the SIOP model into our lessons to promote speaking, reading, listening and writing. The team teaching in general was positive for students as
it provided students with an additional teacher in the classroom to offer support when needed.

**Outcomes**

In this study, I was clearly able to connect with some participants more than others and greater connections generally resulted in a more productive working relationship. When people enjoy spending time together and learning from each other, they tend to seek each other out and create the time needed even when the school structures in place do not support collaboration. With respect to attitudes towards collaboration itself, Davison (2008) suggests that the EAL teacher could have a more positive attitude towards the collaboration than content teachers. To the contrary, I found that some participants’ desire to collaborate went beyond expectations. This enthusiasm is evident in the comments in the interviews where participants expressed positive perceptions towards the benefits of collaboration. They also unanimously agreed that our collaborative interactions had been valuable in improving their knowledge of sheltered instruction and becoming more aware of sheltered instructional practices. Furthermore, each teacher desired to learn more about EAL instruction. Three of the four participants specifically recommended team teaching as a method for collaboration.

With respect to the actual team teaching that occurred, it was an excellent opportunity and experience for myself to interact with native English speaking students as it helped me gain an understanding of what content teachers experience and how EAL students participate in a mainstream course. As a teacher, I care about all students and want to see each one succeed. My expectation is that teachers treat every student
equitably and are willing to do what is required to make that possible regardless of each student’s country of origin or language abilities.

Other positive outcomes were also realized in my study. Teachers benefitted by gaining confidence in their ability to teach EAL students and were be more willing to take risks in their teaching. This risk-taking was most true for Scott as we had opportunities to observe each other teach and learned from each other as a result. We were able to experience self-development and gained an appreciation for the expertise of teaching colleagues. Personally, I was able to gain new knowledge from my talented and knowledgeable research participants. Finally, another more tangible outcome of the study was a higher level of academic achievement by EAL students as a result of the collaborative efforts of teachers. Scott and I agreed that students benefitted from the team teaching environment as we were able to successfully scaffold lessons in a way which supported all students.

Possible Limitations of the Study

It is necessary to recognize some potential limitations of this study. First, the relatively short timeline for three of the four participants of only three months limited the amount of interactions that could occur especially considering the lack of common preparation times. However, I was able to engage in collaboration with Scott for a longer term which provided the opportunity to more thoroughly explore the effectiveness of this type of partnership. Even so, there is the potential for future research to explore longer term collaborative efforts between EAL and content teachers and incorporate and reflect upon actions taken. A second limitation of the study was the lack of TESOL professional development opportunities provided to content teachers prior to the commencement of the
study. While EAL teachers were given the option to receive the SIOP training in particular, this was not an opportunity afforded to all participants. If content teachers had some knowledge of the SIOP model, this would have made the time together more productive.

A third limitation of the study was the number of participants. In retrospect, working with fewer participants would have provided us with more opportunities to work together as I would have been more available. I appreciated having another EAL teacher take part as it provided me with support, confidence and knowledge which I drew upon throughout the study. However, I felt that engaging four participants in the study was overwhelming as there was less time to interact with each participant more intensely which limited the potential for individual growth for the participants in the study. With that said, there were also advantages to the inclusion of four participants rather than two or three. While time constraints and scheduling difficulties did not allow for as many interactions as expected, I was able to compare and contrast the collaborative experiences of a greater number of people and was provided with the varying thoughts and insights.

Implications and Recommendations

Several implications can be identified as a result of findings from this action research study. First, content teachers and language teachers should recognize the importance of working together to support EAL students. Ideally, my vision for the future direction of EAL instructional practices is to see all teachers providing essential sheltered instruction strategies. It is important for EAL teachers to become teacher leaders in order to support mainstream teachers especially considering the diverse needs of our students. Another implication is for teachers to make collaboration an important
part of their teaching practice as a whole. While the focus of this study was to address the learning needs of EAL students, it is important to collaborate and share expertise to ensure the overall quality of education for all students in our classrooms. Teaching can be an isolating profession yet we need to recognize and share the vast knowledge and expertise that exists within colleagues in our own buildings.

As revealed, the two major barriers to collaboration were a lack of time for collaborative partners to work together and few opportunities for TESOL professional development. First, with respect to addressing the lack of time, administrative support is needed to address these concerns as time can be made available by arranging for common preparation times amongst collaborating teachers. These times must be built into the timetable as well as considerations for team teaching which allows for more intensive collaborative interactions as evidenced in this study. Another possibility to enhance teacher learning would be to develop collaborative partnerships or groupings (interdisciplinary or subject-specific) to allow for larger collaborative efforts and an even greater potential for learning. That is, teacher partnerships or groupings could team up with others to learn together rather than the one-on-one interactions featured in this study. Essentially, collaboration must be a priority that is formally scheduled to allow for the time and diligence necessary for successful teaching partnerships.

The other barrier discussed in the study was a lack of TESOL professional development for content teachers. There are various options that can address this issue. The first option for content teachers is to independently seek out TESOL training through formal institutions such as a university. Considering the time and commitment involved, this is an unlikely solution. Another option is provide content teachers access to online
SIOP training (Pearson, 2015) but this would involve a significant cost and still a significant amount of time and level of commitment on the part of content teachers. Therefore, the most feasible option is to do what I have accomplished in this action research study where EAL teachers take on the role of collaborative partner and work together to plan for EAL students’ specialized instructional needs. Using structured tools such as SIOP lesson plans for guiding sheltered instruction and Davison’s Levels to reflect upon collaborative efforts is recommended. According to Martin-Beltran and Peercy (2014), using common tools of collaboration can afford both EAL and content teachers an opportunity for ongoing professional development to support diverse learners.

To effectively implement shared tools, EAL teachers require leadership training specifically related to coaching and facilitation. These skills would enable EAL teachers to work productively with content teachers and to serve as advocates with school administrators. For example, the Saskatchewan Professional Development Unit (2015) provides a workshop entitled ‘The Art of Facilitation’ in which teachers learn how to develop positive relationships and communicate knowledge and skills. A final recommendation related to education that I would also suggest is that appropriate courses should be provided to pre-service teachers so they understand their responsibility of teaching diverse learners in their future classrooms. New teachers should be introduced to sheltered instructional practices as part of their university education before entering into the teaching profession.

This research study was intended to be a starting point for more formalized collaboration where all teachers begin to see themselves as teachers of EAL students. Furthermore, its orientation embraces the principles of action research that I wished to
initiate with my colleagues. By working together, we had the ability to collectively
develop our shared knowledge and skills in a synergistic manner for the benefit of all
students. He et al. (2011) strongly express that teachers must move beyond ‘just good
teaching’ to prepare all students for academic success. The following quotation captures
my vision for a collaborative action-oriented approach to research:

All teachers working with ESL students [EAL students] need to be equipped with
not only knowledge of language and culture, but also skills of collaboration,
leadership and critical reflection, to engage all educators in the innovative process
that leads to change in schools. Not only do all teachers need to understand and
embrace their roles as language teachers and cultural facilitators, but they need to
take on the challenge of being an advocate for ESL students and collaborating
with other educators, parents, and the community in advancing our efforts to
prepare ESL students for the twenty-first century. (He et al., 2011, p. 15)

The goal of this collaborative action research project was to bring educators together to
blur the lines between language and content and to initiate more long-term collaborative
relationships and the creation of the ‘content-EAL’ or ‘EAL-content’ teacher. As a result
of this action research study, both the EAL and content teachers were able to continue to
identify with their own area of expertise but advance beyond the current paradigm as they
expanded their knowledge and skills in order to increase opportunities for EAL students’
academic success. While it will take more time to actualize the full potential inherent in
the original goal, this study was a helpful starting point for the teachers involved. It
facilitated the creation of the collaborative culture needed to better support not only EAL
students but all students so that they may be successful not only in their academic pursuits
at present but as productive, contributing members of our community and society in the future.
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### Appendix A: Davison’s Levels of Collaboration in Teaching Partnerships

(Adapted from Davison, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Distinguishing characteristics (attitude; effort; achievement; expectations of support)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Pseudo-compliance or passive resistance | - an implicit or explicit rejection of collaboration and preference for status quo (generally after a short “attempt”)  
- little or no real investment of time or understanding by teacher  
- no positive outcomes (may have been counter-productive, i.e. entrench existing negative attitudes)  
- expectation is that “this too will pass.” |
| 2. Compliance               | - a positive attitude and expressions of “good intent”  
- efforts made to implement roles and responsibilities but with limited understanding of implications  
- informing documents seen as external and/or imposed  
- dealing with challenges and/or conflict in roles is seen as part of the teacher’s job, but it is a source of unhappiness, frustration and stress  
- teachers feel defensive and besieged by conflicting demands  
- “achievements” conceptualized as non-intrusive and very concrete (e.g. development of worksheets, adaptation of texts)  
- expectation of high degree of practical and teacher-specific external professional development  
- teacher dependence on external sources of encouragement and reward |
| 3. Accommodation            | - a positive attitude and willingness to experiment  
- efforts made to accommodate to perceived co-teacher’s needs but conflicts/uncertainties seen as unnecessary and avoidable if “model” is correctly implemented by teachers  
- only limited understanding of theoretical base of collaboration and little critical examination  
- achievements conceptualized mainly as strategies and techniques  
- expectation of high degree of program-specific external professional development  
- teacher dependence on external sources of encouragement but also some signs of intrinsic rewards from developing partnerships |
| 4. Convergence (and some co-option) | - a very positive attitude, embracing opportunities to learn from peers  
- efforts made to engage with co-teacher’s ideas and initiate dialogue and interaction/experimentation  
- high degree of respect for other evident  
- understanding that solutions not ready-made  
- forming documents seen as fluid and subject to negotiation but conflicts still seen as dichotomous and requiring resolution i.e. simplifying alternatives and/or avoiding expression of contradictory views  
- achievements increasingly impact on content of lesson, not just delivery, but not always consistently  
- some co-option of other’s ideas/strategies with still limited understanding of rationale and theoretical basis  
- increasing satisfaction from intrinsic rewards of collaboration, increasingly seeking opportunities for peer interaction  
- growing preference for action research and peer-directed professional development. |
|---|---|
| 5. Creative co-construction | - a very positive attitude, collaboration normalized and seen as preferred option for ESL teaching  
- teachers’ roles become much more interchangeable, yet more distinct, high degree of trust of other evident, responsibilities and areas of expertise continually negotiated  
- informing documents seen as actively co-constructed and teacher-developed  
- conflicts in roles seen as inevitable, accepted, even embraced, as a continuing condition which will lead to greater understanding  
- achievements demonstrated across whole curriculum  
- normalisation of teacher-based professional development such as action research and critical reflection, accompanied by extensive reading in area to extend understanding of specific theoretical concepts  
- possibly some formal study in each other’s areas |
## Appendix B: SIOP Planning Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic:</th>
<th>Class:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Vocabulary</th>
<th>Materials (including supplementary and adapted):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Order Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Links to Experience:**

**Links to Learning:**

**Key Vocabulary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>Student Activities (Check all that apply for activities throughout lesson):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffolding: □ Modeling □ Guided □ Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grouping: □ Whole Class □ Small Group □ Partners □ Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Processes: □ Reading □ Writing □ Listening □ Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies: □ Hands-on □ Meaningful □ Links to Objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review and Assessment (Check all that apply):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual □ Group □ Written □ Oral □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Key Vocabulary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Key Content Concepts:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix E: Letter of Recruitment for Participants

May 2013

EAL and Content Teachers Collaborating to Support the Academic Success of English Language Learners in a Saskatchewan Secondary School

I am working towards a Master’s Degree in Curriculum and Instruction from the University of Regina in the Faculty of Education and I am seeking colleagues to participate in a collaborative action research study. My goal is to work together with content teachers to create lessons for EAL students in order to incorporate both language and content outcomes. I also hope to learn from each other and use our collective expertise to provide EAL students with effective sheltered instruction strategies. (Sheltered instruction is a means for making content comprehensible for English learners while they are developing English proficiency.)

Who would best be suited for this project?

- Secondary teachers who are open to participating in a collaborative action research project in order to learn more about supporting the linguistic needs of EAL students (English Language Learners).
- Someone who shares a commitment for inquiry, problem solving, sharing, and reflecting.

What would be involved?

- Pre- and Post-Interviews
  - I will ask you general questions about teacher collaboration and your knowledge and perceptions of EAL students and EAL professional development. I will be making a digital recording of the interviews and then I will transcribe them and they will become part of my research data.
- Collaborative Interactions including joint planning
  - We will plan lessons together using a template which considers EAL teaching strategies. I will help guide teachers through this process and we will work together to incorporate both language and content outcomes into lessons. We will also meet and discuss other important considerations for EAL students such as drawing upon background information and ensuring that content is comprehensible. I will be keeping copies of these plans to use as part of the research data.
- Observations
  - I will be making general observations, both descriptive and reflective throughout the duration of the research. Nothing is required by you with respect to these observations.
- Participant Reflective Journals
  - Participants will be asked to write some reflections upon the collaborative interactions and general thoughts and feelings about the action research.
These will be in the form of open-ended journals with a guide provided to consider levels of collaboration. Teachers may choose to write about anything related to the action research project and this could take on any format including but not limited to lists, guided imagery, dialogue, poetry, webs, free writing, etc.

**Possible Benefits to You**
- The opportunity to formally collaborate with an EAL teacher in order to integrate language-based outcomes into your content and to expand your knowledge of effective sheltered instruction strategies.
- A way to engage in a school-based action research project which hopefully will inspire you to learn more about the benefits of action research and perhaps engage in your own planning to change a problem or question you have identified.

**Possible Risks**
- Participating in an action research project can result in some uncertainty and requires adaptability.
- You may experience some discomfort with planning and implementing new teaching strategies.

**What measures will be taken to ensure this study does not compromise relationships or confidentiality?**
- The digital recordings of the interviews will be password protected on my laptop.
- I will collect your reflective journals at the conclusion of the study.
- If at any time you wish to discontinue your participation in the project, you will have the option to withdraw consent without fear of it negatively affecting our personal or professional relationship. In order to withdraw consent, you will simply contact Dr. Andrea Sterzuk to indicate your withdrawal. No reasons need to be provided for your decision.
- Following the study, all data will be stored digitally and password protected or in a locking filing cabinet in Dr. Andrea Sterzuk’s office at the U of R for five years, as required by the Research Ethics Board, and following that, it will be deleted or shredded.
- A pseudonym will be used in the final version of my thesis and the names of the school and division will be changed; however, because of the small community in which we teach, it may be possible for other teachers to identify you based on my identity and their knowledge of the study.

Sincerely,
Trudy Thorson

**Supervisor:**
Dr. Andrea Sterzuk
Appendix F: Participant Consent Form

**Project Title:** Research Proposal for an Action Research Study: EAL and Content Teachers Collaborating to Support the Academic Success of English Language Learners in a Saskatchewan Secondary School

**Researcher(s):** Trudy Thorson, Faculty of Education Graduate Student, Curriculum and Instruction, University of Regina, [contact information redacted]

**Supervisor:** Dr. Andrea Sterzuk, Faculty of Education, [contact information redacted]

**Purpose(s) and Objective(s) of the Research:**
- The purpose of the proposed study is to explore the dynamics of EAL and content teachers’ collaborative relationships. Teachers will work together to plan lessons which include content and language objectives in both EAL and mainstream teaching situations.

**Procedures:**
- Teacher participants will be active participants in collaborative planning for English Language Learners. Specific research components will include: a transcribed pre- and post-interview, researcher observations of interactions through notes and lesson plans, and a participant journal. Interactions will occur at Balfour Collegiate or another mutually agreed upon location. Time will typically fall within regular working hours. There will be an additional time commitment required for the interviews (approximately an hour each) and journalizing (flexible).
- Please feel free to ask any questions regarding the procedures and goals of the study or your role.

**Potential Risks:**
There are no known or anticipated risks to you by participating in this research.

**Potential Benefits:**
- Ideally, research participants will learn more about sheltered instruction strategies and feel more confident in teaching EAL students in mainstream classrooms. Another potential implication of the study is improved collaborative relationships between EAL and content teachers and a great understanding of others’ perspectives. It also has the potential to spark an interest in the process of action research and perhaps create an interest for participants to initiate their own studies.

**Confidentiality:**
- Pseudonyms will be used in reporting the research data including the name of the school and teachers involved in the study.
- The researcher and participants will only use the work e-mail server when sending and receiving messages related to the study to ensure security and confidentiality.
- All data will be password protected and original documentation will be destroyed after five years by permanently deleting electronic data. Paper documents will be shredded.
**Right to Withdraw:**
- Your participation is voluntary and you can answer only those questions that you are comfortable with. You may withdraw from the research project for any reason, at any time without explanation or penalty of any sort.
- Whether you choose to participate or not will have no effect on your position or how you will be treated.
- Should you wish to withdraw, please inform the researcher by e-mail at [trudy.thorson@rbe.sk.ca](mailto:trudy.thorson@rbe.sk.ca), by phone at [306-531-5790](tel:306-531-5790) or in person.
- Your right to withdraw data from the study will apply until data has been pooled. After this date, it is possible that some form of research dissemination will have already occurred and it may not be possible to withdraw your data.

**Follow up:**
- To obtain results from the study, please contact the researcher for information about when the research report will be completed. You will receive the report upon completion.

**Questions or Concerns:**
- Contact the researcher(s) using the information at the top of page 1;
- This project has been approved on ethical grounds by the U of R Research Ethics Board on (insert date). Any questions regarding your rights as a participant may be addressed to the committee at [306-585-4775](tel:306-585-4775) or [research.ethics@uregina.ca](mailto:research.ethics@uregina.ca). Out of town participants may call collect. OR

**Consent**

**Continued or On-going Consent:**
This content form will remain in effect for the duration of the research study. Please be aware that the study will commence in June 2013 with a pre-interview and conclude by November 30th, 2013 with a post-interview. The majority of the research will occur between August 26th and November 15th.

**SIGNED CONSENT**
Your signature below indicates that you have read and understand the description provided; I have had an opportunity to ask questions and my/our questions have been answered. I consent to participate in the research project. A copy of this Consent Form has been given to me for my records.

____________________    ________________________
Name of Participant          Signature

______________________       ____________________
Researcher’s Signature        Date

*A copy of this consent will be left with you, and a copy will be taken by the researcher.*
Appendix G: Interview Protocol Form

Date: __________________________

Time: ____________________

Location: ___________________________

Interviewer: ______________________________

Interviewee: ______________________________

Consent Form Signed? _________

Notes to interviewee:

• Thank you for your participation in my research. I believe that your input will be valuable to this research and in helping grow all of our professional practice.

• I will be making a digital recording of the interview and will also be taking notes throughout.

• Confidentiality of responses is guaranteed.

• Approximate length of interview: One hour

Purpose of the research:

• The purpose of the proposed study is to explore the dynamics of EAL and content teachers’ collaborative relationships while working together to implement sheltered instruction in both EAL and mainstream teaching situations.

Research Questions

1. What do collaborating teachers learn about themselves and each other while working together to provide sheltered instruction for EAL students in mainstream classrooms?
2. What, if any, barriers are identified or observed while conducting a collaborative action research study between EAL and content teachers and in what ways, if any, do teachers and administration attempt to overcome these challenges?

3. Which collaborative activities are perceived to be most effective for teachers? For EAL students?

**Pre-Interview Questions**

(Adapted from O’Brien, 2011; Dellicarpini, 2009)

A. **Participant Background Information**

1. Tell me about your teaching experience and linguistic background.
   
   a. How many years have you a public or private school teacher (including this one)?
   
   b. Is English your native language?
   
   c. Do you speak any other language(s)?
   
   d. If yes, what are they and at what level? (e.g. beginner, intermediate, advanced)
   
   e. What is your ethnicity?
   
   f. What is the number of ELL students you have in your classes now?
   
   g. How many different languages are spoken by your students?
   
   h. How would you characterize these students’ ability to speak English currently?

B. **Perceived Challenges**

2. What are the challenges of including ELL students in your classes?
   
   a. What would your reaction be to receiving more ELL students in your classes?
   
   b. How do you think students’ native culture may impact their performance as a student in your class?
c. How do you think EAL students’ ability to speak their native language affects their performance as a student in your class?

d. What is the biggest obstacle faced by content teachers to effectively teach ELL students who are mainstreamed into their classrooms?

C. Benefits

3. What are the benefits of including ELL students in your classes?

D. Training

4. What are your feelings about the training and level of support you receive when EAL students are included in your classroom?

5. Tell me about training you have received in working with ELL students.

   a. How effective was this training?

   b. What can administration do to better support you?

   c. What training would you recommend for content teachers for ELL students?

   d. Describe the support you receive from ELL teachers at your school.

E. General Attitudes

6. Please describe your feelings the first time an ELL student enrolled in one of your classes.

   a. How have your attitudes towards EAL students changed over time?

7. What techniques or strategies have been successful in your experience with ELL students who are mainstreamed in your classroom?

8. What techniques have been unsuccessful?
9. How would you characterize your attitude towards teaching EAL students using the terms positive, neutral, or negative?

10. How would you characterize your overall philosophy regarding how and what you teach in your classroom?

F. **Collaboration**

11. What are your experiences with respect to collaborating with other teachers?
   a. What are some experiences you have had working in a collaborative teaching situation?
   b. Describe your past experiences working with education specialists.
   c. What are some positive and negative experiences you have had working in a team taught setting?
   d. What barriers to collaboration with EAL teachers do you feel exist, and how are these similar or different from other collaborative teaching relationships?
   e. What types of instructional strategies have you used to address students’ varied approaches to learning?
   f. What do you see as the roles and responsibilities of collaborative team members?

**Post-Interview Questions**

A. **General Questions**

1. What are your general thoughts on the collaborative work in which we engaged these past few weeks?

2. What were the successes you experienced as a result of participating in the collaborative team with an EAL teacher?
3. What were the challenges you experienced as a result of working with the collaborative team members?

4. What did you learn about yourself while working together to provide sheltered instruction for EAL students?

5. What was the most valuable part of the collaborative process?

6. What did you learn about the other team members during the collaborative process?

7. Were there any barriers to collaboration between the EAL and content-area teachers?
   a. If yes, in what ways do teachers or administration attempt to overcome these challenges?
   b. Were there any barriers that could be eliminated through theoretical knowledge, guided practice, reflection and independent practice?

8. Which types of collaborative activities did you perceive to be most effective for EAL students?

9. How did you feel about using language objectives in your lessons?

10. Did the collaborative opportunity meet your expectations? Why or why not?

11. How do you envision collaboration playing a role in continued interactions between EAL and content teachers?

Closure

- Thank you to interviewee
- Reassure confidentiality
- Ask permission to follow up
Appendix H: Interview Transcript Release Form

(Adapted from the University of Saskatchewan, 2013)

[U of R Letterhead]

TRANSCRIPT RELEASE FORM

In cases where direct quotations will be reported that may compromise the anonymity of participants, it may be appropriate to afford participants the right to verify the accuracy of their responses and/or of the interpretation given to them. Please see our application guidelines for a discussion of these issues. When a transcript release form is appropriate, it should be signed after the participant has had the opportunity to read and revise his/her transcript in order to acknowledge that it accurately portrays what he/ she said. For instance, you may wish to use wording similar to the following for a Data/Transcript Release Form:

Title:

I,__________________________________, have reviewed the complete transcript of my personal interview in this study, and have been provided with the opportunity to add, alter, and delete information from the transcript as appropriate. I acknowledge that the transcript accurately reflects what I said in my personal interview with [name of the researcher]. I hereby authorize the release of this transcript to [name of the researcher] to be used in the manner described in the Consent Form. I have received a copy of this Data/Transcript Release Form for my own records.

_________________________    _________________________
Name of Participant                        Date

_________________________    _________________________
Signature of Participant                    Signature of researcher
# Appendix I: SIOP Lesson Plan – Beth

**Date:** October 29, 2013  
**Grade:** EAL Literacy – 2.5 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Unit/Theme:</strong> Farming</th>
<th><strong>Standards:</strong> RW 4.2 Investigate the importance of agriculture to the economy and culture of Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Content Objectives:**
- distinguish between livestock, oilseed, pulse and cereal crop farming.
- investigate one type of farming.

**Language Objectives:**
- read information on one type of farming and summarize it orally and in written point form.
- listen for information about different types of farming.
- summarize the different types of farming in Saskatchewan in a flip book using drawings and key vocabulary.

**Key Vocabulary:**
- livestock, cattle, dairy, poultry, pigs, bees, sheep, oilseeds, mustard, flax, canola, cereal crops, wheat, oats, barley, legumes, pulse crops, lentils, peas, chickpeas

**Supplementary Materials:**
- Agriculture in the Classroom
  - www.aitc.sk.ca
  - www.agriculture.gov.sk.ca
- picture cards of types of farming in Saskatchewan
- chart paper and coloured markers
- http://www.siopinstitute.net/media/squeepers.pdf
- SQP2RS (Squeepers) graphic organizer, paper for fold books

**SIOP Features:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Preparation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Scaffolding</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group Options</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation of content</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Whole class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to background</td>
<td>Guided practice</td>
<td>Small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to past learning</td>
<td>Independent practice</td>
<td>Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies incorporated</td>
<td>Comprehensible input</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Integration of Processes**
- Reading
- Writing
- Speaking
- Listening

**Application**
- Hands-on
- Meaningful
- Linked to objectives
- Promotes engagement

**Assessment**
- Individual
- Group
- Written
- Oral

**Lesson Sequence**
Motivation/Building Background: (15 minutes) (Large group and pair activities)

1. The teacher will direct the students' attention to the KWL chart on the bulletin board. She will have the students read the points that they added last day under the Know/Would like to know headings. The teacher will explain that the "W" heading is made up of things they would like to know, so these sentences should start with a question word. The teacher will ask the students to give her the common question words (who, what, where, when, when and how) and she will list them on the board. She will model a question that could go under the "W". The students will then meet in groups of 3 to try to come up with at least 3 questions that could be added to the chart. Additions will be listed.

Next, the teacher will ask if there is any information they can add under the "Learned" section. She will let the students "Turn and Talk" to their partners to discuss what they learned about farming. The teacher will pull "sticks from the can" to ask students. Information that they learned will be added in point form on the "L" section of the chart.

Presentation: (10 minutes) (Large group instruction)

2. Share the content and language objectives.
3. Farming in Saskatchewan- The teacher will bring out the hypothesis chart from yesterday and the students will read the names of the types of farms in Saskatchewan. She will explain that they are going to learn more about farming from another website called www.aitc.sk.ca. An outline of the 4 main types of farming in Saskatchewan (livestock, cereal crops, oil seeds and pulse crops) will be given. The teacher will show the students a definition of each type of farming on chart paper.

Practice and Application: (30 minutes) (Large group and small group activities)

Guided Practice:
4. SQP2RS (Squeepers) Jigsaw Activity (Part 1)- The teacher will explain that the students will be learning about the 4 types of farming with 2 other students in their groups. Each group will be working on a different type of farming and their job is to work together with their group members to become experts on their type of farming. Students will meet with their group members and will be given information on their type of farming (Agriculture in the Classroom-Handout 2.1) and their Squeepers outlines. The teacher will use an overhead projector and a transparency of the Squeepers outline to lead all of the groups through the survey, question and predict steps using a "Think Aloud" strategy. She will also attach herself to the group with the 2 early beginners in order to model and assist with the process. The teacher will ask the students to survey the text they have been given. She will have them look at pictures and captions. Also, she will tell them to look at bolded or highlighted words and headings and subheadings. They will be given about 1 minute to do this. Next, the groups will generate a list of 1-4 questions that they think will be answered in the text. The students will record these questions on their Squeepers graphic organizers. They will be given 5 minutes to do this. Then they will be asked to predict 1-3 things that they will learn from the text. 5 minutes will be given for this part also.

The small groups will then read the text together. As they are reading, they will respond to their own questions in jot notes on their graphic organizers. They may also need to drop or add new questions. The final part of Squeepers is to summarize
After answering their questions and confirming or revising their predictions, the groups will write a summary of what they learned in a paragraph on chart paper. These summaries will be shared in the next lesson.

**Independent Practice: (20 minutes)(Independent activity and homework)**

5. Flip Books- Students will make "Flip Books" to display the information they have learned about their type of farming. To make a flip book, students will use 4 pieces of paper that are 8 1/2" x 11". They will fold each paper so that the layers of the book can be seen. (Please see enclosed sample book). The cover will represent their type of farming and each layer will be given a heading to represent an example of that type of farming. The inside of the flip book will contain key words and illustrations that explain each word or phrase. The books will be completed before the next part of the Jigsaw can take place.

6. Jigsaw Activity (Part 2)- (30 minutes) (Small group activity) The groups of students will be reorganized so that there is one "expert" on each type of farming in each new group. The students will take turns reading their summary paragraphs and sharing their flip books with the group. Once each person is finished presenting their type of farming, they will ask the other groups members to do a 1 minute "Quick Write" in their journals about that type of farming.

7. Gallery Walk- (20 minutes) (Small group activity) Once students have finished sharing their farming expertise with their small groups, the teacher will bring out the large chart paper from the beginning of class with the definitions of each type of farming on them. The groups will each choose a recorder and will be given a different coloured marker. The groups will have 3 minutes to add a few jot notes to a chart before they move on to the next chart. Once they move to a chart, they read the definition and the other group's jot notes. If they can add to the notes, they do. Once they have visited each chart, the teacher will display the charts for the class at the front of the room.

**Assessment and Review: (15 minutes)**

8. The students will be given Agriculture in the Classroom Handout 2.2. Students will work independently or in partners to match words from the word bank to the livestock or crop descriptors.

9. The students and teacher will re-read the content and language objectives for the lesson.

11. The teacher will take in the individual Flip Books and assignment 2.2 for assessment.

12. KWL Chart check in: The teacher will have the students look at the KWL chart and will have them focus on the Learned section. The students will "Turn and Talk" to a partner about something that they learned today. Once the students have had 2 or 3 minutes to talk, the teacher will pull "Sticks from a Can" to have students share something that they learned. The teacher will record the students' answers on the large KWL chart.

**Reflections**

This lesson was lengthy to plan and deliver. There were many parts to it that involved SIOP strategies that are new for my students, so I have been doing a lot of modeling and guided instruction for them. Now that I have taught three SIOP lessons, I can see that establishing student routines for the various strategies takes a lot of time and practice. I have noticed
that the students are now moving more quickly into their partners or small groups. This has also shown me that some of my students enjoy leadership roles while others need a lot of encouragement to contribute ideas. I was glad that I took the time to go over the question words at the beginning of the lesson. This helped the students develop questions for the KWL chart and Squeepers. I worked with the beginners on pulse crops and I could see that the students were making a connection between the questions they asked and the predictions they made. Two out of the four groups were speaking to each other in English, but the other 2 were very quiet. They are still very reluctant to speak to each other unless I am structuring dialogue for them. All of the students enjoyed making the flip books. Some of them used key words and others copied the text from the information sheets. Since this was their first attempt at flip books, I met with each student and talked about what was helpful. I was very pleased with the Gallery Walk strategy. The students collaborated well and used their flip books to help them explain their type of farming to their group members. I am pleased with the increase in speaking English in the classroom. Since the majority of this class is Chinese, I have really had to watch to make sure that these students are not relying on their translators and are speaking English. I feel that the range of activities and student involvement is putting them more at ease in the classroom. Some of my students who are passive in groups were participating without teacher encouragement. Student engagement has improved.
### Appendix J: SIOP Lesson Plan - Rebecca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic: Clichés</th>
<th>Class: ELA A30</th>
<th>Date: December 13, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Objectives: I can recognize familiar common place phrases in writing and replace them with original or distinct words, phrases, or images.</td>
<td>Language Objectives: I can understand the concept of clichés and write them in words and images.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Vocabulary: cliché, tone, concrete image, sensory language, parallel constructions</td>
<td>Materials (including supplementary and adapted): Poem: I'm a Canadian by: Duke Redbird, Definition of Cliché, Do you know these clichés activity, Cliché movie or television moments and dialogue (cliché images), Assignment sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher Order Questions:
What general idea or theme are you suggesting through your clichéd images? (Be specific!)
How do the images create a particular tone? For example, critical, admiring, objective tones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Links to Experience:* In writing a poem about identity, they can connect with personal experiences and things that they know in life.

*Links to Learning:* Reading different types of poetry so they understand the format. Pre-teaching the concept of clichés and extending into writing an essay about the poems studied in class. They will use the details of the poem to describe the themes of the poem in their analysis. They need to use their own writing style and avoid using clichés. Also introduced most of the key vocabulary previously.

*Key Vocabulary:* Provided a definition of clichés, gave examples of written clichés to identify in sports, gave a sheet with clichés, discussed cliché images.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>Student Activities (Check all that apply for activities throughout lesson):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffolding: ✔ Modeling ✔☐ Guided ✔☐ Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modeling by creating own version of the poem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grouping: ☐ Whole Class ☐ Small Group ✔☐ Partners ✔☐ Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independently but have option of working with a partner and sharing the grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processes: ✔☐ Reading ✔☐ Writing ✔☐ Listening ✔☐ Speaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Can volunteer to read their poems aloud.

Strategies:  
- [ ] Hands-on  
- [X] Meaningful  
- [X] Links to Objectives

Review and Assessment (Check all that apply):

- [X] Individual  
- [ ] Group  
- [X] Written  
- [ ] Oral

Review Key Vocabulary: Consider creating a colour coded system to identify the vocabulary in own writing piece. For example, highlight three words that identify the tone in your writing.

Review Key Content Concepts: Create a unique poem about personal identity using the style of Duke Redbird and including the key concepts.
### Appendix K: SIOP Lesson Plan – Scott

**Topic:** Limiting Reactant  
**Class:** Chemistry 20  
**Date:** Dec. 12, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Objectives:</th>
<th>Language Objectives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Students will calculate the limiting reactant in a chemical reaction using stoichiometry. | Students will communicate the conclusions of their limiting reactant and percent yield experiment orally to the teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Vocabulary:</th>
<th>Materials (including supplementary and adapted):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Limiting reactant, excess reactant, mass-mass conversions, mole-mole conversions, percent yield. | Computers, Internet access, Various chemicals and lab materials

**Higher Order Questions:**  
What does it mean to be a limiting reactant in a chemical reaction? What would happen if the mass of one of the reactants was changed? Predict the limiting reactant based on the original masses given at the beginning of the experiment.

**Time:**

**Activities**

### Building Background

*Links to Experience:* Make connections to baking, construction, crafts etc. and the idea that one ingredient/supply will run out at some point in the process of creating a “product.” Challenge the students to come up with an example that connects to something they have experienced.

*Links to Learning:* Previous learnings include chemical naming, balancing chemical reactions, mole-mass conversions and mass-mole conversions

*Key Vocabulary:* Limiting reactant, excess reactant, . Write down the new words on the board with definitions and have students copy them down. Connect with the explanation and pictures in the textbook. Also have the students work through a PHET computer simulation connecting chemical reactions to building sandwiches.

**Time:**

**Student Activities (Check all that apply for activities throughout lesson):**

*Scaffolding:* Students will all have computers with the simulation running. I first model an example of how to build the “sandwiches” highlighting the leftovers or “excess reactant” and the reactant that has run out or limiting reactant.

*Grouping:* ☑ Whole Class ☑ Small Group ☐ Partners ☑ Independent

Partners – Work in partners on the computer simulation.  
Small Groups – Connect with other groups of 2 to share work done on the
computer simulation.
Whole group – Work through a problem on limiting reactants together as a whole class.
Independent – Students will practice limiting reactant problems with guidance from the teacher.

Processes:  ☑ Reading  ☑ Writing  ☑ Listening  ☑ Speaking
Strategies:  ☑ Hands-on  ☑ Meaningful  ☑ Links to Objectives

- Note-taking, sharing, technology, problem-solving

Review and Assessment (Check all that apply):

Individual ☑  Group ☑  Written ☑  Oral ☑

Individual – When working with the computer simulation, they can peer and self-assess by comparing the results in their activity.

Review Key Vocabulary: Reviewing the vocabulary throughout the lesson by asking for students to talk through the process of solving an equation in the form of a think-aloud.

Review Key Content Concepts: Students will attempt to create their own limiting reactant problem to promote higher order thinking. Also sharing of their connections to personal experiences involving limiting reactant.
Appendix L: SIOP Student Template for Content and Language Objectives

Date: Monday, February 23, 2014

Content Objectives:
- To identify physical and chemical properties of matter and to be able to classify matter using these properties.
- To classify changes in matter as either physical or chemical.

Language Objectives:
- To develop note-taking skills by writing key definitions and terms.
- To discuss physical and chemical changes with a partner and determine the correct classification.

Key Vocabulary: matter, physical change, chemical change, property, atom, element, compound, mixture, malleability, solubility, precipitate

Rate yourself 1-3, how well did you meet the objectives today?  1  2  3
1. I can teach the concept to someone else because…
2. I can demonstrate my learning and want to know more…
3. I’m not sure, I need more…

Comments:
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Date(s): ____________________________________________

Content Objectives:
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Language Objectives:
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Key Vocabulary:
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate yourself 1-3, how well did you meet the objectives today?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>