UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Santa Barbara

The Importance of Professional Development: A Critical Discourse Analysis Surrounding the Teaching of California's Multilingual Students

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in Education

by

Heather Christina Macias

Committee in charge:

Professor Tim Dewar, Co-Chair

Professor Richard Durán, Co-Chair

Professor Diana Arya

June 2019

The dissertation of Heather Christina Macias is approved.

_____

Diana Arya

_____

Richard Durán, Committee Co-Chair

_____

Tim Dewar, Committee Co-Chair

May 2019

The Importance of Professional Development: A Critical Discourse Analysis Surrounding the Teaching of California's Multilingual Students

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Working on this dissertation was a long and arduous process physically, emotionally, and mentally. As such, the amount of thanks I want to give is significant.

First, I'd like to thank KUSC for always playing in the background when I needed to concentrate. You play too much Tchaikovsky, but thank you nonetheless for your music that helped me focus. On a similar note, I'd like to thank *The Office* for also playing in the background when I needed you. You always left me satisfied (that's what she said).

She can't read, but thank you to my pupper, Lady, for literally being there every step of the way during this dissertation process. You played, chewed, slept, and barked at me from the beginning to the end (you're trying to get me to play fetch as I write this). You forced me to get out and walk you twice a day, prevented me from becoming a sad little hermit-grad student, and you were there every night to sleep next to my head and keep me warm. Thank you for being the emotional support that I needed daily, you little lovebug.

For the humans in my life, I'd like to thank my parents and my sister for enduring me the last five years. I spent most of it broke, grumpy, and hungry, but thank you for feeding me whenever I visited. Your love and support helped me survive and persist. Lindsey, thanks for being there for me when I felt alone. Mom, thank you for helping me to fall in love with teaching. Dad, this Ph.D. is for you.

I'd like to thank my committee, as well. Through your help and guidance, this dissertation process made me a stronger and more confident researcher. Diana, thank you for your help with CDA – this method was a beast, but reading everything Fairclough wrote was all worth it. Richard, thank you for pushing me to become a better scholar. Tim, you kept me

going and made me believe in myself and for that I cannot thank you enough. Thank you for having faith in me and helping me both as a student and as a teacher (I still want your job one day).

Finally, Dina - I will never understand how you tolerated me the last three and a half years, but I could not have done any of this without your unfailing support and love. Through all my tears, frustration, and anxiety, you kept me sane, you fed my stomach and heart, and you sacrificed so much to be with me when I needed you. Thank you for playing the long game and texting me after our first date even though I was late and you thought I laughed too loudly. I love you, wifi.

VITA OF HEATHER CHRISTINA MACIAS
June 2019

EDUCATION

2019 **University of California, Santa Barbara**
Ph.D., Education
Dissertation: "The Importance of Professional Development: A Critical Discourse Analysis Surrounding the Teaching of California's Multilingual Students"
Thesis Committee: Tim Dewar (co-chair), Richard Durán (co-chair), Diana Arya

2017 **University of California, Santa Barbara**
M.A., Education
Thesis: "The Language Ideologies and Language Socialization Practices of Bilingual Latina Mothers"
Thesis Committee: Amy Kyratzis (chair), Richard Durán, Mary Bucholtz

2007 **University of Southern California**
M.A., Secondary Teaching
Single Subject Teaching English Credential and Supplemental Art Credential

2006 **University of Southern California**
B.A., *magna cum laude,* Fine Arts

PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS

2018-2019 **Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara**
Instructor of Record for the graduate student course, Reading and Writing in Content: Literacy Methods, with 40 students. Designed the course to provide credential candidates with the knowledge and skills necessary to design and enact comprehensive English/Language Arts instruction. Lectured, advised students, wrote exams, and oversaw individual lesson planning.

2017-2019 **Department of Asian American Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara**
Instructor of Record for the upper division course, Asian Americans and Education, with 18-30 students, and lower division course, Introduction to Asian American Literature, with 50 students. Developed and directed courses investigating the impact and experiences of Asian Americans in both

educational and literary contexts. Lectured, advised students, wrote exams, and oversaw individual and group projects.

2016-2018 **Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara**
Teaching Consultant/Co-instructor of record for the graduate course, Essential South Coast Writing Project, with 20-25 students. Developed and directed a course introducing teacher candidates to writing-centered pedagogy and practices through active and situated learning. Lectured, advised students, developed curriculum, and oversaw group writing pieces.

PUBLICATIONS

Book Chapters

Macias, Heather. (forthcoming) "Three times a charm: One teacher's confession about her failed attempts to create an inclusive classroom for her autistic students before finally getting it right." In S. Rhoden (Ed.), *The Discomfort zone: Cultural congruence is key in K-12 education.* Lanham, MD: Roman & Littlefield.

Refereed Journal Articles

Macias, Heather. (September 2018) "A threshold concept in grading: How I learned to create meaningful opportunities for collaborative peer editing in the classroom." *California English, 24*(1), 14-16.

AWARDS AND HONORS

2019	Academic Senate Outstanding Teaching Award
2019	California Teacher Education Research and Improvement Network Fellowship
2019	Gevirtz Graduate School of Education Dissertation Fellowship
2018	Graduate Student Association Excellence in Teaching Award
2018	Graduate School of Education Philip and Helen Green Fellowship
2015	South Coast Writing Project Summer Fellowship

CONFERENCE PARTICIPATION

2019 "From good policy to good teaching: A Critical Discourse Analysis of California's teachers and multilingual students." International

Society for Language Studies, Hong Kong, China; June 20-22.

2019 "The role of professional development: A Critical Discourse Analysis of California's English Learners." American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada, April 4-9.

2018 "Culture and commodity: How Latina mothers use language to battle against language loss and assimilation in their children." International Society for Language Studies, Waterloo, Canada; June 28-30.

2018 "On Wednesdays we wear pink: Using writing to help students see beyond their tribe." California Association for Teachers of English, San Diego, CA; March 8-11.

2017 "The language ideologies of Latina mothers regarding Spanish-English Code-switching." International Society for Language Studies, Honolulu, HI; June 5-8.

2017 "The practice and pedagogy of secondary science (and writing) teachers." California STEM, Anaheim, CA; May 4-6.

2017 "Making with a purpose: Exploring reading, writing, presenting, and making connections." California Association for Teachers of English, Santa Clara, CA; February 16-19.

2016 "The misrepresentation of queer Asian American bodies in American popular culture." UCLA QGrad, Los Angeles, CA; October 28.

2016 "The influence of others' language use and language ideologies on bilingual, Latina mothers. American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC; April 8-12.

2015 "Enhancing civic engagement at Club Proteo." University of California Links, Berkeley, CA; March 6-7.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

2015-2019 **Department of Asian American Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara**

Teaching Assistant for various lower division Asian American Studies courses with 200 students. Led three discussion sections elucidating the artistic contributions of Asian American authors and artists. Developed syllabi, administered exams, graded papers, and assigned grades.

Winter/Spring 2016 **Santa Barbara City College/San Marcos High School**
Co-teacher for a community college class for high school seniors with 30 students. Led a one-hour class twice a week on introductory linguistics from a sociolinguistic perspective. Developed a syllabus, lectured, recruited guest speakers, supervised three undergraduate mentors, advised students, and oversaw group projects.

2007-2014 **Granada Hills Charter High School**
English Teacher for a public charter high school for classes ranging from 25-42 students at various grades (9-12) and levels (Honors, College Preparatory, English Language Development, SKILLS). Led five to six one-hour classes five days a week using innovative teaching pedagogy and practices to develop literacy through critical thinking and interdisciplinary learning.

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

2017-2019 **Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA**
Doctoral research under Tim Dewar and Richard Durán's supervision on a qualitative study of the influence of professional development on inservice teachers' attitudes towards English learners and California state policies. Data collection included in-depth interviews with six teachers and two professional development facilitators, and textual analysis of state educational policy documents. (IRB #73-18-0264)

2017 **Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA**
Graduate researcher under Tim Dewar's supervision on a qualitative study of the writing strategies of secondary science teachers involving in a writing-centered summer professional development program. Data collection included in-depth interviews with three science teachers. (IRB #74-18-0452)

2015-2017 **Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA**

Master's thesis research conducted under Amy Kyratzis' supervision on a qualitative study of the language socialization practices and ideologies of bilingual Latina mothers raising bilingual children. Data collection included in-depth interviews with six mothers. (IRB #59-16-0325, modification #16-0325)

2015 **Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA**
Graduate research conducted under Amy Kyratzis and Richard Durán's supervision on a qualitative study of the relationship between personal language ideology and the ideologies of surrounding influences on bilingual, Latina mothers raising bilingual daughters. Data collection included in-depth interviews with three mothers. (IRB #59-16-0325)

2014-2015 **Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA**
Graduate research conducted under Richard Durán and Betsy Brenner's supervision on the digital learning practices of the students at an after-school computer club at a local community center. Data collection included videotaped sessions and field notes of students in an afterschool setting.

SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION

Organizer **Graduate Student Teaching Symposium,** Santa Barbara, CA; 2018

Peer Reviewer **American Educational Research Association Annual Conference**, 2019

American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, 2018

American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, 2016

Graduate Mentor **Club Proteo, Goleta Boys and Girls Club,** 2014-2015
Created and facilitated inquiry-based learning and hands-on activities for children, grades 2-8. Helped train undergraduate students who acted as mentors to the children.

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

Facilitator	**Summer Teaching Institute for Associates,** 2018 "Constructing an Effective Course Syllabus," workshop facilitator "Active Learning," workshop facilitator "Handouts 101," workshop facilitator
Pedagogical Advisor	**Instructional Development,** 2017-2018 "Teaching to Different Levels," workshop facilitator "The Active Classroom," workshop facilitator "Common Concerns for First Time TAs," workshop facilitator
President	**Graduate Student Association for Education,** 2015-2016 Elected chief executive officer of Gevirtz Graduate School of Education student government. Managed and oversaw interests and issues concerning graduate students within the department.
Vice President	**Graduate Student Association,** 2016-2017 Elected executive officer of graduate student government representing 3000 students. Managed and oversaw issues related to graduate student academics and research interests.
Secretary	**Student Resources Building Governance Board,** 2014-2019 Elected officer of the board. Managed meeting minutes and other committee-related documents.
Member	Ombuds Advisory Committee, 2017-2019 Graduate Council (ex-officio), 2016-2017 University of California, Student Mental Health Oversight Committee, 2015-2018 Department of Education, Faculty Executive Committee (ex-officio), 2015-2016

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Speaker/Volunteer	**Pacific Pride Foundation,** 2015-2019

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

California Association of Teachers of English

American Educational Research Association
International Society for Linguistic Studies
National Council of Teachers of English

ABSTRACT

The Importance of Professional Development: A Critical Discourse Analysis Surrounding the Teaching of California's Multilingual Students

by

Heather Christina Macias

To better support teachers enacting policy changes, this study investigated the influence professional development (PD) and California state policy have on teachers' views regarding teaching and feeling supported to teach multilingual students. Teacher-participants were enrolled in a two-year PD program designed to provide teachers with cognitive literacy strategies to teach multilingual students. To better understand the connection between teacher attitudes and PD during a change of policy for English learner (EL) education in California, six 7th-12th grade English/language arts teachers across three cohorts and two PD facilitators were purposefully selected. Drawing on the notion of power as product and power in discourse, Critical Discourse Analysis was conducted of data collected: interviews with teacher-participants and PD facilitators, observations of PD meetings, and written documents of state EL policy, including the California English Language Development Standards and the California EL Roadmap. Findings reveal that these teachers do not feel supported by their schools and districts to gain the necessary skills and knowledge needed to align with California EL policy. However, through the help of an outside PD program that emphasizes

sociocultural learning, teacher-participants were able to collectively develop their EL-centered practice and pedagogy. As a result, both novice and expert teachers felt more confident in the classroom. These findings hold implications for the important role that PD plays in rebuilding teacher agency, communities of practice, and the need for the State to provide clear recommendations for teacher learning to effectively implement policy changes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

I. Introduction

This dissertation is a report of a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of an ongoing professional development (PD) program for inservice teachers learning to effectively teach their multilingual students during a transformative time for California educational policy. The study was based on three data sources: qualitative interview data from inservice teachers and the PD facilitators, observation data from PD meetings, and written discourses of California educational policy, including the California English Language Development (CA ELD) Standards and the California English Learner (CA EL) Roadmap policy. This first chapter of the dissertation presents the background of the study, specifies the problem of the study, and describes its significance. The chapter concludes by presenting an overview of the methodology used and noting the limitations of the study.

A. Background

Currently, California is in a new era of education for its multilingual students, or as they are commonly referred to, English learners (ELs). With the implementation of the CA ELD Standards starting in 2014, the overturning of Proposition 227 (1998) with the passing of Prop. 58 (2016), and then the publication of the EL Roadmap (2017), California is veering away from the deficit perception of ELs. No longer seen as burdens, emerging bilinguals are finally being recognized as a diverse group of learners who have linguistic and cultural tools that add benefits to California's classrooms. Impressively, this shift is in of spite the oppressively nationalistic attitudes of the current White House administration. However, changing policies surrounding multilingual students does not mean that the way they are taught will transform overnight. Passing these new policies does not lead to changes in EL-centered practice and pedagogy without sufficient support for teachers to transform their

teaching to reflect those policy changes. How teachers are being supported to effectively teach emerging bilinguals is just as important as the policies that surround them. No amount of good policy can balance out an educational experience that does not reflect the additive perspective of multilingual students that California has embraced.

High-quality PD for inservice teachers is a central component for creating that transformation. As such, examining PD programs that are aimed at helping teachers effectively teach their emerging bilinguals is imperative for many reasons. Oftentimes, these programs are who teachers turn to ensure that they can provide equitable and rigorous teaching for ELs when their district or school is not doing enough. While student outcomes are a vital aspect of measuring the effectiveness of a PD program, teacher perceptions about feeling supported are also important. High-quality PD ensures that not only do teachers change their practice to better support multilingual students' learning, but also that teachers' ideologies towards feeling supported to effectively teach emerging bilinguals is a positive one, making California's additive-learning perspective of ELs attainable.

B. Problem Statement

The general question this study attempted to answer was, "In what ways, if any, does an ongoing PD program and the State of California influence teacher practices and beliefs to provide equitable and rigorous education for multilingual students?" That larger question subsumes several related questions:

1) What ideologies do inservice junior high and high school English/language arts (ELA) teachers hold regarding…
    a) Teaching multilingual students?
    b) Receiving support to teach multilingual students?

2) What, if any, similarities or differences in teaching multilingual students exist between teachers and other stakeholders in EL education, including…
    a) A high-quality PD program, the Pathway Project?
    b) The State of California, via two state documents, the CA ELD Standards and the CA EL Roadmap?
3) In what ways, if any, does an ongoing PD program and the State of California influence teacher practices and beliefs to provide equitable and rigorous education for multilingual students?

C. Professional Significance

It is hoped that this proposed study of the ideologies of different stakeholders in the education of multilingual students will contribute to the knowledge of both high-quality PD and EL education. Much of the past research on PD has focused on characteristics considered effective in helping teachers learn and change their practices to improve student outcomes (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone, 2009; Desimone et al., 2002; Ingvarson et al., 2005). Additionally, there have been a variety of attempts to understand the catalyst that causes changes in teacher practices and beliefs from effective PD (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Cobb, Wood, & Yackel, 1990; Desimone, 2009; Guskey, 2002, 1986; Huberman, 1985; Opfer & Pedder, 2011; Richardson, Anders, Tidwell, & Lloyd, 1991). However, little of the past research has examined the effects of high-quality PD on specific teacher ideologies. Conspicuously absent is an examination of how high-quality PD can affect teacher perceptions of teaching multilingual students. Given that ELs constitute 21.4% of the State's student population, with 42.6% of enrolled students speaking a language other than English at home (CDE, 2017b), this is an area that needs to be explored.

Moreover, with the current shift in California's attitudes and policy towards multilingual students, this study comes at a unique and critical time for EL education. First, the CA ELD Standards make academic achievement more equitable, more individualized, and more rigorous for emerging bilinguals. Second, with the recent passing of Prop. 58 in 2016, Prop. 227 has been repealed, a 1998 state legislation that required students to take classes only taught in English, unless parents signed a waiver indicating otherwise (Los Angeles Times, 2016). Third, recent changes were made to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015. Fourth, recent implementation of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) changed how districts and schools measure growth in student outcomes, now encouraging "the measurement and improvement of meaningful learning for students, improved resource allocation to the neediest students, and professional learning and supports for teachers and leaders" through models that build political accountability (CDE, 2018, p.9).

Finally, to provide guidance for local educational agencies (LEAs) and to ensure that the State has a unified vision for EL education, the State approved the EL Roadmap in 2017. Deemed a "roadmap," this policy provides LEAs with a common direction for promoting bilingualism and biliteracy in a way that best fits their community and students. Being both flexible and aspirational in its vision for California schools, the EL Roadmap is an essential component in defining how multilingual students in California are taught from this point on. All these policies are evidence of new ideologies towards multilingual students in California and cannot be ignored by researchers. This study looks to add to the research that is just

beginning to examine how such massive changes at the state level affect various LEAs at the local level.

D. Overview of the Methodology

While I will fully address my methodology used for this study in a later chapter, it might be useful to briefly describe my research methods now. The research setting for this study was an ongoing PD program called the Pathway Project offered at the University of California, Santa Barbara. The Pathway Project is for junior high and high school ELA teachers to provide them with cognitive-based pedagogy and instructional practices to help improve the reading comprehension and analytical writing skills of emerging bilinguals. Participating teachers came from the local school districts in Santa Barbara and Ventura counties; participating PD facilitators were the facilitators directly involved in the Pathway Project.

Data collection for this study occurred in three parts: observing PD events, interviewing participating teachers and PD facilitators, and collecting written samples of the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap. Qualitative interviewing methods were used to investigate the participants' perspectives (Patton, 2002). PD events consisted of field notes of the facilitators modeling and providing coaching, as well as naturally occurring interactions between teachers and facilitators. Lastly, the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap were collected, which gave an indication as to the attitudes of the State regarding EL education and multilingual students.

This study drew on the sociocultural approach to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) taken by Fairclough (1992, 1995). CDA is a form of linguistic and semiotic analysis that seeks to explain existing realities by bringing social analysis into the study of language,

while also focusing on discourses and their relationship with other social elements, such as power relations, institutions, social identities, and the like (Fairclough, 2012). I applied this framework to each discourse, working to interpret each text, describe it in the context of receiving support to teach and teaching ELs, and then interpreting how each of these discourses interacted, aligned, or differed from one another in terms of teacher learning and teaching multilingual students.

E. Limitations and Delimitations

While aimed at adding to the research on PD and EL education, this study is not intended to speak for all types of professional learning. Past literature has demonstrated that there are many models and focuses offered for both preservice and inservice teachers. This study focuses on PD aimed at inservice junior high and high school ELA teachers. Furthermore, this dissertation takes the perspective that the PD program examined in this study can be considered high-quality (as known from Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone et al., 2002), but does not speak to the effects of high-quality PD on all teachers. Like many qualitative studies, the subject size of this dissertation remains small and the location confined to one geographic region of California and thus cannot speak to the attitudes of all inservice ELA junior high and high school teachers in the State.

However, this study can serve as a window into the overlooked world of teacher ideologies and EL-focused PD at a specific time in California's educational policy. This dissertation's intent is two-fold. Firstly, to speak to the lack of research into the effects of high-quality PD on teacher perceptions of multilingual students. As stated previously, given the lack of literature into teacher ideologies and high-quality PD aimed at ELs, this dissertation seeks to fill that gap. Secondly, to examine those ideologies in the context of a

political and ideological shift in how California views EL education. Thus, this dissertation is confined to a specific context of policy and practice surrounding EL education that has implications for the future of multilingual students, teachers, PD, and policy.

Chapter II. Literature Review

This chapter encompasses two major sections. The first section reviews the literature on multilingual students. The second section reviews studies on PD.

In the first section, the literature on ELs is briefly discussed. Then previous studies regarding California's perspective on EL education, as demonstrated by the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap, are reviewed in subsections respectively. These research themes were grounded in and drawn from the data analysis of this study (see Chapter 3 for details). Thorough examination of these past literatures contributed to gaining some insight toward answering the research questions.

In the second section, the literature regarding PD is reviewed. In the past, PD has been defined as "any activity that is intended partly or primarily to prepare paid staff members for improved performance in present or future roles in the school district" (Little, 1987, p.491; qtd. in Desimone, 2009). More recently, research on PD acknowledges it as an important component for enacting policy changes and improving student achievement (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Desimone, 2009). PD now is seen as "ongoing, continuous, and embedded in teachers' daily lives" (Desimone, 2009, p.182). Much of the research into what makes PD effective (or not) discusses different characteristics that PD should include to promote change and learning in teachers (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone et al., 2002). While student outcomes are often used to measure and link to the effectiveness of PD (King, 2014), understanding teacher learning and change is less relied upon and clear-cut (Opfer & Pedder, 2011; Wayne et al., 2008). Trying to better understand how teachers learn and change, particularly when linked to a particular ideology such as EL education, needs to be a greater focus in educational research. The researcher of this study

not only examines how high-quality PD affects the ideologies of teachers of multilingual students, but also in what ways state policies surrounding EL education can likewise influence or resemble teacher ideologies of ELs.

A. Review of Multilingual Students

The linguistic challenges that emerging bilinguals face in the classroom are two-fold. On the one hand, their English language proficiency is still developing, including literacy and oral proficiency; simultaneously they are developing their academic English language skills. The standards define "academic language" as the "language used in school to help students develop content knowledge and language students are expected to use to convey their understanding of this knowledge" (CDE, 2014, p.151). While most language learning happens through contact with speakers of the target language, interactional opportunities to practice the type of academic English language that is used and valued in schools is rarer (Wong Fillmore & Fillmore, 2012). As a result, an emerging bilingual faces the greater challenge of becoming proficient in academic English than in the conversational language used amongst peers. In fact, due to the onerous nature of learning academic English, past literature suggests that it can take 4-7 years for an emerging bilingual to acquire enough academic English language proficiency to handle the demands of grade level content (CDE, 2018; Cook, Linquanti, Chinen, & Jung, 2012; Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000). Numerous factors affect second language acquisition, including initial English language proficiency, age/grade level upon entry, native language literacy level, the type of language proficiency assessment used, prior educational experiences, etc. (Heritage, 2015; Proctor, August, Snow, & Barr, 2010).

Despite the challenge of developing the necessary English vocabulary to succeed in school, developing the literacy skills in a student's native language (L1) has been shown to be beneficial to multilingual students. Past research (Cummins, 1991; Proctor et al., 2010; Riches & Genesee, 2006) demonstrates that L1 reading proficiency is linked to second language (L2) literacy, meaning that literacy skills developed in a student's L1 can be transferred to their L2. Additionally, L1 oral abilities help support developing oral abilities in a student's L2 (Riches & Genesee, 2006). For example, a qualitative study done by Proctor and colleagues (2010) of the reading and vocabulary scores of 91 Spanish-English bilingual fourth graders showed that students were more likely to have equal development of both their L1 and L2 when literacy skills were developed in both languages. However, despite this research, past views on second language acquisition have taken a limited view on language learning.

The following three subsections review the theories of second language learning that influence California state standards for ELs. This literature provides a foundation for this study to understand the past theories of second language learning, current theories of second language learning, and how such theories have influenced both the creation of the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap.

1. Past Approaches to English language development.

Past approaches to English language development paid little attention to language and focused primarily on vocabulary development (Wong Fillmore & Fillmore, 2012), often to the detriment of the students. This practice stems from traditional language theories that were formal or functional in design and emphasized sentence patterns, grammatical rules, parts of speech, and meaning (van Lier & Walqui, 2012). As a result, using language correctly has

been the focus of English language development for some time, preventing students from participating in any true creativity or critical thinking in the classroom. Worth noting is that the formal and functional approaches to language learning were developed for the teaching of foreign languages in "situations in which the target language was not indispensable for students' participation in valued everyday societal practices" (van Lier & Walqui, 2012, p.4). Despite this obvious mismatch with multilingual students, these views on second language acquisition persisted.

Consequently, there now exists a glut of ELs who have been trapped for 6 years or more at the intermediate levels of English proficiency or lower. This is particularly true at the secondary school level, with 59% of ELs being labeled "long term English learners" (Olsen, 2010). A study of 150 middle schools from 25 different California school districts with high populations of multilingual students showed similar results, with most of the school's emerging bilinguals stalling at the intermediate level and some interview participants even referring to the students as "lifers" (Walqui, Koelsch, Hamburger, Gaarder, Insaurralde, Schmida, & Weiss, 2010, p.76).

Reasons for such a plateau in English language development are many. These reasons include students receiving little to no language development, below or limited access to grade level curricula and materials, and enrollment in weak language development program models or poorly implemented EL programs (Olsen, 2010). These factors vary student to student and school to school, but largely result in significant gaps in academic English. Along similar lines, some emerging bilinguals are reclassified as English fluent before they have attained the academic English language needed to succeed (Olsen, 2010). Fortunately, second language learning has taken a new direction recently, as demonstrated by the new standards

for ELs put forward by the California. However, before discussing the CA ELD Standards, it is important to understand the context that spurred their development: the creation of the California Common Core State Standards (CA CCSS) in 2010.

2. Developing new standards for the State of California.

Developed alongside the CA CCSS for Mathematics and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), the CA CCSS for ELA/Literacy were designed "to ensure K-12 (kindergarten through grade 12) students gain the necessary literacy/language arts, science, and mathematics understanding and practices required for twenty-first-century higher-education and workplace participation" (CDE, 2014, p.2). These standards place a larger emphasis on writing across the curriculum, particularly reading and creating argumentative, evidence-based writing (CDE, 2014, p.165; Santos, Darling-Hammond, & Cheuk, 2012).

To complicate matters, academic texts in middle and high school are full of meaning and highly structured, using written academic language that differs from linguistic styles used in ordinary oral conversations (Schleppegrell, 2004). And while these standards were designed with English-speaking students in mind, they are also meant to apply to multilingual students. Thus, for an EL to master evidence-based writing across the curriculum, they must understand how to structure different arguments to understand, create, and present their own (Bunch et al., 2012; CDE, 2014, p.165). In addition to learning how to gather and manage information when composing their arguments, emerging bilinguals have the additional task of analyzing and evaluating these texts in a second language (Bunch et al., 2012; Heritage, 2015). Moreover, many factors play into an EL's ability to read and write in a second language beyond their English language proficiency, including their native language proficiency (oral and written), their academic subject matter knowledge, the similarity of

their L1 to English (oral and written), immigration status, socioeconomic status, parents' educational levels and English proficiency, etc. (CDE, 2014; Council of Chief State School Officers, 2012; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Thus, the CA ELD Standards are meant to acknowledge these factors and support emerging bilinguals while they grapple with the same expectations and standards of their native English-speaking peers.

To ensure their success in the classroom, Assembly Bill 124 was enacted on October 8, 2011, requiring the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and State Board of Education to update, revise, and align the current CA ELD Standards with California's new ELA/Literacy Standards. The process of updating the CA ELD Standards focused on two main goals, "(1) transparency toward and input from the field and (2) development based on sound theory and empirical research" (CDE, 2014, p.2). As a result, the new intention of the CA ELD Standards is to "advance English proficiency with academic English while developing content knowledge across all disciplines" (CDE, 2014, p.164). The intention of the standards no longer focuses solely on mastering English-fluency but creates a dual goal of developing both academic English language AND content knowledge - although still pushing for such content knowledge to be developed in mainly English, as implied through the use of the word "while." This implication is problematic, however, as it creates an association between English and knowledge, unintentionally (or intentionally?) devaluing students' native language.

In addition to a shift from ELs purely learning vocabulary to learning vocabulary through content, the CA ELD Standards also redirect their view on language learning to a more sociocultural perspective. Previously, the 1999 CA ELD Standards had a more formal and functional perspective on language learning. Learning English meant learning and

following a set of rules, while grammar was kept separate from meaning; language development was viewed as a linear process that was identical for all emerging bilinguals and focused on accuracy over meaning, usually through simplified texts (CDE, 2014, p.164). Now, the 2012 CA ELD Standards view English as a meaning-making resource where grammar is inseparable from meaning and language learning is non-linear, complex, and relies on interactions with others, while utilizing "complex and intellectually challenging texts" (CDE, 2014, p.164) to build content knowledge (Brisk & Proctor, 2012; Heritage, 2015). The understanding that language learning is semiotic and sociocultural shifts the focus from accuracy to meaningful interactions with peers and teachers. This creates the potential for more opportunities for multilingual students to not only develop their conversational English, but also their discipline-specific English. Students are expected to use language to demonstrate comprehensive, analytical, and evaluative skills (Schleppegrell, 2004). Therefore, the greater language-explicitness of the CA ELD Standards offers an opportunity for teachers to engage emerging bilinguals in both general and discipline-specific academic language across all content areas (Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2002).

Specifically, a major emphasis on the connection between language and meaning was absent in the 1999 CA ELD Standards, but is now present. The 2012 CA ELD Standards emphasize "learning about how English works," where teachers can now focus on making visible to their students linguistic features of academic English (CDE, 2014, p.172). This can be seen in the identification of key language demands throughout the standards and in other academic texts that may prove challenging to ELs. Now, students and teachers must play close attention to language and how it is used, promoting student development of more metalinguistic and metacognitive skills on the path to fluency (Brisk & Proctor, 2012). This

is a move away from the previous view of language "as form or even as function, and toward a redefinition of language as a complex adaptive system" (Hakuta & Santos, 2012, p.ii) that students are now encouraged to be aware of as they gain English language fluency.

Therefore, when used correctly, these standards are meant to help content-area teachers recognize opportunities for language development in content instruction and foster developing language that is focused on discipline-specific practices and content knowledge (CDE, 2014, p.175). Before, students were stilted in their language growth and not developing the academic language needed to succeed in school. Now, teachers are encouraged to strategically use complex texts to help emerging bilinguals master both English language fluency AND content knowledge in all subject matters. To fully unpack the State's new attitude towards second language learning, I will now discuss four specific perspectives found in the CA ELD Standards: activating prior knowledge, developing metacognitive and metalinguistic knowledge, the importance of language and interaction, and encouraging students' intentional learning and strategic use of language.

3. The New California English Language Development Standards.

The theories that feed into the CA ELD Standards are largely sociocultural, sociolinguistic, and sociocognitive in nature. Halliday's (1993) theory of learning and Vygotsky's (1978) theory of development are overarching influences, lending connections to language and meaningful interactions to construct knowledge.

a. Activating prior knowledge.

Firstly, the CA ELD Standards value student's prior knowledge and experiences for learning. They promote the development of new knowledge by making connections to prior knowledge (Bailey & Wolf, 2012; Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Bunch et al., 2012;

CCSSO, 2012; Durán, 2014). Bransford and colleagues (2000) explain that "all learning involves transfer from previous experiences" (p.68). By helping students to trigger their prior knowledge in relevant learning situations, students are more likely to connect old knowledge to new knowledge. Similarly, teachers should consider students' cultural practices from the home, "actively identifying the relevant knowledge and strengths that students bring to a learning situation and build on them" (p.78). Previous or prior knowledge can be helpful for students when making sense of new information. However, it can also be misleading or conflict with community practices, thereby making a student's background knowledge still worth addressing when helping students to construct new understandings (Bransford et al., 2000). Finally, and possibly most importantly, a student's background knowledge is vital in acknowledging and respecting the knowledge that emerging bilinguals have coming into the classroom. By acknowledging what students bring with them and using it to help construct new knowledge, the CA ELD Standards set a more positive tone towards students' past experiences and home cultures. This respect for students' experiences and cultures can occur if teachers remain open towards what students have to offer, with a willingness to position themselves as learners, too.

In terms of classroom practices, valuing and activating prior knowledge can take several forms. First, Moll and colleagues (2001) promote utilizing multilingual students' "funds of knowledge," referring to the "historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being" that students and their families bring with them, particularly students of color (p.134). By drawing upon students' and their families' cultural and cognitive resources for classroom instruction, teachers can reach better understandings of their school population. Similarly, the

students become active learners, "strategically using their social contacts outside the classroom to access new knowledge for the development of their studies" (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 2001, p.138). As a result, the cultural and cognitive resources of the students find a place in the classroom, valuing and respecting their prior knowledge while making community connections and giving teachers opportunities to learn from their students.

However, utilizing the cultural and cognitive resources that students bring into the classroom is not as easy task. As Durán (2014) explains in the case of Latinx students, "it will require that educators and policy makers attend to the moral will and human understanding of Latinos, their cultural and linguistic resources, and their communities as they are experienced in everyday settings" (p.207). Such an endeavor means learning and curriculum is determined by the social and cultural processes of the students and their community, giving more agency to them and less to those who traditionally decided curriculum, schools and policy makers (Durán, 2014). This calls for a significant shift in practice, pedagogy, and largely agency, but most likely not what the CA ELD Standards are espousing when calling for teachers to acknowledge students' prior knowledge, unfortunately.

Another way to utilize students' prior knowledge in the classroom is in the bilingual classroom. Mainly, where students' linguistic and cultural resources are seen as assets, not detriments, to learning (Michael, Andrade, & Bartlett, 2007). In fact, high-quality bilingual programs have been shown to successfully educate not only multilingual students, but also language majority students (Gomez, Freeman, & Freeman, 2010). Furthermore, students benefit from the presence of bilingual school personnel in the classroom (Brisk & Proctor,

2012). By seeing academically successful bilingual adults, ELs can make a connection with adults who speak their native language. A multi-state study of 345 pre-kindergarteners who attended pre-kindergarten programs with various levels of Spanish- and English-speaking teachers demonstrated that EL students were more social and assertive with their peers and teachers when they experienced more Spanish-language interactions in the classroom (Chang, Crawford, Early, Bryant, Howes, Burchinal, Barbarin, Clifford, & Pianta, 2007).

Utilizing a student's L1 can likewise be beneficial when a student is literate in their native language and at grade level. At this stage in their learning, a student can work on developing both their academic English-language and their content knowledge in their L1 (August & Shanahan, 2006; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). A bilingual model allows students to gain academic English-fluency in a less stressful environment (Bunch et al., 2012). Students can continue working at grade level by engaging with intellectually stimulating texts that can enhance their academic knowledge and vocabulary in both their L1 and L2. Finally, by learning subject matter content in their L1 and transferring it to their L2 as they develop academic English-fluency, students can reap the metalinguistic and metacognitive benefits of bilingualism (August & Shanahan, 2006; Bransford et al., 2000; Bunch et al., 2012; CDE, 2018; Chang et al., 2007; Genesee et al., 2006), which is another important component of the CA ELD Standards.

b. Metacognitive and metalinguistic knowledge.

Secondly, the CA ELD Standards push for students to think about their thinking and language use (Bransford et al., 2000; CDE, 2014). In other words, students need to develop their metacognitive and metalinguistic knowledge. Research has shown that by "helping students become more aware of themselves as learners who actively monitor their learning

strategies and resources and assess their readiness for particular tests and performances" (Bransford et al., 2000, p.67), they are more likely to independently transfer and connect new knowledge to prior knowledge. Similarly, teaching students to use and draw from a variety of comprehension techniques that emphasize metacognition helps increase understanding in reading comprehension (Duke, Pearson, Strachan, & Billman, 2011; Olson & Land, 2007).

Past studies on building metacognitive and metalinguistic knowledge in the classroom have demonstrated increased reading comprehension in students (Guthrie, Wigfield, Barbosa, Perencevich, Taboada, Davis, Scafiddi, & Tonks, 2004; Olson & Land, 2007; Palincsar & Brown, 1984; Spörer, Brunstein, & Kieschke, 2009). For example, Spörer and colleagues (2009) measured the reading comprehension of 210 third through sixth grade students using standardized test scores. Results indicated that students who were taught to use cognitive and metacognitive strategies were able to engage with the texts more deeply and score higher in reading comprehension. Guthrie et al. (2004) was able to find similar results on third-grade students from four different schools; students who were taught to use cognitive strategies compared to traditional reading instruction that did not include such strategies had higher test scores on reading comprehension, reading motivation, and reading strategies. Booth Olson and Land (2007) found that ELs particularly benefit from being given instruction in metacognitive skills because they make visible the "thinking tools" used by experienced readers and writers during the meaning-making process (p.297). Additional research has also explored similar metacognitive benefits in being bilingual.

Bilingualism helps foster metacognitive and metalinguistic knowledge in students and is congruent with this focus of the 2012 CA ELD Standards (Brisk & Proctor, 2012). For example, Adesope, Lavin, Thompson, & Ungerleider (2010) looked at the cognitive

correlates of bilingualism. After examining data from 63 different studies, their findings indicated that regardless of socioeconomic status, bilingualism fosters greater metacognitive and metalinguistic awareness, greater attentional control and problem solving, and other benefits. Thus, it is apparent that the CA ELD Standards are finally recognizing the research that demonstrates the cultural and cognitive resources that multilingual students bring to the classroom. Being allowed to use their prior knowledge and their home language allows students to see and use their cultural and linguistic knowledge as tools, not as impediments towards academic success.

The practical side of building students' metacognitive and metalinguistic knowledge depends on breaking from traditional reading comprehension teaching and relying more cognitive-based reading strategies. These strategies help students engage with texts more deeply by mimicking what advanced readers automatically do when reading (Palincsar & Brown, 1984). Furthermore, these strategies give students a routine for reading, which leads to more independence as students. Cognitive strategy instruction includes, but is not limited to, activating prior background knowledge to connect to texts; using student-generated questions related to the texts; using graphic organizers to organize information; and monitoring comprehension during reading (Boardman & Jensen Lasser, 2016; Booth Olson & Land, 2007; Genesee et al., 2006; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). What makes these strategies more effective for reading comprehension and engagement is that they "increase students' competence in using the strategy, awareness of the strategy, and comprehension of text for which the strategy was intended" (Guthrie et al., 2004, p.405; National Reading Panel, 2000).

There exists a variety of classroom models that utilize a combination of these and other cognitive and metacognitive strategies. This includes reciprocal teaching as used in the studies by Spörer et al. (2009), Guthrie et al. (2004), and Palincsar and Brown (1984), where students not only use cognitive strategies, but also work in small groups to help teach and guide one another through a text. As a result, less able students can benefit from their more able peers (Palincsar & Brown, 1984). This is particularly helpful for emerging bilinguals who may be at different levels of L2 language proficiency and can benefit from the help of more fluent speakers, giving ELs a chance to practice speaking and writing academic English with their peers. This model of teaching relies heavily on teacher modeling or scaffolding, leading to the third theoretical framework used by CA ELD Standards.

c. Language and interaction.

Third, the CA ELD Standards view language and interaction as playing an important role that mediate both linguistic and cognitive development through social interactions. Literacy learning is situated in and mediated by social and cultural interactions and tools (Heath, 1983; Vygotsky, 1978). This means that different social organizations create different opportunities for literacy, each particular to that sociocultural environment. For example, in her extensive ethnography of two communities, one white and one Black American, Heath (1978) demonstrated how speech and literacy practices varied socially and culturally. Each community developed and utilized language and literacy in unique ways in the home, colloquially, and in schools. Important to note is that classroom social interactions can intellectually and linguistically challenge learners as they are often complex and different from the everyday social interactions amongst families (Cazden, 2001). Moreover, the teacher can create different types of interactions in the classroom to help students construct

meaning from speech. These interactions are most meaningful when used to help build new knowledge. Therefore, Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (ZPD) (1978) becomes particularly relevant for all teacher-student interactions, including with multilingual students.

ZPD helps bridge the gap between what tasks a student cannot do independently now and what they will eventually be able to do alone through the guidance of a more advanced expert (Vygotsky, 1978). ZPD is relevant for the CA ELD Standards as teachers - and peers - can strategically guide emerging bilinguals to master both content and the necessary language that accompanies it.

Related to ZPD is Bruner's (1983) idea of "scaffolding." Scaffolding is "the process of 'setting up' the situation to make the child's entry easy and successful and then gradually pulling back and handing the role to the child as he becomes skilled enough to manage it" (p.60). Scaffolding is essential for teaching ELs at different levels of English language proficiency and/or alongside monolingual English-speaking students, which can prove complicated for teachers in diverse classrooms. Teachers need to balance content knowledge, student knowledge, and language development, thereby making it important "to provide access for all learners" (Heritage, Silva, & Pierce, 2007, p.186). This access is done through scaffolding a lesson appropriately to meet the diverse needs of all students (CDE, 2018; Heritage, 2015). Furthermore, teachers must also take into consideration that "effective support does not just spontaneously occur" (Hammond, 2006, p.271). Teachers need a clear understanding of the content to plan scaffolding appropriately throughout lessons, including incorporating meaningful experiences for speaking and writing in academic English and scaffolding the academic language that is needed to build meaning (Heritage et al., 2007; van

Lier, 2004). However, while most scaffolding is planned, unplanned opportunities can likewise aid students to become more independent.

Classroom practices for scaffolding can be either planned or done in the moment to best serve students' needs as necessary (CDE, 2014, p.149). For moments where scaffolding is built into lessons, teachers can use a variety of techniques, including utilizing students' home culture in the classroom to promote transfer (Bransford et al., 2000); modeling tasks and skills for students to use as a guide towards independence (Bruner, 1983); checking for understanding, both informally and formally; promoting critical thinking through questions; enhancing content through a variety of presentations (graphic organizers, photos, video, etc.); and providing a variety of language models for students to draw from, such as word walls, sentence stems, writing samples, etc. (Boardman & Jensen Lasser, 2016; CDE, 2014; Walqui, 2006).

Additionally, utilizing collaborative group work is an ideal way for students to create meaning through language with their peers (CDE, 2014; CCSSO, 2012; Dutro & Kinsella, 2010; Gibbons, 2009). Providing opportunities for small group discussions with peers gives ELs chances to practice using academic, content-specific language with one another to build content knowledge (Gibbons 2009; Walqui & van Lier, 2010). Interaction and collaboration are also important for the Speaking and Listening Standards, in addition to various cooperative tasks (Bunch et al., 2012). In addition to planned scaffolding where teachers can create deliberate moments of guidance, in-the-moment-scaffolding can help students spontaneously as moments arise. This includes prompting students to elaborate on answers; paraphrasing students' responses to model academic English; checking for understanding; and linking student responses to prior knowledge (CDE, 2014). Finally, and important to

note, is that meaningful interactions with peers and teachers help emerging bilinguals construct meaning from experiences, particularly when focusing on what has been emerging with each component of the CA ELD Standards: developing academic English language.

d. Intentional learning and language use.

Lastly, the CA ELD Standards encourage students' intentional learning and strategic use of language (Duke et al., 2011; Halliday, 1993; Palincsar & Brown, 1984; Schleppegrell, 2004). This aspect of the standards integrates all three previously mentioned theoretical frameworks where the development of academic English language is imperative for emerging bilinguals. As students are expected to explain their ideas and critique those of others, both orally and in written form, they need exposure to many examples of how academic English is used across all disciplines (Quinn & Valdes, 2012). Therefore, sheltering emerging bilinguals from complex and intellectually stimulating texts, as was encouraged with the 1999 CA ELD Standards, is detrimental to their English language development. Students do not engage in critical thinking by memorizing lists of words with no context of their usage. Rather, ELs need to be given strategies and opportunities to use and make sense of complex texts in different contexts (CDE, 2018; Quinn & Valdes, 2012; Walqui & Heritage, 2012). Wong Fillmore and Fillmore (2012) see the importance of exposing emerging bilinguals to complex texts because they "provide school-age learners reliable access to this language and interacting with such texts allows them to discover how academic language works" (p.2). While utilizing students' home language and prior knowledge is vital for engagement and knowledge building, learning to adopt and practice "aspects of academic English that approach the more 'literate' ways of communicating that are highly valued in

school" is necessary for academic success (CDE, 2014, p.149; Dutro & Kinsella, 2010; Gibbons, 2009; Schleppegrell, 2004).

Halliday (1993) states that the connection between language and content are linked, but oftentimes ELs find it difficult to move between academic and informal registers. It is important for teachers to develop students' awareness of and proficiency in using the language features of academic language to better comprehend and create academic texts (Hammond, 2006). Unfortunately, this perspective does perpetuate the view that academic English is of higher value than other forms of discourse because it leads to academic achievement, which leads to other forms of capital valued by Western society (economic, social, etc.). However, understanding how to vary one's language for different contexts, purposes, and using different registers and genres is essential for any skilled speaker (Walqui & Heritage, 2012). Thus, learning to use academic language is still a valuable skill to develop in any language.

Furthermore, the standards' explicitly call for an "intentional" use of language, stepping away from the formal and functional theories of language that the previous CA ELD Standards (1999) clung to. Whereas before vocabulary and syntax were the main foci of the 1999 CA ELD Standards, the 2012 CA ELD Standards focus on discourse practices, text structures, and vocabulary (August & Shahana, 2006). All these components of language are inseparable from meaning and are finally given attention now (Snow & Uccelli, 2009; Wong Fillmore & Fillmore, 2012). Looking at discourse practices is important for ELs who need to develop academic English proficiency across all disciplines to be college and career-ready (CDE, 2014, p.151). Therefore, it is important to expose students to and encourage them to

use discipline-specific vocabulary and general vocabulary (August & Shanahan, 2006; Snow & Uccelli, 2009).

Classroom practices abound with opportunities for students to use and practice academic English, many of which have been discussed previously. Small groups, scaffolding, teaching content in a student's L1, and many cognitive and metacognitive strategies all can be used to develop a student's linguistic repertoire (August & Shanahan, 2006; Genesee et al., 2006; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Additionally, teachers can provide varied language experiences (student- and teacher-led read-alouds); front load specific vocabulary; teaching word-learning strategies (cognates, morphology, etc.) for decoding; and encourage word play to explore language (August & Shanahan, 2006; Boardman & Jensen Lasser, 2016; CDE, 2014; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Worth noting is that just as academic language should be developed across all disciplines, these strategies should likewise be utilized in all subject matters to help emerging bilinguals develop their L2 evenly and thoroughly. ELs can succeed academically only through a concerted effort by teachers of all subject matters to help multilingual students reach English proficiency.

Given the major shift that places a significant emphasis on understanding language, teachers need the appropriate support necessary to be successful and consistent in implementing the CA ELD Standards. The final subsection will discuss the creation of EL Roadmap as a response to help LEAs effectively implement the CA ELD Standards.

4. The California English Learner Roadmap.

The CA EL Roadmap was conceived as a policy to promote the capacity-building and the continual improvement of LEAs' implementation of the CA ELD Standards across the

State. Approved on July 12, 2017, the mission of the EL Roadmap is for all California schools to:

> ...affirm, welcome, and respond to a diverse range of English learner strengths, needs, and identities. California schools prepare graduates with the linguistic, academic, and social skills and competencies they require for college, career, and civic participation in a global, diverse, and multilingual world, thus ensuring a thriving a future for California. (CDE, 2018, p.1)

Although aspirational in its scope, this policy focuses on multilingual students in the context of the changing landscape of California education. It looks to acknowledge the diversity of California's emerging bilingual students (CDE, 2018). This includes the linguistic and cultural experiences and capital that the students and their families bring with them. Furthermore, there is a focus on standards, curriculum frameworks, assessment, accountability, school improvement, educator quality, early childhood/preschool, social and family support services, and parent/community involvement (p.1).

Aimed primarily at LEAs, the policy is intended to be used by all levels of educators in California's educational system. Parents, pre-K-12 teachers, administrators, credential programs, and professional and advocacy organizations all have a responsibility in serving ELs (CDE, 2018, p.3). To effectively implement the EL Roadmap and the CA ELD Standards, all these stakeholders need to work together to recognize various facets of effective EL education. These ideas behind the vision of the EL Roadmap have been broken down into four main principles to cover all aspects of EL education.

The first principle, "Assets-Oriented and Needs Responsive Schools," values student's L1 and bilingualism, which is at the core of the EL Roadmap (CDE, 2018). Seeing

students' native language and their varied life experiences as assets to their learning - and not as detriments - can help create school cultures that ensure multilingual students' equitable access to a rigorous education. This principle, befitting its place in the order, is the most essential of all the principles as the attitudes of educators need to reflect the same assets-based attitudes of the State for ELs to feel supported, included, and safe. Furthermore, this principle serves as the main inspiration for this study that seeks to examine the ideologies of teachers regarding their ELs in the context of the EL Roadmap.

The remaining three principles work to support this affirming attitude held by the State and other levels of the educational system in EL education through tangible and deliberate steps. Principle Two, "Intellectual Quality of Instruction and Meaningful Access," calls for county, district, and school leaders to ensure that the necessary resources are allocated in decisions that are consistent with the EL Roadmap. This principle aims for all planning and accountability across the system to be focused on strengthening practices and outcomes for emerging bilinguals (CDE, 2018). This goal is especially relevant in the context of the professional, performance, and political, accountability of the LCFF/LCAP. Providing a rigorous, standards-based curriculum with high-expectations and the necessary instructional materials are all essential aspects of this principle. Principle Three, "System Conditions that Support Effectiveness," pushes for leaders of schools, programs, and services aimed at EL education to provide clear goals, PD, and reliable assessments that inform instruction and continuous improvement (CDE, 2018). This principle asks that both the curriculum and the leadership at various levels of EL education to be held accountable for promoting and building effective EL learning. One aspect of this principle is the need for PD aimed at inservice teachers to ensure rigorous teaching and curriculum for multilingual students,

although it is not the main focus of the principle. Like the first principle, the third principle has also served as a major inspiration for this study that aims to examine the effects of PD aimed at EL education on teacher ideologies. Lastly, the final principle, "Alignment and Articulation within and across Systems," asks LEAs to provide "continuity, alignment, and articulation across grade levels and system segments beginning with a strong foundation in early childhood (preschool), and continuing through elementary and secondary levels onto graduation, postsecondary education, and career preparation" (CDE, 2018, p.16). This aspect of the EL Roadmap is what pushes for consistency across all systems in the State, ensuring that ELs receive the same affirming and rigorous education across California.

In sum, this policy hopes to fulfill the vision for multilingual students to "fully and meaningfully access and participate in a twenty-first century education from early childhood through grade twelve that results in their attaining high levels of English proficiency, mastery of grade level standards, and opportunities to develop proficiency in multiple languages" (CDE, 2018, p.1). Unlike the CA ELD Standards that just provide isolated standards to guide teachers in the classroom, this policy helps make visible the need for ALL stakeholders in EL education to be held accountable. By creating curricular and ideological alignment across the State through different levels and systems of EL education, while also holding leaders and teachers responsible, EL education can become more powerful and more effective. This level of accountability has never been implemented to this degree and as such, the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap collectively place California back at the forefront of EL education; something not seen since before 1998 and the adoption of Prop. 227.

In conclusion, the CA CCSS set a high linguistic standard for emerging bilinguals. However, the CA ELD Standards seek to make class content more accessible for students.

The standards now focus on understanding and formulating evidence-based arguments across the curriculum (Santos et al., 2012), none of which can be done in isolation or without context (Bunch et al., 2012). This new emphasis on language has likewise pervaded into the CA ELD Standards, where a greater focus has been placed on learning how language works and the relationship between meaning and language. The EL Roadmap also helps promote a positive, assets-based view on language and bilingualism in the hopes that EL education can be consistent, aligned, and continually improving.

The role of sociocultural, sociolinguistic, and sociocognitive factors is apparent in the theoretical frameworks of the CA ELD Standards. Unlike the previous set of ELD Standards, the 2012 ones realize the importance of accessing prior knowledge (Bailey & Wolf, 2012; Bransford et al., 2000; Bunch et al., 2012; CCSSO, 2012; Durán, 2014); the importance of developing ELs' metacognitive and metalinguistic knowledge to aid literacy development (CDE, 2014); the connection between language and interaction (Cazden, 2001; Gibbons 2009; Heath, 1983; Vygotsky, 1978; Walqui & van Lier, 2010); and finally the value of intentional language learning and use in order to gain academic English language proficiency across all content areas (Duke et al., 2011; Halliday, 1993; Palincsar & Brown, 1984; Schleppegrell, 2004). Using these views on second language learning, this study examined teachers' ideologies on teaching ELs and where these ideologies overlapped or varied compared to those of PD facilitators and the State of California.

To understand the role of PD in helping inservice teachers effectively implement and teach their emerging bilinguals, the second major section of this literature review examines past research on PD.

B. Professional Development

This study examined the discourses of inservice junior high and high school ELA teachers and their ideologies surrounding teaching ELs. For teachers to support emerging bilinguals in the classroom, teachers themselves need to feel supported. This makes inservice professional development even more essential in helping teachers develop EL-appropriate pedagogy and practice (Heritage, 2015; Santos et al., 2012; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007; Walqui, Hamburger, Koelsch, et al., 2010).

The current need for PD aimed at EL education includes preservice and inservice teachers of all subject matters. The CA CCSS call for deeper content knowledge and more writing instruction across the curriculum (Heritage, 2015); consequently, teacher preparation programs and inservice PD "need to support teachers' deeper understanding of content and mastery of instructional strategies that assist all students' attainment of more rigorous standards" (Santos et al., 2012, p.3). What is more, the lack of guidance in terms of curriculum and instruction provided by both the CA CCSS and the CA ELD Standards (Durán, 2014) makes PD even more essential, helping teachers to develop actual lessons and strategies based on the standards.

For teachers to meet the demands of the CA ELD Standards, as well as the call to action in the EL Roadmap, new opportunities for PD need to be provided for teachers and schools. This means avoiding the "ineffective 'drive-by' workshop model" of the past (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009, p.1) and using research to design more effective models. There exists a plethora of research into PD and inservice teacher professional learning, each with different approaches to what defines effective PD (Desimone, 2009). These approaches range from looking at specific characteristics of effective PD (Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017; Desimone, 2009; Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, &

Birman, 2002; Ingvarson, Meiers, & Beavis, 2005); to examining ways to measure change in teacher practices and beliefs (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Cobb, Wood, & Yackel, 1990; Desimone, 2009; Guskey, 2002, 1986; Huberman, 1985; Opfer & Pedder, 2011; Richardson, Anders, Tidwell, & Lloyd, 1991); and to looking at different theoretical perspectives on teacher learning (Jenlink & Kinnucan-Welsch, 2001; Jurasaite-Harbison & Rex, 2010; Kelly, 2006; Kwakman, 2003; Pedder, James, & MacBeath, 2005; Peressini, Borko, Romagnano, Knuth, & Willis, 2004; Putnam & Borko, 2000).

Research in the last several decades has come to demonstrate the importance of professional learning for inservice teachers. In the past, PD has been defined as "any activity that is intended partly or primarily to prepare paid staff members for improved performance in present or future roles in the school district" (Little, 1987, p.491; qtd. in Desimone, 2009). Unfortunately, traditional approaches to teacher learning have been and continue to be in short workshop form, which has been shown to be ineffective in changing teacher practices because of the disconnect and decontextualization the workshops have from teachers and the classroom (Stein, Silver, & Smith, 1999). In fact, 91.5% of teachers spend their professional learning in workshop type PD (Darling-Hammond, Chung Wei, Andree, & Richardson, 2009). However, newer views on how to conceptualize PD acknowledge it as an important component for enacting policy changes and improving student achievement (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Desimone, 2009). Compared to the one-and-done method of before, PD now is seen as "ongoing, continuous, and embedded in teachers' daily lives" (Desimone, 2009, p.182).

Additionally, teachers realize the importance of professional learning to their professional lives. A study done by Pedder, James, and MacBeath (2005) surveyed teachers

from 32 British primary and secondary schools; their findings indicated that teachers see professional learning opportunities as important or crucial for their both their students' and their own learning. Collinson's (2012) three-year qualitative study of 81 peer-nominated "exemplary teachers" also showed that exemplary teachers actively look for and participate in professional development that is long in duration, helps them learn about themselves, their content, their students, and is collaborative in nature. Likewise, Ashdown and Hummel-Rossi's (2005) examination of teacher participation in two different types of PD aimed at science and reading demonstrated that "high-quality professional development programs produce high-quality results" in teachers and student achievement when programs are differentiated to meet teachers' needs at different phases of their careers and when the program impacts the teachers' beliefs and practices.

It is apparent from the research that effective PD is an important part of school improvement, where teachers can continue to learn and grow as professionals that ultimately have positive outcomes on their students' learning. However, defining what high-quality professional learning looks like is a complicated matter; past research has looked at specific characteristics of high-caliber PD, different models of measuring teacher change, and different perspectives on teacher learning.

The following two subsections review the literature regarding the characteristics of effective PD and the theoretical framework that structure different types of PD. These previous studies provide a foundation and serve as references for this study to understand both the importance of providing high-quality PD and the influence that it can have on inservice teachers.

1. Characteristics of effective professional development.

PD can affect change in teachers, but this can only happen if it is of high-quality. This section seeks to unpack the research into what teacher learning should include to be considered "effective" and thus, lead to sustained change in teacher beliefs and practices. Much of the research into what makes PD effective (or not) discusses different characteristics that PD should include to promote change and learning in teachers (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone et al., 2002). However, while not every characteristic mentioned here guarantees for a successful PD, inclusion of these characteristics has been shown to be considered effective in helping teachers learn and change (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone, 2009; Desimone et al., 2002; Ingvarson et al., 2005).

First, several characteristics relate to the content of what should be included in high-quality PD. This means that PD should be relevant to teachers' experiences in the classroom (Justi & Van Driel, 2005), including expanding their pedagogical content knowledge (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone et al., 2002; Jeanpierre, Oberhauser, & Freeman, 2005; Phelps & Schilling, 2004; Saxe, Gearhart, & Nasir, 2001) and related to standards- and reform-based teaching (Cohen & Hill, 1998). In comparison to PD that focuses on general pedagogy or classroom management strategies, professional learning that develops teachers' deep understanding of content knowledge helps them become confident with the content that must be taught to students and is more likely to affect classroom instruction (Ingvarson et al., 2005). For example, in a 7-year study of 48 different projects of National Science Foundation-funded PD conducted by Heck and colleagues (2008), results demonstrated that when PD focused on content knowledge in relation to classroom practices, math teachers' practices were more likely to change (p.145). Similar results were found in Jeanpierre et al.'s (2005) study on science teachers, as well as Phelps and Schillings' (2004) study on language

arts teachers. Collectively, these studies support the argument that subject matter teachers require specialized knowledge of content beyond just general teaching pedagogy. Additionally, qualitative research data from Gravani's (2008) study of teachers' attitudes towards PD found that teachers assess the success of PD based on the extent to which it meets their practical needs in the classroom. If a program was perceived as not related to their everyday practices or problems, then it was perceived as providing "limited" learning for the teachers. Teachers themselves want PD that is relevant to their everyday classroom.

Effective teacher learning should also include opportunities for teachers to participate in active learning with their colleagues (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Desimone et al., 2002; Sahin & Yildirim, 2016). Active learning means that teachers should not be passive recipients of knowledge, but should engage in interactive and communicative activities during PD, such as role-playing, hands-on activities, small group activities, etc. (Sahin & Yildirim, 2016). Active learning gives teachers a deeper understanding of how their students think and learn (Desimone et al., 2002). This type of learning provides an effective way for teachers to see and engage in the material in the same way their students will.

Collaboration is another important part of the content of high-quality PD. Past research has repeatedly shown that PD is most successful when teachers have regular opportunities to meet and discuss their perspectives and questions (Ball, 1996; Collinson, 2012; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Guskey, 1986; Jenlink & Kinnucan-Welsch, 2001; Shulman & Shulman, 2004; Stewart, 2014). Darling-Hammond (1998) sums up the importance of collaboration best, "Teachers learn best by studying, doing, and reflecting; by collaborating with other teachers, by looking closely at students and their work; by sharing

what they see" (p.8). In fact, Franke, Carpenter, and Levi's (2001) study of 22 math teachers 4-years after participating in an ongoing PD program revealed that PD that was both collaborative and relevant to the teacher's classroom experiences was more likely to change the teacher's classroom practices in the long run - but only if both characteristics were present in the teacher learning experience.

High-quality teacher learning likewise provides time for teachers to reflect on their learning and practices (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Jeanpierre et al., 2005; Jenlink & Kinnucan-Welsch, 2001; Justi & Van Driel, 2005; Saxe et al., 2001). While reflection is a very general characteristic that can take many forms, generally, "it concerns the metacognitive process of comparison, evaluation, and self-direction" (Calderhead, 1989, p.46) associated with learning through self-directed inquiry, analysis, and evaluation. Active learning is related to this characteristic as it usually involves modeling of the new strategies and then opportunities for teachers to practice and reflect on them in relation to their own classrooms (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Saxe et al., 2001). Unfortunately, most PD does not include a collaborative component (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Desimone 2009). However, Kwakman (2003) does note that while collaboration is limited in most teacher learning experiences, opportunities for reflection do take place more frequently, particularly at the individual level, but not through regular feedback from colleagues (p.167). Also, how much collaboration is needed for teachers to learn and change can vary teacher to teacher, sometimes making it difficult to plan for the necessary amount of collaboration needed over time (Opfer & Pedder, 2011). Regardless, the general consensus in the literature is that collaboration, active learning, and reflection are all necessary aspects of effective PD for teacher learning and change to be sustained over time.

Secondly, other factors of effective PD that have been identified in the literature include school culture and ongoing support. The culture of the school greatly affects teacher participation in teacher learning opportunities, including access, support, and encouragement to participate (Opfer & Pedder, 2011; Opfer et al., 2011); this is particularly consistent with Opfer and Pedder's (2011) model of teacher change where the school context factors into the extent to which teachers change and learn from PD. As a result, the school's collective views on learning, common practices, and systems of the school each play a role in what teachers may constitute effective or not in a PD program. This means that the leadership of a school is essential in creating high caliber PD, including "a school's knowledge of the expertise in its midst, or available to it, its capacity to tap into this expertise, grow it and spread it through PD activities and networking" (James & McCormick, 2009, p.17). If the school's administration cannot or will not use its resources, both within the school in expert teachers and collaboration opportunities, or outside the school through external programs and facilitators brought in, then teachers will not feel supported in their professional learning. Thus, it is the responsibility of school leaders to create spaces and atmospheres for high-caliber PD that include opportunities for collaboration, active learning, and reflection (Opfer & Pedder, 2011). For example, Heck et al.'s (2001) longitudinal study of the effects of teacher learning on math teachers, revealed "that teachers' perception that their principal supported standards-based mathematics instructional practice was consistently associated with changes in teachers' reported attitudes and practices" (p.146), thus demonstrating the effect the attitudes and beliefs school leaders can have on teacher change.

Additionally, school culture was a factor in Franke and colleagues' (2001) study of the long-term effects of PD on math teachers implementing large-scale school-wide reforms.

Results indicated that school-wide buy-in and support was an essential part of what made PD effective for implementing new school-wide curriculum. This study also demonstrated one particular school context in which school culture and PD are particularly intertwined: reform-based PD where school-wide and principal support are crucial for effective teacher change. Likewise, changes related to technology-based teacher learning is best sustained when there is collective support from the school, or even within an entire department or grade level (Desimone et al., 2009). In this case, teachers can help one another to develop their understanding and experimentation of the new technology. Lastly, school-wide interventions for minority student populations, such as multilingual students, similarly benefit from the support of school leaders and colleagues (Lee, Deaktor, Enders, & Lambert, 2008). Lee et al.'s (2008) study on the impact of a 3-year PD intervention program aimed at improving the science achievement of culturally and linguistically diverse elementary students showed that school-wide participation in PD was more effective in improving teaching practices and student outcomes than PD that was purely voluntary.

Likewise related to school culture is promoting a culture that regularly engages in teacher learning and reflection. This type of culture includes providing PD opportunities that are ongoing and sustained for longer than one workshop (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Supovitz & Turner, 2001). Also important is continued support and follow-up after the PD program has ended for teachers to receive feedback on new practices (Guskey, 1986). Using quantitative data from an NSF-funded PD program, Supovitz and Turner (2001) found that teachers' practices and beliefs "were affected most deeply after intensive and sustained staff development activities" that lasted on average longer than 2 weeks (p.976). Interestingly, they also found that drastically changing

classroom culture and beliefs occurred after 160 hours of PD, compared to the 80 hours needed to dramatically change teaching practices (p.976).

Lastly, there exists one final factor popular in the literature that defines effective professional learning experiences. High-quality PD also provides theoretical knowledge behind the ideas and instructional practices presented in the PD to sustain teacher change (Richardson et al., 1991). By presenting teachers with both theoretical and practical knowledge, teachers gain a deeper understanding of the theory behind the practices being discussed (Richardson et al., 1991). While some teachers may value the theoretical knowledge behind the content of the PD, others may not see the relevancy of it to their classroom practices (Gravani, 2008). However, all teachers still can benefit from a greater understanding of the theory to effectively implement changes to their practice over time (Richardson et al., 1991). Thus, for PD to create long term changes, teachers benefit from both practical and theoretical knowledge.

One type of PD program that helps give teachers both forms of knowledge is the school-university pairing (Bartholomew & Sandholtz, 2009; Desimone et al., 2002; Gravani, 2008). With the goal of supporting student learning, universities work with local schools to become involved in the professional development of inservice teachers, while local schools may help mentor preservice teachers at the university (Bartholomew & Sandholtz, 2009). This PD program has several benefits, including creating opportunities for collaborative research between schools and higher education. Teachers can draw on the expertise of local universities (Desimone et al., 2002), while also being learners and decision-makers in the learning and research process (Bartholomew & Sandholtz, 2009). Studies of school-university partnerships demonstrate positive results, where PD is more likely to include

active learning and a strong emphasis on deepening content knowledge (Desimone et al., 2002); research is more likely to be disseminated between schools and higher education (Gravani, 2008); and large-scale reforms are more likely to be implemented effectively school-wide (Cohen & Hill, 1998). School-university partnerships offer a type of teacher learning that incorporates many of the previously mentioned characteristics of effective PD, such as collaboration, active learning, reflection, ongoing with sustained support, and a strong base in practical and theoretical knowledge.

One example of a well-designed PD program that utilizes the university-school pairing can be found in the National Writing Project (NWP). The NWP started in the Bay area in 1973 as a partnership between the University of California, Berkeley and local school districts, eventually expanding to all 50 states and other US territories. This model exemplifies the school-university partnership, working to create small communities of teachers during a five-week summer institute (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). The summer institute gives teachers opportunities to write, share, critique, and collaborate with other teachers of all grades and subject matter over a shared interest in writing and teaching writing. Beyond the summer institute, participants, or teacher consultants, continue to participate in sustained conversations about writing and teaching through newsletters, workshops, and annual conferences (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Moreover, other PD programs have emerged from different NWP sites and fellows. This includes the NWP site located at UCSB, the South Coast Writing Project (SCWriP), which is associated with the PD program examined in this dissertation: The Pathway Project.

The Pathway Project originally began as a partnership between the University of California, Irvine site of the NWP and the local school district. Pathway "aims to help

students develop the academic literacy to succeed in school and continue their education in college" (Booth Olson, Land, Anselmi, & AuBuchon, 2010, p.246). Throughout the program, teachers learn cognitive strategies and instructional practices to help develop their multilingual students' reading comprehension and analytical writing skills (Booth Olson, Kim, Scarcella, Kramer, Pearson, van Dyk, Collins, & Land, 2012; Booth Olson et al., 2010). The Pathway Project exemplifies many of the characteristics of quality PD, including being ongoing and sustained, while incorporating collaboration through active learning, reflection, and being content specific (Booth Olson et al., 2012). In addition, Pathway focuses on how to improve the reading and writing of multilingual students by teaching cognitive reading and writing strategies that research has shown "experienced readers and writers use to construct meaning from and with texts, thereby enabling them to improve their interpretive reading and analytical writing abilities" (Booth Olson et al., 2010, p.246). The Pathway Project additionally provides teachers ongoing support from experienced Pathway teachers who act as coaches during the PD meetings (Booth Olson et al., 2012).

Past research on Pathway demonstrated visible improvements in the reading and writing scores of students being taught by Pathway teachers (Booth Olson & Land, 2008; Booth Olson & Land, 2007; Booth Olson et al., 2012; Booth Olson et al., 2010). Collectively, results indicated that students benefit from learning and using cognitive learning strategies (Booth Olson & Land, 2008; Booth Olson & Land, 2007), like the metacognitive framework promoted by the CA ELD Standards. Also similar to the CA ELD Standards is the push for exposing emerging bilinguals to challenging texts and developing content knowledge (Booth Olson & Land, 2008; Booth Olson & Land, 2007). The Pathway Project is particularly relevant for this study as this program is the PD program that the participant teachers are

involved in to help them improve their teaching practices for their ELs. Moreover, Pathway also plays a role in the examination of the how aligned both teacher and PD facilitators' ideologies are with the State regarding EL education.

In sum, past research has identified many characteristics that need be present for PD to be considered high-quality. Of these characteristics, many of them fall under the umbrella of the content of PD (Desimone, 2009; Desimone et al., 2002; Ingvarson et al., 2005). In addition, schools should also consider the overall school culture and commitment to providing effective PD for their teachers, looking at the support provided by school leaders (Opfer & Pedder, 2011; Opfer et al., 2011), offering ongoing PD that extends beyond the episodic workshop model (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Supovitz & Turner, 2001), and creating opportunities for continued feedback after the PD has concluded (Guskey, 1986). Lastly, teachers benefit from being given a balance of both practical and theoretical knowledge for sustained changes in beliefs and practices from PD to happen (Richardson et al., 1991). Several types of programs of PD appear in the literature that include many of these characteristics, in particular the school-university pairings (Bartholomew & Sandholtz, 2009; Desimone et al., 2002; Gravani, 2008) as demonstrated by different sites of the NWP, including SCWriP, and the Pathway Project.

Important to note is that while these characteristics are important for inducing teacher change and learning, there are overarching theoretical perspectives that encompass larger views on learning. These perspectives provide larger understandings of learning for both students and teachers. As such, they inform the deliberate design of high-quality PD programs, including the Pathway Project. Thus, these frameworks are important to discuss

when talking about teacher learning. In particular, two theories of learning in a professional context are relevant and will be discussed in the next section.

2. Theories of learning.

Two theoretical perspectives of learning are prominent in the literature on PD. These perspectives, sociocultural theory and cognitive psychology, are applicable to all learners, including teachers; however, each framework stresses the importance that context has on learning to illustrate why particular characteristics covered in the previous section can be associated with high-quality PD. Sociocultural theory will first be discussed and then the cognitive psychological approach.

First, sociocultural theory originated with Vygotsky's (1978) theory of development. Vygotsky's (1978) theory of development sees social interaction as inseparable from the cognitive development of a child. Vygotsky (1978) asserts that "every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people (interpsychological) and then inside the child (intrapsychological)" (p.57). As such, social interactions between people become internalized in individuals to become cognition. Additionally, Vygotsky (1978) called attention to the connections between people and the sociocultural context in which they interact in collaborative experiences and learning. By nature, this type of learning is lifelong (Vygotsky, 1978), since one cannot divorce interactive discourses from the construction of knowledge.

For teachers, this learning process is particularly relevant given the factors needed for change and learning discussed earlier, including the importance of collaboration, active learning, and school culture. The sociocultural perspective considers "the interconnectedness and interdependency of teacher agency, the initiative itself, and the pivotal role of support"

that all affect teacher learning (King, 2014, p.104). The individual teachers, their colleagues, the school leaders, and the PD facilitators, as well as school culture, all interact with one another and determine the type of learning and change individual teachers will undergo, if any (Borko, 2004). Moreover, the history of a school and past and present educational policy can also influence teacher learning (Jurasaite-Harbison & Rex, 2010), as can the past experiences and understandings of the teachers themselves (Ball, 1996). Furthermore, the discourse and experiences between students and teachers are also a part of teacher change, where "both teacher learning and student learning are outcomes of a dynamic relationship between teachers' and students' conceptual resources, the physical resources available, and the affordances and constraints of the classroom" (Jeanpierre et al., 2005, p.516).

Related to the relationship between teacher and students is another aspect of sociocultural learning in teachers, "knowing-in-practice" (Jeanpierre et al., 2005). Knowing-in-practice refers to the internalization of an experience one has participated in (Jeanpierre et al., 2005). Through repeated participation, participants create the basis of their subjective knowing-in-practice. For teachers, knowing-in-practice means experiencing and internalizing lessons they deliver; for students, this means experiencing and internalizing lessons they participate in. Thus, teacher learning "involves teachers engaging in the process of knowing-in-practice" even in the classroom, not just during scheduled PD (p.515). Therefore, both PD and the classroom are part of the sociocultural context of teacher learning.

Given the scope of where teacher learning takes place, the sociocultural context cannot be ignored when looking at teacher change and learning. For example, a study of elementary school teachers in PD programs in the US and Lithuania demonstrated that school context and school culture, including the historical and social context of the countries, is tied

to the professional learning opportunities teachers had (Jurasiate-Harbison & Rex, 2010). This study also found that teachers are more likely to learn and change when the school culture promotes opportunities for collaboration, including through the support of school leaders and even the physical space of the school (p.276). These findings are demonstrative of the importance that sociocultural context can have on teachers and PD. Sociocultural learning likewise aligns with the characteristics of effective PD discussed previously, including collaboration, school culture, and support.

Also related to Vygotsky and sociocultural learning is the theory of "situated learning" (Lave & Wenger, 1990). Situated learning is the idea that learning is embedded in the context, activity, and culture in which the learning takes place (Lave & Wenger, 1990). In other words, individual learning takes place in the context of larger systems. Lave & Wenger (1990) posit that for situated learning to occur, it must take place in the context or setting that would normally utilize the knowledge being constructed. When Lave (1988) speaks of context, she refers to a social context that is defined in terms of participation in a social practice (Cobb & Bowers, 1999). As a result, interaction and discourse is an important part of situated learning where learners become a part of a "community of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1990; Wenger, 1998). In this community of practice, a learner can gain experience and move from novice to expert. For teachers, situated learning has several implications for effective PD development.

Firstly, situated learning does not imply that teachers can only learn within the confines of their classroom; rather, teacher learning is "intertwined with their ongoing practice" (Putnam & Borko, 2000). As such, what teachers learn will influence and support their teacher practices. Therefore, one cannot divorce their learning from their classroom as

their learning is always situated within the classroom context. Furthermore, while the goal of PD is to promote professional learning and changes in teachers' beliefs and practices, the location of the learning depends on the specific goals for teachers' learning (Kwakman, 2003). This is an essential understanding of situated learning: it is not about the exact location of learning, but about the context of the social system that the learning takes place in. Putnam & Borko (2000) reiterate this distinction and point to the need for researchers to focus not on where the learning takes place, but "on how various settings for teachers' learning give rise to different kinds of knowing" (p.6). Thus, learning should take place in a multitude of locations for teachers with the understanding that these contexts and systems affect learning in different ways: individual teachers' classrooms, school-wide PD settings, summer institutes, university settings, etc. (Putnam & Borko, 2000). For example, Putnam & Borko (2000) point out the use of summer institutes help deepen teachers' content knowledge, while university classrooms are ideal locations to read and discuss ideas about teaching, and finally, the classroom itself where teachers can engage in actual teaching activities. Thus, PD opportunities that integrate situated learning can help facilitators and school leaders easily include active learning and collaboration, while remaining grounded in theory and content knowledge - all effective characteristics of PD.

Putnam and Borko (2000), however, point out some challenges in incorporating different contexts for teacher learning. One main challenge is PD taking place in the individual classroom of teachers. It can be a challenge for facilitators, school leaders, or even researchers to spend copious amounts of time working alongside teachers, both fiscally and time-wise compared to a university setting for example (p.6). Another problem that can arise is in the context of the classroom. That is, while using the classroom as a setting to break bad

habits, it can also be too comfortable a context for teachers and not challenge them enough to change or reflect (p.6). The challenges are all mitigated if schools and districts make a strong effort to provide varied and meaningful interactions and contexts for professional learning that incorporate the same characteristics covered in the previous sections.

The second theoretical framework that effective PD can be structured around is the cognitive psychological perspective that emphasizes the importance of past knowledge and experiences on learning. Specifically, the existing knowledge, beliefs, and in general, what the learner brings to the learning situation, will affect what a learner pays attention to, remembers, and forgets (Greeno, Collins, & Resnick, 1996). For teachers, a change in teaching practices and beliefs is a result of acquiring new knowledge as it relates to pre-existing knowledge and beliefs about teaching (Kwakman, 2003). Furthermore, this knowledge can be divided up into two types: general and domain-specific.

The first type of knowledge, general knowledge or general intelligence, can be applied to a variety of situations or contexts and domain-specific knowledge applies to a specific situation or task (Greeno et al., 1996). Domain-specific knowledge, the second type of knowledge, is the type of intelligence that helps in problem solving and guides new learning. Again, for teachers, the domain-specific knowledge is what guides their professional learning and ultimately, their change in beliefs and practices towards teaching. Just as students are oftentimes asked to use their prior knowledge to direct their learning, teachers must do the same (Kwakman, 2003). Thus, teacher learning is not just about a transmission of ideas from PD to teacher, but must be facilitated by contexts and situations that will allow them to learn and change. In this perspective, "situated cognition" is important for learning (Putnam & Borko, 2000). Situated cognition is the idea that people's knowledge

is embedded in the activity, context, and culture in which it was learned (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989). While this may sound very similar to situated learning, there are in fact differences.

Situated cognition depends highly on the physical space where learning takes place. Cobb and Bowers (1999) explain that while situated learning is focused on the learning of individuals as they take place in different contexts and social practices, the context that situated cognition refers to is the actual physical context or location (Anderson, Reder, & Simon, 1996; Cobb & Bowers, 1999). Situated cognition posits that skills and knowledge cannot be transferred from one task to another, but are task- and context-specific because of the greater domain-specific knowledge gained through learning in context (Brown et al., 1989). For teachers, this means providing PD opportunities that resemble or provide authentic classroom settings, making it important for schools to "develop into places for teachers to learn" (Kwakman, 2003, p.151). Unfortunately, as Kwakman (2003) points out, most schools fail in this endeavor, not providing teachers with opportunities for active learning that are relevant to their everyday classroom experience (Putnam & Borko, 2000). Thus, situated cognition has several of the characteristics that have been identified for what makes PD effective (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Desimone et al., 2002; Justi & Van Driel, 2005; Sahin & Yildirim, 2016). Situated cognition shows the importance of context and content in professional learning.

The two main perspectives on learning found in the literature, the sociocultural framework and the cognitive psychological framework, illustrate the importance context has on learning, despite their two distinct definitions of context. The sociocultural perspective, as discussed by Vygotsky (1978), emphasizes the importance that interactions have on learning

throughout one's life. Moreover, situated learning sees learning as embedded in the context, activity, and culture in which the learning takes place (Lave & Wenger, 1990). Thus, it is important for PD to be collaborative (Ball, 1996; Collinson, 2012; Guskey, 1986; Jenlink & Kinnucan-Welsch, 2001; Shulman & Shulman, 2004; Stewart, 2014); include active learning (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Desimone et al., 2002; Sahin & Yildirim, 2016); and take into consideration the effects of school culture (Opfer & Pedder, 2011; Opfer et al., 2011). According to sociocultural theory and situated learning, only then will teachers be able to learn effectively and change their beliefs and practices to improve student outcomes. Also worth noting is the connection between the sociocultural learning of teachers and students; the context of teacher learning will affect the context of student learning, which will constantly be interacting in the context of the school's system. This likewise points to cyclical models of teacher learning (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Opfer & Pedder, 2011) where teacher change is affected by more than just a change in beliefs or practice, but by other factors including school culture and background knowledge.

Secondly, the cognitive psychological perspective sees learning as mediated by pre-existing knowledge and beliefs (Greeno et al., 1996). Related to this framework is situated cognition, where learning is task- and context-specific (Anderson, et al., 1996; Cobb & Bowers, 1999). As a result, this perspective values PD that incorporates active learning (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Desimone et al., 2002; Sahin & Yildirim, 2016) and content that is relevant to a teacher's everyday classroom experiences (Justi & Van Driel, 2005). The cyclical models of teacher change, specifically Clarke and Hollingsworth's (2002) "Interconnected Model" that stresses the importance that individual teacher's learning experiences have on their change process, fit within this perspective.

Ultimately, both perspectives illustrate the need for professional learning to go beyond the episodic workshop model. Both frameworks identify key factors that extend beyond the teacher to affect learning. Assuming that one type of PD will work to enact and sustain change in all teachers is arguing for a one-size-fits-all approach to learning, an approach most, if not all, researchers would not even argue for in children's learning.

In conclusion, teacher professional learning is a complex and interrelated process involving many factors, contexts, and systems. Taking into consideration the many moving parts of a PD program, including the content, the structure of the program, school culture, and theories behind professional learning, studying teacher learning presents many challenges when determining the effectiveness of PD (Desimone, 2009). Student outcomes are most often used to measure and link to the effectiveness of a PD program (King, 2014), but understanding what motivates teacher learning and change has is likewise important (Opfer & Pedder, 2011; Wayne et al., 2008). Trying to better understand how teachers learn and change, as well as what factors lead to high-quality PD, needs to be a greater focus in educational research. This includes examining teacher attitudes towards engaging in PD opportunities and their feelings towards being supported to engage in those opportunities by their schools and districts.

The need for more research into teacher learning is particularly important in the current context given the recent change in direction that California has taken in EL education with the new CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap. Examining district and school support for teacher learning in this context is likewise significant, revealing how educators may or may not feel supported to expand their teaching and emulate the additive-learning attitudes towards ELs that California has begun to embrace.

As such, this study examined the ideologies of inservice junior high and high school teachers to see the ways, if any, they are supported to align their teaching with those of the State of California regarding teaching emerging bilinguals. Understanding the new perspective that California has taken on EL education can help this study to examine the alignment or divergence of the ideologies of inservice teachers, PD facilitators, and the State towards supporting both multilingual students and teacher learning. The analysis of the discourses of inservice teachers and PD facilitators can reveal their attitudes towards teaching ELs and PD, as well as how the influence of broad social and political systems, such as state documents and policies about EL education, play out in conversations (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). These ideologies can contain similar or diverging themes, viewed as their individual ideologies located within a particular context of society.

Overall, the review of the existing literature on EL education and high-quality PD in chapter 2 helped this dissertation to address the gaps and explore three general research questions as following:

First, What ideologies do inservice junior high and high school ELA teachers hold regarding, (1) teaching multilingual students; and (2) receiving support to teach multilingual students?

Second, what, if any, similarities or differences in teaching multilingual students exist between teachers and other stakeholders in EL education, including, (1) a high-quality PD program, the Pathway Project; and (2) the state of California, via two state documents, the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap? The perspectives and themes related to PD and EL education, visible in the discourses of inservice teachers, were developed using a type of discourse and textual analysis (see chapter 3 for details). The similarities and differences that

emerge between teachers and other stakeholders, including PD facilitators and the state of California, will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Third, in what ways, if any, does an ongoing PD program and the State of California influence teacher practices and beliefs to provide equitable and rigorous education for multilingual students? The influences and relationships of power that exist between these stakeholders will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5.

Chapter III. Methodology

This chapter discusses information concerning the qualitative research methods used in completing this research, giving special emphasis to the analysis of data. The chapter also describes the different stages of the research, including breaking down the research context, the selection of participants, and the data collection process.

A. Research Methodology

This research explored the influence and role high-quality PD has on teachers of ELs in times of policy change in California. Given the focus of this research is the ideologies of the teachers and the influences exerted on their actual teaching beliefs and practices, I combined two research methods: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and ethnographic data collection methods. CDA worked to call attention to the social contexts and influences in which teacher discourses on ELs and PD take place. CDA is also used to defend the oppressed while calling out the motivations of the oppressors (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997), which in this case of this study involved taking a critical stance to defend teachers against the power structures that limit their agency. Additionally, I deliberately included an ethnographic interview design where my intention was to explore the social context of the teachers' PD and teaching experiences.

1. Critical Discourse Analysis.

Inspired by the transformation of linguistic theories and methods in the 1970s, CDA was collectively developed in the early 1990s in Amsterdam. At a two-day symposium, scholars from different backgrounds and interdisciplinary approaches discussed theories and methods now specific to CDA (Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui, & O'Garro Joseph, 2005). Many forms of CDA have emerged since then. Fairclough and Wodak (1997) provide several examples of different approaches to CDA, including French Discourse

Analysis, social semiotics, sociocognitive studies, and the discourse historical method. This study chose to focus on the sociocultural approach to CDA taken by Fairclough, where CDA is a form of linguistic and semiotic analysis that seeks to explain existing realities by focusing on "the partially linguistic characteristics of social and cultural processes and structures" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p.271). Moreover, it brings social analysis into the study of language by focusing on discourses and their relationship with other social elements, such as power relations, institutions, social identities, and the like (Fairclough, 2012). As such, CDA is a combination of theory and method (van Dijk, 2004), working to uncover the relationship between power and discourse in a social practice.

CDA allows for a variety of data collection methods as its primary focus is on data analysis. Fairclough even states that CDA is "a method which can appropriate other methods" for both data collection and analysis (2003, p.210). He argues that CDA should in fact be combined with the methods of linguistic and discourse analysis, such as textual analysis (see Fairclough, 2003, for example), and others. In a review of the literature that relied on CDA methods, Rogers, and colleagues (2005) found that researchers use "a range of theoretical and methodological tools" that they think will help them answer their research questions (p.379). As a result, there has been much talk about the level of rigor that CDA offers as a research method. Some argue for more systematic analytic procedures (Martin, 2000; Verschueren, 2001), while others argue that a diversity of approaches works to strengthens the framework and method (Bucholtz, 2001; Gee, 1999). CDA can be seen as a reflexive framework that can be adapted to the demands of the study, the context, and the theoretical frameworks that are combined with it (Rogers et al., 2005).

As such, CDA is not distinct because of the techniques it uses, but rather because of the work it does to locate discourse within a particular context of society, in addition to the "critical attitude" CDA takes towards it (Hammersley, 1997, p.237). The "critical" in CDA represents various theories, including critical race theory, post-structuralism, postmodernism, neo-colonial studies, queer theory, and other critical theories that "are generally concerned with issues of power and justice and the ways that the economy, race, class, gender, religion, education, and sexual orientation construct, reproduce, or transform social systems" (Rogers et al., 2005, p.366). As a method, CDA not only calls attention to the large social contexts in which a discourse takes place and is influenced by, but also comes to the defense of the oppressed while calling out the motivations of the oppressors (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). To understand the relationship between discourse and broader social and political structures, one must understand the various components that make up a social context and the theoretical influences behind them, including genre, style, and discourse.

Genre, style, and discourse all make up social practices that change and shift depending on the social context. These components make up the social analysis aspect of CDA. Firstly, "genre" refers to semiotic ways of acting and interacting (Fairclough, 2012, p.11), meaning that there are expected social conventions in the ways individuals use language that connect to a particular type of social activity (Fairclough, 1995). Genre creates expected text types, as well as expected ways of consuming texts (Fairclough, 1992). Bakhtin (1986) describes genre as "the drive belts from the history of society to the history of language" (p.65); in other words, genre has the power to change social practices, just as social practices can change a genre.

Secondly, “style” is another important factor of social practices that is associated with different genres. “Style” can be defined as “identities, or ‘ways or being,’ in their semiotic aspect” (Fairclough, 2012, p.11). An individual develops a certain semiotic style deemed appropriate for the genre, the social practice, and the larger social context at hand.

Lastly, “discourse” also makes up a social practice. Discourse is a “semiotic way of construing aspects of the world (physical, social, or mental) that can generally be identified with different positions or perspectives of different groups of social actors” (Fairclough, 2012, p.11). In other words, discourse is socially shaped. In a discourse, there is assumed to be a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event(s) and the situation(s), institution(s), and social structure(s) which frame it (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). One cannot separate the text (written or oral) of a discursive event from the larger context, let alone from genre and style. Analysis of the discourse makes visible the “different positions or perspectives” found in the social exchange.

Additionally, CDA sees discourse as unfixed and connected to power relations between individuals. Fairclough and Wodak (1997) state that “every instance of language use makes its own small contribution to reproducing and/or transforming discourse” (p.273). This makes Bakhtin (1981, 1986)’s influence prominent again, where utterances by nature are heteroglossic and thus, intertextual. “Intertextuality” refers to the idea that any text is one part of a chain of texts, simultaneously reacting to, being influenced by, and transforming other texts (Fairclough, 1992; Kristeva, 1986). Thus, discourses are always connected to other discourses, both from the past, the present, and the future texts that will be influenced by the current discourse.

However, to look at the intertextuality of a discourse, a certain amount of sociocultural knowledge should be drawn from to truly understand the context of the discursive event (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). That is, discursive events are constrained by hegemony and social structures that influence the discourse being produced (Fairclough, 1992). Gramsci's (1973) influence on CDA is apparent here (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997); particularly Gramsci's (1973) work that emphasized "hegemony," where consent is given by the majority to maintain the status quo, with internalized hegemony seen as one of the most powerful forms of oppression. This oppression includes how power relations constrain and control the production of discourse practices because of the hegemonic nature of capitalist life (Fairclough, 1995). Also influential is the Western Marxist view that capitalist social relations are maintained and reproduced by culture and beliefs, not just economics (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). According to CDA, power relations are inherently built into social exchanges and cannot be ignored when analyzing a discourse. These social structures and hegemonic struggles are either reproduced by the discourse to maintain the status quo or be transformed.

CDA sees discursive events as having the power to transform power relations. This transformation occurs by changing the order of discourse found in a social context. Adapted from Foucault (1972, 1981), an "order of discourse" is genre, style, and discourse all put together in different ways. Different combinations of genres, discourses, and styles combine to create a particular social ordering of relationships that create meaning differently. As a result, since orders of discourse can change, then as can the power relations that Gramsci (1973) sees as hegemonic. This is done by transforming ideologies. "Ideology" refers to "particular ways of representing and constructing society which reproduce unequal relations

of power, relations of domination and exploitation" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p.275). Furthermore, ideologies contribute to sustaining particular relations of power and dominance (Fairclough, 2012). Therefore, it is important to examine not only how a text is interpreted in a social exchange, but also the intertextuality of the discourse to understand its relationship to the larger social context. This relationship includes the production and consumption of the discourse by the participants. In sum, CDA seeks to make "more visible these opaque aspects of discourse" by examining these dialectical relationships and how they affect society (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p.258).

As a research method, CDA offers analysts the opportunity to examine how larger social and political systems and structures influence language in everyday contexts and situations. This includes examining language and systems in institutions where language plays a key role, such as the educational context. Fairclough (1992) argued that critical language awareness is an important aspect of language education in schools, making it a fitting research method to understand the systems of power that operate in classrooms and schools. It is important to reiterate that CDA is interdisciplinary by nature. Thus, prior to CDA, education researchers used Discourse Analysis in order "to make sense of the ways in which people make meaning in educational contexts" (Rogers et al., 2005, p.366). This included the fields of sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, ethnography of communication, etc. CDA was an extension of Discourse Analysis, allowing researchers to examine the relationship between language and broader systems found in society. In fact, using CDA in an educational context fits particularly well given the variety of research being done in the field.

In an educational context, CDA appears to work well due the many techniques and contexts available to researchers. Interesting to note is that while CDA has been criticized in the past for not focusing on "ordinary language" in everyday interactions, particularly by Schegloff (1997), Rogers and colleagues' (2005) survey of 39 educational studies that used CDA found that most studies utilized interactional data, with 66% using either interactional data or interactional and written data (p.376). Furthermore, other critics have argued that CDA does not focus enough on ethnographic contexts, "the criticism being that the analyses are often based on decontextualized texts (speeches, policy documents, excerpts of talk) rather than on grounded, interactional data that occur within a larger frame of interactions" (Rogers et al., 2005, p.378). However, educational research using CDA can use a myriad of educational settings and explore research questions that demand attention to both the language and the broader social and political systems in which the interactions take place (Rogers et al., 2005). Data sources, likewise, can include, but are not limited to, textbooks, policy documents, transcripts of observational video data, and qualitative interview data; settings can range from classrooms, meetings, and extracurricular activities and clubs. The studies themselves can cover a wide variety of contexts, ranging from elementary school to higher education, home schooling, subject matter classrooms, administrator meetings, parent-teacher meetings, and more.

As such, qualitative interview data is a one possible source of data for research utilizing CDA methods, oftentimes making up much of the corpus of a study. This is particularly relevant when an analyst wants to enhance their study through the inclusion of interview data from people who are in some significant relation to the social practice in focus (Fairclough, 1992, p.227). Interview data can take many forms, but as CDA seeks to uncover

how everyday discursive events demonstrate the influence of larger power structures, ethnography provides a strong research design for educational studies.

2. Ethnography.

Ethnography operates under the assumption that culture is a shared system of meanings that is learned and defined through interactions with others (Wilson, 1977). "Culture," in this case, refers to the acquired knowledge that people use to interpret experience and generate social behavior" (Spradley, 1979, p.5). Ethnographers seek to uncover and explain the "common cultural knowledge" (p.310) of groups by looking at patterns of "language-in-use," where language permeates culture and culture is constructed through the use of language (Green, Skukauskaite, & Baker, 2011, p.310). As such, an ethnographer's role is to "discover what these meaning structures are, how they develop, and how they influence behavior" (p.254). The main objective of an ethnographer is "to learn from the people (the insiders) what counts as cultural knowledge (insider meanings)" (Green et al., 2011, p.309). Ethnography allows researchers insight into the feelings and reactions of participants because of the researcher's ability to share and understand their daily practices.

To unpack cultural knowledge, ethnography relies on a variety of data collection methods. This flexibility in data collection is because of the constant tweaking made by the researcher that influence the decisions made during the data collection process. These decisions include where to be, what kind of data to collect, and what interviews to conduct and with whom (Wilson, 1977). The ethnographer must constantly evaluate what data is needed to answer the research questions. Thus, ethnography's use of participant-observation field notes, document collection, and debriefings work to understand how language is used to explore the roots associated with particular meanings, patterns, events, customs, or cultural

practices (Green et al., 2011; Spradley, 1979). In the case of the present study, observations of PD meetings, collection of teaching materials distributed during the meetings, and interviews with PD facilitators help contextualize and unpack the teaching practices and concerns of the participating teachers. The collection of ethnographic data work to better understand the influences on the teachers' discourses on teaching ELs and teacher learning.

3. Commonalities between methods.

CDA and ethnography have similar perspectives on what kinds of discourses to look for and examine. Common between CDA and ethnography is the idea of "cruces" (Fairclough, 1992, p.226) or a "clash in expectations" (Green et al., 2011, p.310). These "cruces" offer rich points for the researcher to understand what is really happening in a discursive practice (Agar, 1994; Green et al., 2011). This means looking for discourses in social practices that maintain the status quo, as well as ones that transform it. Fairclough mentions that moments of stress or "cruces" are also particularly informative to include as they can show what is normative and not for a situation, which may be hard to notice otherwise. Likewise, Fairclough (1992) stresses the importance of choosing discourses that are demonstrative of participants that are representative of the context, while also obtaining a variety of judgements via interviews with those involved in the social practice. In the case of the present study, discourses were chosen that both represented the context, while also ones that challenged the status quo. Typical discourses included teachers who had similar experiences or were in agreement with one another about teaching and perceived support; atypical ones included instances of teachers who were outliers in their opinions or experiences.

Interestingly, coupling ethnography with CDA helps to solve several critiques that have been aimed at CDA, particularly by linguistic anthropologists. One example is Schegloff's (1997) critique that CDA imposes an interpretation of interaction that reflects the analyst's theoretical perspective and obscures what is relevant to the participants in the here and now. In ethnography, it is essential for the ethnographer to "bracket their own points of view, expectations or interpretations" to explore insider members' points of view (Green et al., 2011, p.312). Likewise, Spradley (1979) reminds ethnographers that "before you impose your theories on the people you study, find out how those people define the world" (p.11). Thus, the concept of bracketing helps the researcher when analyzing data. This means seeking out insider knowledge via discourses that will then lead to uncovering exactly what social and political structures influence their language. Bracketing is especially important in an educational context, as Rogers and colleagues (2005) point out,

> Education researchers are often researchers of familiar educational settings. As members and ex-members of the school communities that we study, we bring with us (often successful) histories of participation in those institutions as students, teachers, and parents. (p.382)

Fairclough (1992) refers to this situation as "members' resources," that in turn affect the researcher's beliefs, assumptions, and values in educational contexts. To keep the line between research and past participation in tact, bracketing offers a way to maintain a clear, reflexive stance.

Additionally, ethnographers are often concerned with the ways in which their research can be used, realizing that "cultural descriptions can be used to oppress people or to set them free" (Spradley, 1979, p.13). This is strikingly similar to CDA's inclination to

intervene on the side of the oppressed. However, to combat the misuse of their research, ethnographers often conduct "strategic research" that is aligned with the goals and needs of the participants and not their own research agendas (Spradley, 1979, p.15). Following this method helps CDA analysts combat the assertion that they only seek to make data fit their own "theoretical elitism" (Schegloff, 1997, p.167). Therefore, it is apparent that CDA and ethnography do well when used together in research that seeks to explore the relationship between language and educational contexts. In fact, Roger et al.'s (2005) survey of educational studies using CDA found that 100% of the studies examined used some form of ethnographic model in their data collection (p.378).

In sum, past research has shown CDA to be particularly relevant and strong as a research method in an educational context. Fairclough (1992) argued that critical language awareness is an important aspect of language education in schools, making it a fitting research method to understand the systems of power that operate on classrooms. In an educational context, CDA appears to work well due to the many techniques and contexts available to researchers. This includes interactional data, the wide variety of educational settings that exist, the plethora of data sources a researcher can choose from, as well as the many ethnographic contexts that they can examine (Rogers et al., 2005). As such, CDA lends itself well to being combined with ethnographic research methods.

Where CDA uses language to understand how larger social and political systems affect every day social practices, ethnography uses language to explore the roots associated with particular meanings, patterns, events, customs, or cultural practices (Green et al., 2011; Spradley, 1979). Moreover, both methods seek out "cruces" (Fairclough, 1992, p.226) or "clashes in expectations" (Green et al., 2011, p.310) to make visible for the researcher what

is really happening in a discursive practice. Ethnography can help CDA remain free from imposing unwarranted biases of theory onto their participants by aligning their own research goals and needs with those of the participants (Spradley, 1979). These frameworks are what guided the present study into an exploration of the discourses of teachers about the influence and role high-quality PD has on teaching ELs in a time of policy change in California.

B. The research context.

The research setting for this study was an ongoing PD program called the Pathway Project offered by SCWriP at UCSB in Santa Barbara, CA. As discussed in the previous chapter, the Pathway Project is for middle and high school ELA teachers to provide participants with cognitive-based pedagogy and instructional practices. These cognitive-based practices are meant to help improve the reading comprehension and analytical writing skills of the emerging bilingual students. Participating teachers come from the local school district in Santa Barbara, CA, with one teacher moving to Ventura county, CA after completing the program.

1. Professional development program: The Pathway Project.

The Pathway Project is a two-year program that each year includes 6-full day PD events, taking place at a local hotel and one conference at the University of California, Irvine, and 5 after school events, taking place at different local schools. There have been three cohorts at the UCSB Pathway site, with one cohort currently in its second year of the program. Teachers in the first two cohorts were limited to only junior high or high school ELA teachers; however, the third cohort also includes one Spanish-language teacher and several Special Education teachers. Approximately 25 teachers participate in each cohort. Teachers for the first two cohorts were recruited to participate by the program and then were

randomly sorted into the assigned treatment (Cohort One) or the control group (Cohort Two). Cohort One participated in the PD meetings starting in the 2014-2015 school year, while Cohort Two did not start the PD program until the 2015-2016 school year. This intentional grouping was done to measure and compare the effectiveness of Pathway as an intervention program for students in the classes of the participating teachers by comparing the first two cohorts. This grouping was done as one of four Pathway sites in a replication study for an Investing in Innovation (i3) Validation grant received in 2014. Cohort Three was also recruited, but not sorted into groups, and began in the 2017-2018 school year.

Each year, the program introduces tutorials on cognitive strategies, revision strategies, and explicit directions for teachers to use in their classrooms as they guide their students through a multiple draft revision process. Pathway is designed to provide participating teachers with support and coaching from experienced Pathway teachers during the full-day PD events. The facilitators and teachers model Pathway lessons for the teachers and provide ready-to-use instructional materials. To measure student growth, teachers are required to give students a pre-test at the beginning of each year and a post-test at the end. This test during the first year also is meant to serve as motivation for teachers to continue with the program in year two after seeing evidence of student growth from a year of Pathway strategies. As part of their participation in the program, teachers received a monetary stipend, a classroom library of books, invitation to attend the annual conference for the California Association for Teachers of English (CATE) each year, a binder of over 400 literacy activities, as well as any ideas or handouts used during professional learning meetings.

2. School districts.

Teachers in this study came from two junior high schools (four teachers) and one high school (one teacher) in Santa Barbara Unified School District (SBUSD). One teacher taught at a high school in SBUSD during her participation in Pathway, but moved to the neighboring county, Ventura county, CA, the following year to teach at a local high school.

Five participating teachers came from the local school district, SBUSD. As of the 2017-2018 school year, 15,042 students were enrolled in the district's twenty-three schools (Educational Data Partnership, 2018b). This includes thirteen elementary schools, four junior high schools, three high schools, one continuation school, and two alternative schools. The district includes students who receive free or reduced lunch, 50.4%, and ELs, 20.4% (Educational Data Partnership, 2018b). Of the ELs, 95% of them speak Spanish as their home language; other languages include Tagalog, Arabic, French, and Mandarin (Educational Data Partnership, 2018b). The student population is made up of Hispanic/Latinx, 59.4%, White, 33.6%, Asian, 3.2%, two or more races, 1.2%, Black American, 1%, and less than 1% for all other races (Educational Data Partnership, 2018b).

SBUSD is made up of a school board, a superintendent, and five assistant superintendents (Educational Services/Elementary, Educational Services/Secondary, Student Services, Educational Technology Services, Human Resources, and Business Services) (Santa Barbara Unified School District, 2019). Four directors fall under the two branches of Educational Services, with both branches sharing one English Learner and Parent Engagement Director. Each school has one principal and one or two assistant principals except for one junior high school. This junior high school, where two participant teachers taught at, recently lost their principal at the end of the 2017-2018 school year. Until the district is able to hire a new principal, the district has two district officials, the assistant

principal, an elementary school principal, and a former district principal dividing up the administrative duties for the 2018-2019 school year. Junior high schools included grades seven through eight, while high schools were ninth through twelfth grade.

One participating teacher taught in Ventura county at the time of the interviews. Ventura county is much larger than Santa Barbara county with twenty school districts. Oxnard Union High School District (OUHSD), where one participant teacher taught at the time of the interviews, had 17,474 students during the 2017-2018 school year (Educational Data Partnership, 2018a). This district is made up of one K-12 school, eight high schools, one continuation school, and one alternative school. OUHSD also includes students who receive free or reduced lunch, 63%, and ELs, 13.4% (Educational Data Partnership, 2018a). Multilingual students include primarily Spanish speakers, 90.7%, as well as Mixteco, Tagalog, Arabic, and Vietnamese (Educational Data Partnership, 2018a). The student population is made up of Hispanic/Latinx, 76.6%, White, 13.9%, Filipino, 3.5%, Asian, 2%, two or more races, 2%, Black American, 1.6%, and less than 1% for all other races (Educational Data Partnership, 2018a).

OUHSD includes a board of trustees, one superintendent, and three Assistant superintendents (Business Services, Human Resources, and Educational Services) (Oxnard Union High School District, 2019). Six directors fall under educational services, including Instructional Support Services, Student Support Services, English Learner Services, Special Education, Learning Support Services, and Career Education, each with supporting coordinators. Under the Instructional Support Services there also includes an ELL Instructional Design Coach. Each school has one principal and one assistant principal, with grades 9-12, except for the one K-12 school in the district.

C. Participants

Six teacher-participants were interviewed in this study, all of whom are English/language arts teachers who have or currently are teaching a significant number of ELs and have/are participating in the Pathway Project. In total, two teachers came from each of the three cohorts from the program. Four of the teachers taught at the junior high school level and two taught at the high school level. Table 1 summarizes the descriptions of the teachers.

Table 1
Social and Demographic Characteristics of Participating Teachers

Participant's Pseudonym, Age	**Teaching Experience**	**Pathway Cohort**	**School level; grades; current subjects/classes**
Megan, 29	>3 years	Three	Junior high; grades 7-8; ELA, ASB
Eve, 34	>7 years	Three	Junior high; grades 7-8: ELA, ELD
Sue Ellen, 33	>7 years	Two	High school; grades 10, 12; ELA, ELD
Josephina, 33	>9 years	Two	High school; grades 9-10, ELA
Ashley, 39	>18 years	One	Junior high; grade 8; ELA, Social Studies
Jaycee, 44	>18 years	One	Junior high; grade 8, ELA

Of all the teachers, Megan, 29, is by far the least experienced. At the time of the first interview, she was finishing her second year of teaching and her first year of Pathway. Having received her bachelor's, teaching credential, and master's degree from UCSB, Megan was familiar with Santa Barbara despite not being from the area. Of Armenian descent, Megan only speaks English, but wishes she spoke Spanish so she can talk with her EL students. Megan currently teaches 7th and 8th grade at one of the middle schools in SBUSD,

having been there since she began teaching. Young-looking and of small stature, Megan speaks quietly and comes off as unsure of her abilities as a novice teacher; however, her questions and comments indicate that she wants to support her students by building personal relationships with her students and helping them to go beyond their comfort zone. She often turns to books and her more experienced colleagues to help her with her teaching as she tries to grow as an educator.

Also part of the third cohort, Eve, 34, graduated from UCSB with her teaching credential the same time as Megan. However, prior to teaching 7th and 8th grade at another local junior high in SBUSD, Eve taught English at an Italian middle school for five years. Harkening to her family's British heritage, she previously had a British teaching credential and was used to teaching multilingual students before coming to Santa Barbara. Speaking Italian and English, Eve talks about using her knowledge and experience as a language teacher helps her understand the struggles of her ELs. Her bright smile and love of traveling give her a warm personality that evokes a confidence in her when she talks about teaching and English weather.

From the second cohort, Sue Ellen, 33, has taught both at the junior high and high school level and currently teaches at one of the local high schools in SBUSD. Usually teaching different levels of English in grades 10 and 12, during our second round of interviews she taught an ELD class for the first time. Sue Ellen is a Caucasian, monolingual English speaker who received her master's and teaching credential from UCSB, as well. With bright blonde hair and a bright personality to match it, Sue Ellen has a good rapport with her students, always giving them a witty quip when they talk. She is an innovative

teacher, working on trying to incorporate games into her teaching to help her students practice using their English in a low-stakes environment.

Also in Sue Ellen's cohort was Josephina, 33. While participating in Pathway, Josephina was teaching at a local high school in SBUSD. Prior to that, she taught at the junior high level and at a Catholic school. At the time of the interviews, she was in her first year at a high school in the neighboring county of Ventura, CA. Having been raised in a bilingual household by her Mexican immigrant mother and English-speaking father, Josephina describes herself as only being able to have "topical conversations" in Spanish now. Josephina identifies closely with her Latina heritage, talking many times about wanting her students of color to be able to see themselves in their readings, just as she saw herself when she read Sandra Cisneros' *The House on Mango Street* (1984/1991). However, the social justice teaching that she did while in SBUSD thus far has proven harder to implement at her new school where she feels she is alone in advocating for her linguistic and cultural minority students.

From the first cohort, Ashley, 39, has taught for almost 18 years, with twelve of those years spent teaching at SBUSD. Teaching eighth grade at the same junior high as Eve, Ashley spent five years teaching in Riverside county, CA. After coming to Santa Barbara, Ashley eventually participated in UCSB's SCWriP as a summer fellow. Additionally, Ashley had prior experience teaching English to adults and earning her certificate to teach English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). Caucasian and partially fluent in Spanish, Ashley talks about being able to converse with her Spanish-speaking students well-enough to "connect" with them. Very matter of fact and with a typical Santa Barbara sun-kissed look, Ashley's enthusiasm for teaching is evident when she talks about the many areas she wants to improve

upon as a teacher, despite her wealth of teaching experience, including using new technology and making more time to work with her students one-on-one.

Lastly, Jaycee, 44, was also part of the first cohort with Ashley and a former SCWriP fellow. Teaching at the same school as Megan for almost seven years now, Jaycee has taught for almost 18 years. Before coming to Santa Barbara, Jaycee taught high school in Georgia, like her mother, but does not have a detectable Southern accent as a Caucasian, monolingual English speaker. Jaycee has experience teaching many ELA classes, including AP Language, and ELD classes. The year before our interviews began, Jaycee had applied to become the district's English learner teacher on special assignment (EL TOSA) in SBUSD, but did not get the job and did not get asked to teach the ELD class again that year, either. With unkept hair and intense eyes, she speaks fervently about advocating for culturally and linguistically diverse students; however, her apathy and frustration with the district regarding the EL TOSA position and their treatment of her was palpable during interviews. Jaycee cares for her students, oftentimes talking about how important it is for them to be socially aware and active, but her own desire to "remove" herself from the "politics" of SBUSD appears to be at odds with her desire to challenge the status quo in education.

In addition to the six teachers interviewed, two of the four PD facilitators from Pathway were interviewed. These interviews were not for the sole purpose of analysis, but rather to round out the sociocultural context of the PD program that the teachers were immersed in during PD meetings. One PD facilitator was a former high school ELA teacher, but now works as a liaison between Pathway and SBUSD. His interview helped provide insight into the history of Pathway, the design of it, the district's connection to Pathway, and the rationale behind the instructional practices discussed during PD meetings that the

teachers alluded or directly referred to during their interviews, such as the cognitive strategies. The second PD facilitator currently teaches at a high school in Ventura county, CA. His interview provided a better understanding of the particular instructional practices and concerns the participating teachers discussed during their interviews.

D. Instruments used in Data Collection

Various instruments were used in the data collection process. The primary mode of data collection for this dissertation was interviews. Ethnographic interview practices allow for a semi-structured interview to fully explore the topic in a manner free enough to ask follow-up questions as needed (Brenner, 2006). Semi-structured interview questions were open-ended questions allowing for flexibility as the interviews progressed. Using "grand tour" questions helped "to elicit key terms (words or phrases) in the context of their use" during the interviews. These types of questions worked to explore the research questions without explicitly outlining any prior assumptions and thus, influencing the answers of the participants (Werner & Schoepfle, 1987, p.218). These questions were then followed with mini-tour questions to elicit more detailed information about the informant's own opinions and values about teaching multilingual students and PD. Such questions were purposefully asked at the end of the interviews as evaluative questions are more personal in nature and thus, "should be saved for a time when rapport between consultant and ethnographer is well established" (Werner & Schoepfle, 1987, p.343). These final questions were particularly important as they got at the parts of the research questions that explored the teachers' views of their students, their schools, and their district. The interview protocol for the teacher participants (appendix 1; appendix 2) and PD facilitators can be found in the appendices (appendix 3).

Second, observations were done of PD meetings to round out the sociocultural context of the PD program. Two observations were done of all-day PD meetings, one with the final meeting for Cohort Two in their second year, and one with one of the first meetings with Cohort Three during their second year. These PD meetings took place in a conference room in a local hotel and lasted from 8:45 am until 3PM. During meetings, the researcher sat in the back of the room with a view of the facilitators and participating teachers, taking field notes of the natural occurrences of the facilitators presenting and the teachers working together. One observation was done of an afterschool meeting, taking place in a classroom of a participating teacher at a local junior high school in SBUSD. This meeting lasted from 4PM to 6PM with the researcher sitting at a desk towards the back of the classroom with a view of both the teachers and the PD facilitators. Field notes were taken as the teachers and PD facilitators engaged in presentations and naturally-occurring discussions.

Lastly, state documents were collected from the California Department of Education (CDE). Two public documents were accessed and taken from the CDE's website, including the CA ELD State Standards (CDE, 2014) and the CA CCSS for ELA (CDE, 2010). This included accessing the literature review and any other documents related to the ELD Standards that were included on the website and put forward by the State. One other state public state document was collected, the CA EL Roadmap (CDE, 2018), during the 2018 annual meeting of CATE. This document was passed out during a session conducted by a representative for the CDE to explain changes being done to EL education in California. These documents gave an indication as to the attitudes of the State regarding bilingualism and ELs.

E. Procedures

To complete the research design, various procedures were followed. After developing the interview protocol, human subjects approval was submitted and received to begin the data collection process and to ensure that research done was approved and ethical (IRB #73-18-0264). Access to the PD program was done through utilizing the researcher's connections through SCWriP and Pathway's association with the NWP site. Through these connections, the researcher had direct access to the teachers and facilitators involved with the Pathway Project.

Teachers interviewed were selected using the following criteria: teachers were given a short survey (see appendix 4) to indicate interest in being interviewed. Cohorts one and two were emailed the survey via Google form, while cohort three was given the survey in person at a PD meeting. This survey was done also to select teachers who provided a variety of teaching experiences, grade levels, and backgrounds teaching ELs. Fairclough (1992) stresses the importance of choosing discourses that are demonstrative of participants who are representative of the context. Thus, it was important that participant teachers had similar perspectives on PD, while also having a breadth of experience teaching and with ELs.

Two sets of interviews were done with each teacher. The first set of interviews explored the teachers' experiences and ideologies regarding teaching multilingual students and PD. The second interview continued to examine the teachers' beliefs by exploring particular themes and attitudes brought up in the first interview. Each interview with the participants was done separately, lasted between 2-3 hours and were digitally recorded. Confidentiality was maintained using pseudonyms for any individual mentioned in the transcripts.

One interview was conducted with each PD facilitator after the teacher interviews. This was done deliberately to explore any ideologies, statements, or concerns the teachers brought up during their interviews in the hopes of better understanding the sociocultural context of the PD meetings and the PD design. These interviews lasted between 1.5-2 hours and were also digitally recorded.

F. Data Analysis

As discussed in a prior section of this chapter, this study chose to focus on the sociocultural approach to CDA taken by Fairclough as a method of analysis. As such, data analysis corresponded to the three sets of data which included the analysis of all the written and oral discourses of the teachers, PD facilitators, and the State. After transcribing the oral discourses using ExpressScribe, a transcription software, each discourse was analyzed according to Fairclough's three-dimensional framework (1995). Fairclough's (1995) framework maps three separate forms of analysis onto one another. These three forms of analysis include "analysis of (spoken or written) texts, analysis of discourse practice (processes of text production, distribution, and consumption), and analysis of discursive events of instances of sociocultural practice" (p.2; see also Fairclough, 1989, 1992). Collectively, any discursive event is (1) a piece of text, (2) an example of a discursive practice, and (3) an example of a social practice. As such, analysis involves a progression from interpretation to description to interpretation (Fairclough, 1992). This can be done by looking at particular text features, patterns, and structures that are normative of a discourse, in addition to looking at text features, patterns, and structures that transform this type of discourse.

For this dissertation, I applied this framework to each discourse, working to interpret each text, describe it in the context of receiving support and teaching ELs, and then finally interpreting how each of these discourses interact with one another given California's shifting views and change in policy regarding EL education. For the first level of analysis, the textual level, two forms of textual analysis were coded for in the teachers' discourses. This coding focused on identifying evidence of intertextuality and assumptions, based in "linguistic pragmatics" (Blakemore, 1992) that focuses on meaning and the making of meaning in actual communication (Fairclough, 2003; 1992). Fairclough (2003) explains that "both intertextuality and assumption can be seen in terms of claims on the part of the 'author' - the claim that what is reported was actually said, that what is assumed has indeed been said or written elsewhere, that one's interlocutors have indeed heard it or read it elsewhere" (p.40). While "assumptions" are meanings which are shared or taken as given, they also connect texts through voices or styles. Assumptions are related to intertextuality, where assumptions reduce the dialogicality of a text and intertextuality accentuates it through the voice of the author of a text and other voices (Fairclough, 2003). The difference between assumptions and intertextuality is that oftentimes assumptions do not directly reference a specific text, while intertextuality does refer to the voices of others (Fairclough, 2003).

First, coding was done to identify any evidence of the teachers' assumptions identified by Fairclough (2003): existential assumptions, propositional assumptions, and value assumptions. Existential assumptions refer to assumptions about what exists; propositional assumptions are assumptions about what is or can be or will be; and finally, value assumptions are about what is good or desirable (Fairclough, 2003, p.55). These assumptions are marked by linguistic features of a text, including definite articles and

demonstratives for existential assumptions. Factual assumptions are marked by factive verbs (*realized, forgot, remembered*) and value assumptions by verbs that demonstrate the value system of the text (*help, threat, risk)*. Coding focused on identifying the teachers' attitudes towards PD as a form of support for their teaching and teaching multilingual students. Identifying the assumptions of the teachers guided the selection of the parts of the transcripts that were important for this study and the first research question.

Second, coding was then done to identify evidence of intertextuality across the discourses of the teachers, PD facilitators, and state documents. Statements that included evidence of intertextuality were identified by using "five scenarios" of interaction and social events identified by Fairclough (2003). These scenarios accentuate an openness to difference; a struggle over difference; an attempt to overcome difference; a focus on commonality; and consensus (pp.41-42). Additionally, these scenarios are not discrete, but can also be combined in different ways based on texts and social events. Coding focused on identifying instances where the teachers made references to the voice of their colleagues, school administrators, district officials, PD facilitators, and state documents. As with the first part of the textual analysis of the data, identifying moments of dialogicality and intertextuality helped guide the selection of the parts of the transcripts that answered the second and third research questions.

The second dimension of Fairclough's framework is the discursive practice. This includes analyzing the process of "production, interpretation, distribution, and consumption" (Fairclough, 1995, p.2). This process involves looking at how people interpret and transform texts; in this case, texts as they relate to teacher learning and teaching multilingual students. This study used within-case analysis and then cross-case analysis to compare the coded

interviews of the participants and identify patterns in the context of receiving support and teaching ELs. To refine the coding further, selected transcripts were read and coded through open-coding, focusing on creating categories of information that were related to the research questions in terms of their attitudes towards teaching ELs and PD that came across from the participant's discourses (Mostyn, 1985). Next, categories were analyzed "to build abstractions across cases" (Merriam, 2009, p.204). The final "key and subsidiary concepts" were derived from these categories, pulling quotes to help compose and answer the research questions on the ideologies of the participants and the intertextuality across the texts (Mostyn, 1985, p.141).

Using Fairclough's (2003) framework, the concepts focused on how the ideologies of the participants influence (or not) one another and what this revealed about the quality of education multilingual students currently receive in California. The concepts focused on determining the amount of influence, if any, each category had on each participant in the study, if any, and likewise, the way those influences manifested themselves in the participants' own language ideologies and language socialization practices they imparted on their children. From this examination emerged themes related to how schools/districts supported (or not) teachers to align their teaching with state policy surrounding EL education, the approaches used (or not) by the teachers to teach their multilingual students, and the ways high-quality PD has supported the teachers to grow as educators, which are discussed in chapter 4 of this dissertation.

The final dimension of Fairclough's framework, sociocultural practice, looks at issues of power. This power is constructed and realized through hegemony and explores "the ways in which discourses operate in various domains of society" (Rogers et al., 2005, p.371). This

dimension examines the larger political/ideological implications of the phenomena under examination. For this study, this examination was done under the sociocultural practice of teaching in the context of California's shifting views and change in policy regarding EL education. From this examination emerged themes related to the three main foci of this study, including multilingual students, PD, and EL educational policy, which are fully discussed in the final chapter of this dissertation.

G. Summary

To summarize the previous explanation, this study utilized both Fairclough's approach to CDA and ethnographic research methods to explore the influence and role high-quality PD has on teachers of ELs in a time of policy change in California. CDA calls attention to the larger social contexts in which a discourse takes place and is influenced by and in doing so, comes to the defense of the oppressed while calling out the motivations of the oppressors (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). For this study, the critical stance taken here defends teachers against the power structures that limit teacher agency in the context of teacher learning and teaching multilingual students.

In an educational context, CDA works well because of the many techniques and contexts available to researchers. These techniques and contexts include interactional data, the wide variety of educational settings that exist, the plethora of data sources a researcher can choose from, as well as the many ethnographic contexts that they can examine (Rogers et al., 2005). CDA lends itself well to being combined with ethnographic research methods since ethnographers use language to explore the roots associated with particular meanings, patterns, events, customs, or cultural practices (Green et al., 2011; Spradley, 1979). Moreover, both methods seek out "cruces" (Fairclough, 1992, p.226) or "clashes in

expectations" (Green et al., 2011, p.310) as places for the researcher to understand what is really happening in a discursive practice. For the present dissertation, both typical discourses and cruces were chosen to reveal both normative and transformative attitudes of the teacher-participants in the social context.

The research setting for this study was an ongoing PD program called the Pathway Project offered at UCSB and meant to provide participants with cognitive-based pedagogy and instructional practices. Six teacher-participants were interviewed in this study, all of whom are English/language arts teachers who have or currently are participating in the Pathway Project. In addition to the six teachers interviewed, two of the four PD facilitators from Pathway were interviewed to round out the sociocultural context of the PD program that the teachers were immersed in during PD meetings.

The primary mode of data collection for this dissertation was ethnographic interviews. Additionally, observations were done of PD meetings, both after school and full day meetings. Field notes were taken during all observations as the teachers and PD facilitators engaged in presentations and naturally-occurring discussions. Lastly, state documents were collected from the CDE, including the CA ELD State Standards (CDE, 2014) and the CA CCSS for ELA (CDE, 2010). These documents gave an indication of the attitudes of the State towards multilingual students and their teachers.

To complete the research design, various procedures were followed. The process included gaining human subjects approval, gaining access to the PD program, surveys, and then selecting participants to interview. Two sets of interviews were done with each teacher and one interview was conducted with each the two PD facilitators. After transcribing the oral discourses, each discourse was analyzed according to Fairclough's three-dimensional

framework (1995). This framework was applied to each discourse, working to interpret each text, describe it in the context of receiving support and teaching ELs, and then finally interpreting how each of these discourses interact with one another given California's shifting views and change in policy regarding EL education. For the first level of analysis, two forms of textual analysis were coded for in the teachers' discourses, focusing on identifying evidence of intertextuality and assumptions (Fairclough, 2003). From there, further coding was done to create categories of information related to the research questions (Mostyn, 1985). Next, categories were analyzed to build final concepts and pull quotes related to the research questions (Merriam, 2009).

The final themes that emerged included how schools/districts supported (or not) teachers to align their teaching with state policy surrounding EL education; the approaches used (or not) by the teachers to teach their multilingual students; and the ways high-quality PD supports the teachers to grow as educators, which are discussed in chapter 4 of this dissertation. Regarding the political and ideological implications, the themes that emerged were related to the three main foci of this study, including multilingual students, PD, and EL-related educational policy, which are discussed in the final chapter of this dissertation.

Chapter IV. Results

As stated in Chapter 1, the study examined the influence and role high-quality PD has on teachers of ELs in times of policy change in California. This chapter is organized in terms of the major themes that emerged regarding the two areas of inquiry of this study: teaching multilingual students and PD. To present findings, I first purposefully selected one typical and then one "cruce" (Fairclough, 1992, p.226), or atypical speech event, for each theme, in addition to supporting examples. I will use those transcripts to illustrate the patterns observed across the data sets that reveal the ideologies and influences within the discourses surrounding teaching ELs and PD, ultimately revealing the power dynamics between teachers of ELs, PD facilitators, and the State when it comes to supporting EL teachers through high-quality PD.

Similarities and differences within and across the two areas of inquiry emerged, resulting in three major areas and eleven themes in total. The study first explored four themes related to the perception of teachers feeling supported or not by their schools and/or districts to effectively teach their EL students. I then inspected five themes discussing the various ways teachers, PD facilitators, and California educational documents and policies talk about using language and literacy practices to support the language development of multilingual students. Finally, different ways in which teachers talk about how PD helps them to expand their EL-centered teaching practices were addressed in the last pair of themes.

A. Professional Development: Perceived School and District Support

To address the first research question (i.e., what ideologies do teachers hold towards teaching ELs and PD?), I focused on identifying speech events that contained assumptions (Fairclough, 2003). Assumptions refer to statements about "meanings which are shared and

can be taken as given" (p.55). When teachers talk about teaching and PD, they refer to various perceptions they have surrounding the support they receive to teach their multilingual students. In terms of answering the second (i.e., what similarities and differences exist between stakeholders in EL education?) and third research questions (i.e., in ways do the stakeholders influence teachers of ELs?), I focused on identifying speech events that contained dialogicality and intertextuality across the data sets. Dialogicality refers to differences between ideologies, while intertextuality is when "texts draw upon, incorporate, recontextualize, and dialogue with other texts" (p.17). Four major themes emerged in my analysis of the teachers' ideologies regarding PD and will be discussed in this section: (1) a lack of communication between teachers and school/district officials; (2) confusion from the teachers regarding the supporting role of school/district officials; (3) lack of teacher input regarding school/district decisions; and (4) a difference in the priorities of teachers versus school/district officials concerning ELs (I will note, but not discuss, that all these teachers collectively had negative experiences when it came to their perception of school and /or district support, resulting in these themes that reflect those beliefs and experiences).

1. What email...what meeting?

Each of the teachers expressed a lack of communication between themselves and their school administrators and/or district officials. Given the number of teachers and schools in a school district, information is often distributed to teachers via their school administrators who have received communication from the district. As such, teachers rely on hearing from their school administrators to be clear about what decisions are made by the district that will impact their teaching and students. Example 1 illustrates one discussion with teacher, Jaycee; when teaching an ELD class, Jaycee learned second-hand that she was supposed to be

teaching only the odd units of her school's ELD curriculum for the last several months. However, she was never told this by her principal at the start of the new school year,

Example 1

01 So that happened and nobody told me. And then I come to this meeting in
02 November, which I didn't know about it until the day before. And then they're
03 like, "You're supposed to be doing this." And I was like, "Well, who told me?"
04 "We told your principals." And I'm like, "They didn't tell me." And they're
05 like, "Well you have to start tomorrow." And I'm like, "No, I'm not doing that.
06 It's wrong." And then I come back here and I'm like, "Are you kidding? No
07 way, I'm doing this. They didn't tell me, you didn't tell me." And they're like,
08 "Well you need to do what they said." And I'm like, "Can I have some support
09 here?" Instructionally, this is the wrong thing to do.

Jaycee mentions in line 4 that she was never told by her principal about the curricular changes made by the district. As a result, she had been teaching differently than the rest of her counterparts since the start of the year. Additionally, Jaycee had to change her teaching the next day (line 5) to make up for her principal's lack of communication with her. This is also in spite of the fact that Jaycee does not agree with the changes made (line 9); however, because her principal did not communicate with her in a timely fashion, Jaycee was given no opportunity to talk about the decision made by the district with her principal, let alone explore ways for her to adapt the curriculum to her own teaching pedagogy or practices.

Similar to Jaycee's experience, the other teachers also had instances of not hearing from their school or district officials regarding important decisions or changes. Sue Ellen, for example, talks about also not getting clear directions from her vice principal about her EL

curriculum. She mentions that "no one told me" what curriculum she was supposed to be drawing from when she asked for help from her school's literacy coach. She explained that "I don't feel like someone is ... I don't know, like really pouring in and caring about what is happening in here." The lack of support from her administrators to help her with her curriculum makes Sue Ellen feel as if her administration is not invested in her, let alone her students ("...really pouring in and caring about what is happening in here."). Her word choice is significant, describing the feeling of investment as "pouring in" to her students and her teaching, indicating the emptiness, or empty vessel, that Sue Ellen feels in terms of wanting more support to teach her ELs. Similarly, Eve feels that she hears from her district "a bit last minute," but is sympathetic to the fact that there have been a lot of changes made at the State level that her school and district are still working through. While understandable that schools and districts also need to work through new policies, this kind of pipeline makes it hard for classroom teachers to adapt their teaching practices to reflect new policy in a timely manner.

The lack of communication between teachers and administrators/district officials was also felt went it came to attending district-wide PD meetings. For example, Megan was scheduled to attend a training, but was only told about it two days beforehand by her school, explaining that teachers are always being "thrown" into random trainings without warning or explanation. Eve had a similar situation, where she was told about a major district-wide grade-level meeting two days in advance by her school, only to be told the day of that she could no longer attend because they could not find her a substitute. While both teachers were given opportunities to participate in professional learning by the district, they were not able to benefit from these opportunities, either because they were cancelled, as in Eve's case, or not even sure what they were being trained for, as in Megan's case.

The significant number of times the teachers talk about not hearing from their administrators or hearing from them last minute about decisions made at the district level shows a breakdown in communication between the classroom and the district. In the context of state documents and EL-related policy, there is no explicit discussion of the role that communication plays in ensuring teachers are informed by their district about decisions and changes made that may affect the teaching of multilingual students. The closest the State gets to discussing communication is in Principle Three of the EL Roadmap, which discusses the system conditions needed to support effectiveness in EL education. Principle Three explains the need for each level of the school system to have leaders and educators who provide resources and tiered support "to ensure strong programs and build the capacity of teachers" to meet the needs of ELs (CDE, 2018, p.37). Similarly, the CA ELD Standards discuss the importance of supporting teachers "to develop and refine instructional practices, and most importantly, a sustained focus on the strengths and needs of individual ELs" (CDE, 2014, p.175). Given that the State is the governing body that credentials administrators, California's role in the preparation of qualified administrators who can handle these responsibilities cannot be ignored. Nor can be ignored the role of those administrators in building strong programs and ensuring that teachers can meet the needs of ELs by letting teachers know what they should be teaching and have the time and understanding to develop their curriculum. Unfortunately, this type of communication between teachers, schools, and districts was something that neither Jaycee nor Sue Ellen were clear about - and are not prioritized by the State in EL-related policy and documents.

However, not all teachers felt that there was a lack of communication between the district and teachers. Jaycee and Ashley were the only participants to discuss hearing directly

from the district. Their status as veteran teachers is apparent given their communication with district officials. Despite hearing from the district regularly, Jaycee and Ashley have very disparate perceptions of the district.

Jaycee's perception of the district is not a positive one, despite being in regular contact with them. She specifically mentions regularly "talking very candidly" to the Superintendent of Secondary Instruction about her concerns, but Jaycee still feels "frustrated" because "nothing happens." Her frustrations with the district are similar to the frustrations felt by Sue Ellen, who does not feel like her school or district cares about her classroom, Megan, who feels like she is too often thrown into random training sessions, and Eve, who gets frustrated when she receives inconsistent messages about big district meetings to attend (or not).

Unlike the anxiety felt by the other teachers, Ashley was the only participant to feel that the district communicated well with teachers. In the example below, she talks about how well her superintendent communicates with them compared to past ones,

Example 2

I feel like our superintendent does a better job communicating to everyone in the district that I experience from previous superintendents. I feel like I've heard from him more regularly and to everybody. There's definitely more communication than I remember from any of the previous ones. I've heard this from him, and it personally has to do with our experiences because he's been here more, probably because of that. I feel like he has more of a dedication and understands the range in needs that our populations have. And also understands how discrimination has been playing a role in our district and

09 how students have been.

Ashley mentions that her superintendent has done "a better job communicating to everyone" (line 1) compared to past ones. Related to that is an increase in communication concerning the issues that have arisen at the school ("...personally has to do with our experiences…," line 5) and the needs of their students (line 7-8). This includes the recent issues of discrimination that have arisen in the district and the concern of white flight that have plagued the district. Ashley's discussion of the superintendent understanding (line 7) the issues surrounding the school and students is distinctly different than the lack of action that Jaycee refers to when talking about her communication with the district. Additionally, Ashley's perception that the district is actually concerned with the "needs" (line 7) of their students is in alignment with the EL Roadmap. As discussed before, the third principle of the EL Roadmap explains the need for "leaders and educators who are knowledgeable of and responsive to the strengths and needs of English learners and their community" (CDE, 2018, p.37). Conversely, given that Ashley is the only teacher who perceived the district as communicative, it is unclear if her status as a veteran teacher is the reason that she sees this level of involvement. Having worked in the district for so long, she may have established stronger ties to the district, like Jaycee. Unlike Jaycee, however, Ashley sees the district as working for positive change. Jaycee's negative perception of the district may be related to her past experiences with the district that have been contentious, passing her over for a job as the district English Language Teacher on Special Assignment (EL TOSA) and leaving Jaycee jaded about the district.

In sum, Jaycee's communication with the district, although present, is more consistent with the other teacher-participants, who feel frustrated when it comes to how the district

communicates and supports them. Given the overall negative perception of school and district officials' communication with teachers, there is an evident breakdown in communication between the different levels of the school system. It is unsurprising that districts and schools are not prioritizing effective communication given that the State does not explicitly discuss the role that communication plays in ensuring effective EL education in the EL Roadmap or the CA ELD Standards. This lack of communication leads to a general lack of clarity in the role that the district plays in helping teachers feel supported to effectively teach their multilingual students, which will be discussed in the next section.

2. "I don't know."

In addition to a general lack of communication between district officials, school administrators, and teachers, many of the teachers also talked about having an unclear perception of what role the district or school administration plays in helping them to feel supported when teaching emerging bilinguals.

When asked about the ways the district supports them to effectively teach their ELs, three of the teachers replied, "I don't know." This confusion is most clearly demonstrated in the example below, where Sue Ellen talks about having to teach an ELD class for the first time this year and not being sure about her curriculum, how to help students get reclassified, let alone who to ask to get answers to her questions. Having turned to her district's EL TOSA, Sue Ellen still was not able to get answers:

Example 3

01 Well, I also feel like I should know very clearly and the student should know
02 very clearly what they need to do to be reclassified. Even talking to [EL
03 TOSA], there was some questions that I have that I can't quite remember right

now, but ... I'm still not sure if can they get a C in the class or is it a C or a C minus? Does it have to be both semesters? There's just certain things that I'm like, I don't understand. That I don't know. Even with the STAR I'm like, is it their most recent STAR score or is it the best STAR score? So I don't know. I feel like that should be very clear to me as their teacher that's trying to get them reclassified. I'm like, I don't know. Maybe I'm supposed to go out there and do that research and find it, but I also feel like someone should just be telling me that information.

…

So I know [EL TOSA], after she left she sent me some documents. But then I'm like, I have to go look through all those, I don't know.

…

I feel like this is someone's job to know this stuff all the time. So can someone just tell me? That would be great.

Sue Ellen's frustration is evident in several ways. First, when she reached out to the EL TOSA for better clarity about reclassification, she still couldn't get answers for even her most basic questions (lines 2-5). The inability for her to get simple answers from the district designated EL specialist is troubling. Second, as an ELD teacher, she feels unprepared by her school and her district when she tries to better inform herself (lines 8-9). It is clear from her statement, "I feel like that should be very clear to me as their teacher," that Sue Ellen wants to support her students, but is not getting the support to improve. Next, Sue Ellen is very unclear about who to go to for clarity about teaching ELs and reclassification, as she states that "someone should just be telling me that information" (lines 10-11), especially since the

district EL TOSA could not help her, only sending her an email of state documents to unpack on her own (line 12). Finally, her final question, "So can someone just tell me?" (lines 14-15), clearly shows that she just wants answers, but has no idea who can help her. If the district's EL TOSA cannot support teachers to effectively teach their multilingual students, then the district is not supporting teachers and ELs beyond creating a position to make it appear as if the support is there.

Jaycee voiced similar sentiments towards the EL TOSA when she talks about how the district should have hired three separate EL TOSAs, one for elementary teachers, one for junior high teachers, and one for high school teachers. Similarly, Jaycee feels that "in our district, EL leadership has been kind of a revolving door for the last few years" with a new EL TOSA and new people in secondary district positions. She also states that "Because I feel like when everyone's on a different page...it's really hard to think about literacy in a cohesive, sort of systematic way." Jaycee means that when new people enter leadership positions, new agendas are set that differ from the previous leadership's agendas. Therefore, Jaycee sees the district as lacking a clear and consistent vision for EL education. Given her ties to the district as a veteran teacher, this "revolving door" is something Jaycee is more aware of that other, less experienced teachers, such as Megan or Eve who are more concerned about receiving basic guidance to become stronger teachers for the ELs.

The lack of support from the district is also articulated by novice teachers, such as Megan when she talks about the district not clearly providing her with opportunities to grow as an educator. Megan struggles with understanding what exactly her district is doing to support her teaching and ELs, admitting, "I feel like I have this perception of the district supporting them, but I don't know if they actually are." Being one of those teachers who said

that she does not know what the district has done for her, she talks about how as a new teacher, she is not even sure what district support should look like. Even though she is unsure about what she needs to develop her practice and pedagogy, she still feels that "I'm just not supported in that way as becoming a better teacher for my EL students." It is apparent that Megan wants support, but is not receiving it from her district and as a result, is not clear what to even ask for, only knowing that she wants help in some way.

While district support is very clearly felt to be absent by all the teachers, school support is a murkier situation. Several of the teachers talked about their school supporting their growth as teachers of ELs because they have consistently been allowed to participate in Pathway, a PD aimed at providing teachers with cognitive strategies to better teach their EL students. However, that is where the support ends. Ashley and Eve state that they do feel their schools support teachers' participation in Pathway since they are regularly allowed to participate as new cohorts have been formed. Sue Ellen and Jaycee, on the other hand, do not see being allowed to participate in Pathway as genuine support. For example, Sue Ellen wishes her administrators would attend Pathway just once to see how beneficial it is to her teaching, stating,

Example 4

01 It just would be cool if they [administrators] sat at a table and were there for
02 the full day. We had twelve pull out days over two years. Invite one
03 administrator for a full day. I know that's hard to do but I don't know. Can't we
04 do it?

Her desire for administrators to sit at the same tables as the teachers (line 1) for a full day when the administrators had twelve full days of PD to choose from (line 2) demonstrates

several of her beliefs. First, Sue Ellen wants her administrators to see how beneficial Pathway has been to her by seeing it first hand during a PD meeting. This can create buy-in from the administrators, perhaps convincing them of the value of providing teachers with more EL-centered PD from their school, and not PD that teachers must seek out themselves, like Pathway. Jaycee also holds this view, mentioning that Pathway is something she was allowed to participate in by her school, but it was PD she sought out herself. Furthermore, if her school truly supported her participation in Pathway, they would help teachers copy and distribute the resources Pathway provides them year to year. Although simple, helping teachers to regularly use what they have learned from PD demonstrates school and district support for strong classroom practices.

Ultimately, school administrators can do more than just allow teachers to participate in outside PD by offering their own PD that is aimed at teaching ELs for teachers in all content areas. This comment is something other participants also brought up, such as Josefina, who calls offering EL-centered PD only to EL teachers and not all content areas "a mistake." For Josephina, if ELA teachers need help supporting EL students, then other content areas likely need the same type of support.

Second, if school administrators participate in PD about ELs, they can gain a better understanding of the needs and strengths of their multilingual students. In fact, Sue Ellen laments that one of her administrators did come to one meeting, but only during the free lunch the teachers were served during their lunch break. The desire for administrators to actually participate in Pathway is interesting because it is consistent with the importance of having knowledgeable educational leaders, as outlined in the EL Roadmap. As discussed in the previous section, Principle Three asks for school leaders and educators to be

knowledgeable of and responsive to the needs and strengths of ELs (CDE, 2018, p.37). If administrators attend EL-centered PD such as Pathway, this knowledge base can develop in school administrators who can in turn support teachers' curriculum development. However, when administrators, or likewise district officials, do not work with their teachers as these teachers feel, then the EL Roadmap is not clearly being followed. This is particularly evident when district officials cannot help teachers understand curriculum, reclassification, or offer relevant PD. It is likewise visible when teachers cannot articulate how their school supports their development as teachers of ELs beyond being allowed to participate in EL-centered PD.

To make matters worse, the PD facilitators themselves are also unsure about true school or district buy in, with both facilitators acknowledging that the fact that Pathway pays for all substitutes on day-long PD meetings could be a major factor in why teachers are allowed to participate. Jaycee sums up all these frustrations best when she says, "I know it's hard - I'm not saying that they're [the district] doing it maliciously, but the system is so cumbersome and clunky. We work in this environment, and it's just hard to come to terms with that." The "system" has many moving parts that make it "cumbersome and clunky." Coupled with unstable leadership, unanswered questions, and superficial support, the pipeline connecting districts, schools, and teachers demonstrates an incohesive system. This is antithesis to the creation of the EL Roadmap, meant to provide a cohesive EL educational experience across the State and across systems. If a district cannot even provide a cohesive educational experience for the teachers of ELs, then it is unsurprising that the teachers also feel as if they are not being heard.

3. What input?

In addition to the lack of communication and unclear support felt from the district and school, the teachers also discussed not having any input when it came to major decisions made by the district or school. This lack of inclusion in the decision-making process was not limited to just EL-related decisions or changes, but to other major ones that impacted the teachers.

Curriculum changes for EL students is the biggest issue the teachers felt that they were not included in. One of the biggest changes occurred at Eve and Ashley's school because of the unexpected passing of their principal at the end of the school year. Because the district was unable to hire a new principal before the start of the next school year, two school administrators, a former district employee, and two district officials served as a team of "principals," each with different responsibilities, until a new principal could be hired. As a result, this team overhauled the school's EL program without asking the teachers about it and not telling them about the change until they came back the week before school started. Ashley expresses her frustration about it here when talking about being left out of the decision:

Example 5

01 The bigger issue is that feeling like the district isn't understanding the needs of
02 our school, and our population, and looking at our test scores from previous
03 years, showing that we have been successful in how things happened before.

Ashley explicitly states that the district "isn't understanding the needs of our school, and our population" (lines 1-2). Her frustration appears valid as the decision to change the EL curriculum was made without any teacher input; this was a program that the school had worked on for years to best serve their multilingual students. According to both Eve and

Ashley, this was a strong program that the school was proud of ("...we have been successful…," line 3). Ashley also states that the district did not look at "at our test scores from previous years" (lines 2-3) as evidence of their hard work. The school's work to serve their population, as evidenced using testing scores to inform their curricular decisions, demonstrates the school's dedication to serving the needs of their EL population. It is understandable why the teachers would be upset at the sudden change being done without teacher input or valid justification. Eve even states that she is not entirely sure who made the decision since it was not the teachers, stating, "I have no idea. Admin, maybe the district…?" The only reason behind the change Eve could come up with was because their school was the only one in the district that utilized a different EL program and the two district officials on the principal team wanted consistency throughout the entire district.

What is interesting about this decision, while made without teacher input, the rationale to create consistency across the district is consistent with the EL Roadmap. Principle Four of the EL Roadmap talks about the importance of creating alignment within and across systems, where "English learners experience a coherent, articulate and aligned set of practices and pathways across grade levels and educational segments…" (CDE, 2018, p.37). The district's desire to implement alignment across their schools actually aligns with this vision. The problem, however, lies in how the district chose to implement this move towards alignment: without asking the teachers and without considering how this program met the needs of the school's EL population. This principle also mentions the need for "leadership that are responsive to the differentiated strengths and needs of English learners, and strengthening appropriate assessment tools and practices" (CDE, 2018, p.37). The language used implies creating consistency not for consistency's sake, but for the needs of

multilingual students, emphasizing "differentiated strengths and needs" and "appropriate assessment tools and practices," not a one-size-fits-all approach that is more reminiscent of the previous 1999 ELD Standards. As such, there is a tension built into the EL Roadmap's desire for consistency, but also for differentiation. This in turn impacts how districts and schools choose to interpret these guidelines.

Jaycee and Josephina had similar concerns about EL-related course planning. Josephina, for example, talks about not understanding the pedagogical reasoning behind making an EL student take three English classes in a row, "So that was another thing about EL students at my school. Counter practice. And one of them was in three English classes. He was in a sophomore, junior, and a senior year English class." Josephina sees this kind of course planning as prioritizing credits over learning. Scheduling students in multiple ELA classes ignores the cognitive fatigue of ELs and instead aims just to get them enough credits to graduate, regardless of the effectiveness of their learning experiences. This is unfair to the student, a "counter practice" towards learning. Jaycee feels similarly as her ELD class is scheduled during seventh period, the students' last class of the day when most of their English-only peers are going home. She calls the class scheduling "horrible" for the students. Like Josephina, Jaycee realizes multilingual students' cognitive fatigue that the administration has chosen to ignore. Jaycee states, "So that's a great example of administrators not really prioritizing the needs of the English learners and they're just like, 'Oh my God, we have to give them an English class, where are we going to put it?'" Her apathy for her school's administration is apparent in the way she voices their decision to schedule her class during seventh period as a last minute, harried, recollection ("Oh my God, we have to give them…"). She finally sums up her attitude toward her principal when she

says, “My principal does not make choices based on the, it doesn’t seem, the most – the optimal instructional situation for students.” Jaycee, like Josephina, does not see administrators as prioritizing the needs of multilingual students, “the optimal instructional situation for students.” Instead, administrators appear to make decisions without taking the needs of ELs into account, let alone taking the input of teachers into consideration.

Finally, while teachers feel left out of EL-related decisions surrounding curriculum and course planning, they likewise feel left out of other decisions being made that affect them. For example, Megan’s school got rid of paper planners in favor of relying on Google Classroom, as well as purchasing iPads and not Chromebooks. She explains,

Example 6

01 And so now the kids don't have a place to write down their homework. And
02 that was a site decision, and it was a way to save money, and I don't know for
03 what other reasons.

…

04 But it's just kind of like, why wouldn't you think to ask us? There's such an
05 issue with iPads. My colleague always says, "If you would have asked the
06 English department we would have said that we wanted Chromebooks."
07 Because we don't care for iPads.

Being in junior high, students still need help becoming independent and responsible, something paper planners are used for to teach students about planning, balancing school work, and taking responsibility for their homework. Using Google Classroom with junior high students hinders that lesson, “And so now the kids don't have a place to write down their homework” (line 1). Megan makes her distaste known when she talks about the decision

being made “to save money and I don’t know for what other reasons” (lines 2-3). Her dismissive attitude towards a decision she disagrees with, but has no explanation for, adds to her frustration with the district. In terms of the iPads, being a novice teacher, Megan takes her cues from other teachers, discussing how she has been told that Chromebooks (with keyboards) are superior to iPads for English teachers (lines 5-6). It is apparent that she sides with her colleagues when she says, “But it's just kind of like, why wouldn't you think to ask us?” The question is posed as a rhetorical one, but one that apparently is not obvious to administrators from the teachers’ points of view. Sue Ellen makes a similar point, saying, “I would say administration is not on the ground in terms of being in the classrooms, asking these teachers, ‘Hey how are they doing? What other supports do you need to support these students?’” Her statement makes it clear that her administrators are not asking teachers for their input, about asking what they need to be successful, let alone visiting their classrooms. This lack of teacher input demonstrates a distinct separation between what is happening in the classroom and what administrators assume is happening in the classroom. It likewise connects to Sue Ellen’s earlier comments about administrators never coming to Pathway meetings (example 4) and thus, not knowing what teachers are independently doing to improve their teaching. Without talking to teachers about their needs and the needs of their students, it is difficult for school administrators and district officials to know what changes need to be made and where their priorities should lie.

4. What are your priorities?

Finally, a distinct difference in the priorities of school administrators, district officials, and teachers concerning emerging bilinguals is another reason why teachers feel disconnected, unheard, and unclear about how their school and district supports their

teaching and EL students. The main concerns seem to surround priorities that are more concerned with technology over language and literacy development, and only hearing about multilingual students when it comes to testing and scores.

Technology appears to be the main priority of one of the local districts, including the one Megan and Sue Ellen are teaching in currently. Megan, for example, talks about how she wanted to attend the California Association for Teachers of English (CATE) annual conference, a conference aimed at English teachers and literacy and language development. Unfortunately, Megan was told by her principal that they did not have the money to send any teachers to attend. However, when talking to her principal, she found out that there was money to send teachers to Tech, a conference about using technology in the classroom,

Example 7

01 And so he told me that we have some money and that he wanted to, and this
02 was just in passing. I don't think I would have brought up the CATE
03 conference, anyways. Because I was talking to my colleague, and he was like,
04 "Oh you didn't bring up CATE?" I'm like, "No it was in passing." So I don't
05 know. It just makes me feel like, what we have money for that? Tech?

The fact that her principal turned down CATE, but was willing to send teachers to Tech (lines 1, 5) is a clear demonstration of where administrators' priorities lie. Literacy is unprioritized, while technology becomes the focus, particularly in an educational atmosphere that is more recently fixated on science and technology ("…we have money for that? Tech?," line 5). Even the colleague she mentions asks about CATE (lines 3-4), indicating that Megan is not the only one who wants to attend and that other teachers could also benefit from PD centered around literacy and language development. This attitude held by Megan and her

colleagues reveals how important teacher input is for supporting teacher learning that is relevant to their needs.

Since supporting literacy and language learning are not clear priorities, other priorities appear to take precedence when they do concern ELs. Multilingual students only come up when it comes to holding schools accountable for their performance. For example, Eve discusses how every time she hears the word "assessment," it is usually in the context of emerging bilinguals. She elaborates, "... there's a lot of crappy assessments out there that don't measure things well, and I have my students spend a lot of time this year testing, just all kinds of different testing. So I don't love the idea of a state test, and a county test, and a school test, and a district test, and my test." Eve lists all the different tests that her EL students must take, "a state test, and a county test, and a school test, and a district test, and my test," to illustrate the amount of time she must dedicate towards testing, as opposed to teaching. She also refers to the tests as "crappy assessments…that don't measure things well." Her description of the tests indicates that Eve sees these tests as poorly designed. Many of these tests are used to hold schools accountable, measuring the growth of the students against state standards and expectations, oftentimes with money and other high-stakes consequences tied to their performances. Given the accountability tied to these "crappy assessments," it is even more frustrating that tests are what is being used to determine how successful a teacher is, making Eve's ire understandable.

Because of the high-stakes nature of many of these tests, it is natural that schools would want all their students to do well; however, the fact that the teachers only perceive any interest in EL students from their schools and districts during testing is significant. These priorities imply that there may not be genuine interest in the learning of multilingual students

past the classroom level. Rather, the interest from schools and districts is shallow and perhaps even in self-interest of reputation and money. In fact, Jaycee, again a veteran teacher who is aware of the politics behind teaching, sees this. She blatantly states, "And I'm sick of the way they're [the district] jerking them [ELs] around, kind of. And I just needed to pull myself out of that political scene." Jaycee's diction is as strong indicator of her exasperation ("I'm sick…") with the district who keeps "jerking" emerging bilinguals around. That "political scene" is what makes it hard for teachers like Jaycee, a veteran teacher who has been ignored and overlooked, for teachers like Eve, a teacher who feels her students have been oversaturated with testing, and for teachers like Megan, a novice teacher who is at the mercy of the newest trend in education, to feel supported to better teach emerging bilinguals.

Ashley's experience with her school is similar, only being aware of the ELD Standards when her district was under scrutiny. When she was a new teacher, the district came to her school to check that they knew their ELD Standards and EL students while the district was being accredited by the State. She explains that, "I remember our school was getting observed to see if we knew our ELD standards and if we knew who to talk to if we had questions about our ELs. There was this just rush to, like, everybody get informed and everybody know who to talk to. We had a little cheat sheet of how to answer...I feel so ignorant right now." The fact that her district only worried about the teachers' familiarity with the ELD Standards and EL students during accreditation ("There was this just rush to, like, everybody get informed…") is telling and consistent with the other teachers' experiences with testing: these schools and districts only appear to be concerned about multilingual students when it is a high-stakes situation for them. The concern is also a superficial one as evidenced by the school giving the teachers "cheat sheets" so they could

answer questions during accreditation, but not care beyond that whether teachers have a true understanding of the ELD Standards or their students. This experience is further complicated by the fact that Ashley, now a veteran teacher, admits that today, "I feel so ignorant right now" about the ELD Standards. If Ashley as a veteran teacher feels ignorant, it is fair to say that other teachers may as well feel "ignorant" in these areas.

The teachers see their schools as having different and disconcerting priorities when it comes to multilingual students. This contrasts with how the State talks about schools and districts building the capacity of students and teachers in the EL Roadmap. Discussed in the previous section, Principle Four in the EL Roadmap emphasizes how "the California State Board of Education will direct the California Department of Education to provide guidance to districts" to create alignment and articulation within and across systems (CDE, 2018, p.37). Furthermore, "the guidance will invest in and build educators' professional capacity; emphasize collaborative efforts; support effective pedagogy; and develop systemic solutions to create a coherent and positive educational system" (CDE, 2018, p.37). This statement includes helping teachers to learn and grow through conferences and PD that is relevant to them ("build educators' professional capacity"; "emphasize collaborative efforts"). Also included is not over-testing students at the sacrifice of learning ("positive educational system"). This statement finally includes making sure teachers are familiar with how the ELD Standards impact their teaching, not just when being accredited ("support effective pedagogy"). It is not evident what the CDE is doing to help districts achieve this goal, particularly since the teachers perceive their schools and districts as holding different priorities than themselves when it comes to effectively teaching ELs.

Josephina, out of all the teachers, perhaps is in the most concerning environment at her school. Having started teaching in a new district only a year ago, Josephina feels at odds with her school's attitudes and likewise priorities when it comes to teaching emerging bilinguals. In fact, she has heard from both teachers and administrators at her new school the desire to reduce the multilingual student population to improve their testing scores,

Example 8

01 I just feel like they're not acknowledging what they need, in the ELL program.
02 Not only do they not acknowledge what they need, but they don't want to. It's
03 just kinda brushed under the rug. One teacher made the comment, "so we're
04 going through [testing scores] loss this year to figure out how to get those
05 students out who are bringing our scores down." This is central California,
06 and this is what actual conversations are happening at staff meetings. And it's
07 not just one person, it's multiple people that feel that way. I'm just sitting there
08 like, what's going on.

Josephina worries about the attitude her school has towards ELs, demonstrated by her comment, "Not only do they not acknowledge what they need, but they don't want to" (line 2). The fact that she feels that one of the most vulnerable student populations is being completely ignored is upsetting. To further illustrate that disinterest, she voices the comment a teacher made in a faculty meeting who directly blames multilingual students ("those students," lines 4-5) for bringing their testing scores down. Josephina even states that it was "multiple people that feel that way" (line 7), showing a school culture of bias towards ELs. While the other teachers in this study worry about the mismatched priorities they perceive their schools and districts to have regarding multilingual students, Josephina is battling with a

school who has zero priorities when it comes to ELs. Or even worse, a priority that involves figuring "out how to get those students out" (lines 4-5). Experiences such as Josephina's are just one school in California, a state considered progressive because it developed a vision for EL education before any other state. If California is still struggling with shifting the attitudes of teachers of emerging bilinguals, it can only be speculated about what may be happening in other, less progressive states and schools.

In sum, teachers in this study are not feeling supported by their schools and districts to become stronger teachers for their EL students. For example, there is a lack of communication between districts, schools, and teachers when it comes to enacting changes or decisions being made that impact teachers. Jaycee discusses how her district changed the EL curriculum she was supposed to teach but never heard about it from her principal (example 1). Sue Ellen had a similar experience, not feeling like her school cares about what happens in her classroom. Despite being a veteran teacher, Jaycee has the most negative perception of her school and district, something that Ashley, also a veteran teacher, does not feel in comparison to past experiences (example 2). The general consensus of the lack of communication the teachers had between their administrators and district is concerning; it is likewise in contrast to the EL Roadmap that asks for school leaders to be responsive to the needs of ELs, but also does not explicitly mention the importance that clear communication plays in addressing those needs through strong, regular, and open communication with the teachers who teach ELs.

Additionally, teachers have an unclear or apathetic perception of how their schools or districts are supporting them to teach their multilingual students. Despite the appointment of an EL TOSA, Sue Ellen talks about not getting enough answers or help from her (example

3). In terms of school support, the teachers acknowledged that their schools supported their participation in Pathway; however, this may be in part due to the program paying for the substitutes on day-long PD meetings, something admitted by even the PD facilitators. Voicing her frustration about not being supported to better teach ELs, Sue Ellen also asks why school administrators do not attend any of their PD meetings, something she feels would demonstrate true support on her behalf (example 4). This idea is not a farfetched one, as the EL Roadmap does talk about BOTH educators and school leaders being knowledgeable enough to support EL learning. It would be beneficial then, if teachers and administrators could work together to collectively develop strong EL programs and curriculum to create a unified vision for EL education in their school.

Similarly, there is a lack of teacher input when it comes to decisions made by the school or district that concern emerging bilinguals. This is visible in curricular or course decisions, such as when Eve and Ashley's school replaced their EL program without considering how or why the teachers used their program (example 5). Teachers were also left out of other conversations, as discussed by Megan (example 6) and Sue Ellen. Interestingly, the desire to create consistency across schools is in alignment with the EL Roadmap's vision for a consistent EL educational experience; however, the changes made in this district were not done because of the EL Roadmap. Rather, they were made out of an administrative desire for district consistency. Thus, these types of changes discussed by the teacher-participants were not made with ELs in mind - they were made to serve the interests of the district. This is despite a call for differentiation and an awareness of the needs and strengths of ELs by the State. This creates a tension in how the EL Roadmap may be unintentionally adhered to by

schools and districts, supposedly in the name of multilingual students, but not actually to their benefit.

Finally, teachers have different priorities when it comes to ELs compared to the priorities of schools or districts. For example, Megan feels that PD focused on technology has become a greater priority over literacy and language learning (example 7); likewise, Eve and Ashley both see their district as only caring about ELs when it comes to high stakes situations that involve money or reputation. Josephina, on the other hand, is dealing with a school whose only concern is how to push out EL students from the school (example 8). Unfortunately, this contrasts with how the State sees EL education heading, as the EL Roadmap talks about supporting teacher growth, effective pedagogy, and creating a positive educational system (CDE, 2018), none of which can be done if different levels of the school system cannot get on the same page when talking about how to best teach ELs.

Through these examples, teachers are not receiving the necessary support needed to effectively teach their ELs by their schools or districts. Despite this lack of support, however, the teachers can articulate the many ways in which they have expanded their practice to better serve and teach their multilingual students, particularly through practices gained from their participation in the Pathway Project. In the next section, I will discuss five particular approaches the teachers take to effectively teach ELs. These areas demonstrate the necessary skills and knowledge a teacher must develop to help emerging bilinguals develop their literacy and language skills that schools and districts should be providing for teachers through high-quality PD.

B. Multilingual Students: Language and Literacy Development Practices

To address the first research question concerning teaching ELs (i.e., what ideologies do teachers hold towards teaching ELs?), I again focused on identifying speech events that contained assumptions, as discussed in the previous section (Fairclough, 2003). When teachers talk about teaching multilingual students, they refer to various assumptions they have about their multilingual students and best practices for teaching them. In terms of answering the second (i.e., what similarities and differences exist between stakeholders in EL education?) and third research questions (i.e., in ways do the stakeholders influence teachers of ELs?), I focused on identifying speech events that contained dialogicality and intertextuality across the data sets, also discussed in the previous section. Five major themes emerged in my analysis of the teachers ideologies regarding teaching ELs and will be discussed in this section: (1) regularly utilizing students' prior knowledge and cultural assets, but uneven use of their linguistic assets; (2) the use of meaningful interactions between ELs and their monolingual peers; (3) encouraging English language development (ELD) integrated through content; (4) the use and difficulties surrounding scaffolding and differentiation; and (5) a lack of knowledge about the ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap.

1. Utilizing prior knowledge and cultural assets...and linguistic assets?

All the teachers talked about the importance of accessing multilingual students' prior knowledge and cultural assets to help them make connections between new and past knowledge. Accessing prior knowledge includes seeing students' experiences and cultural backgrounds as assets to utilize in the classroom to value and draw upon when developing students' English proficiency, something consistent with both the EL Roadmap (CDE, 2018, p.36) and the CA ELD Standards (CDE, 2014, p.175). For example, Sue Ellen feels that not

only should teachers access the prior knowledge and cultural and linguistic assets of ELs, but it should be done for all students:

Example 9

01 We build on a home language and culture for the English language. You
02 know, we always try to make the material relevant, and apply to their lives,
03 and their prior knowledge. I don't know why it would any different for an
04 English learner. Even just taking out EL, instruction should value, and build
05 on home language, and culture, and other forms of prior knowledge. Yes,
06 that's good instruction. I think you do that by giving them some choices in
07 assignments and allowing them to bring in different stories from their past,
08 different experiences. I think the text that you use should cover wide range of
09 cultures. Opening up the classroom for those perspectives in safe ways is
10 really important.

Sue Ellen sees "good instruction" (line 6) as valuing and building on home language, culture, and prior knowledge in ELs (lines 1-3), in addition to all students ("Even just taking out EL...," line 4). Her verbs are active, stating that "we build on home language and culture" (line 1) to explain what teaching practices she and her colleagues are already doing for ELs. Sue Ellen also states that "you do that [good instruction]" by tapping into students' prior knowledge and experiences (lines 6-8). Similar sentiments were also voiced by Ashley, saying, "We want to value what they bring. We want to use what they already know as building blocks, and I would say this is true for any student, not just an EL student." Like Sue Ellen, her repeated use of the active verb, "want," shows the goals of their teaching: to draw from strong teaching practices that benefit all students. The other teachers also felt the

same way, making repeated references to helping students to create "connections," "associations," or "make bridges to connect" new knowledge to past knowledge or their lived experiences.

In fact, the teachers all talked about how their experiences in Pathway helped them to make this happen in their classrooms. Specifically, the cognitive strategies that Pathway emphasized helped give the teachers a common language to use when helping their students to access their prior knowledge and experiences. Megan, for example, mentioned how the cognitive strategies helped her access her students' prior knowledge, "one of the cognitive strategies is tapping prior knowledge and so we had this, we had a conversation about, you know, how students can't tap prior knowledge if they haven't been exposed to these things. Or just like how the cognitive strategies - these are things that students already do, but it's making them aware of that kind of thinking." Being a novice teacher, Megan relies heavily on Pathway to help inform her teaching. She depends on Pathway so much in fact, that she wishes Pathway would provide them with more resources and lessons, beyond the classroom library, conference travel, binder of activities, and regular lessons discussed during PD meetings they provide all participants. Megan's desire for more resources from Pathway also demonstrates the differing needs of new teachers versus experienced teachers, which I will discuss further in a later section.

The experienced teachers also value Pathway's teaching practices to help them utilize their students' cultural assets. One way that Pathway does that is by having teachers incorporate texts that reflect the lives and experiences of the students, using texts as "mirrors and windows" (Bishop, 1990). Pathway stresses the importance of using texts as "mirrors and windows" to students, meaning that students are exposed to texts with characters and

settings that resemble them and their lives, like a reflection in a mirror, but also help them to understand and appreciate the narratives of others, like peering through a window. Josephina, for example, talks about how Cisnero's (1991/1984) *The House on Mango Street* helped her as a student, which is why she sees this as so important for her ELs now, "Since we do have a lot of Spanish speakers here bring in some of the texts that had Spanish words in them and I know that really affected me as a youngster when I first saw Sandra Cisneros', *The House on Mango Street.* I read it as a seventh grader and I was like, 'Oh my gosh. This girl is me,' and being able to see a mirror in a text which I had never seen before." Josephina's own experience about the effectiveness of mirror texts in her own educational experience and having Pathway affirm that for her makes her more certain of the importance of having her multilingual students read about people like themselves.

This idea of connecting texts to the lives of students also includes "book matching," something Pathway talks about with participating teachers. Jaycee, a veteran teacher, talks about how valuable book matching has been to help her students become interested in reading, "That's another thing that Pathways helped me do very well. And Penny Kettle is an advocate of this book matching. 'You don't like that one? Cool. Get rid of it. Let's find another one. Oh, that one's too hard? You don't like reading drama? No problem. Let's read.'" She refers to Penny Kittle, an educational researcher whose work is discussed and referred to often in Pathway, including book matching as a form of books as mirrors. Through book matching, teachers can find books that connect to students' interests and lives, again building those connections to the experiences and cultures of the students that both the EL Roadmap and CA ELD Standards promote.

In reference to using student's home language in the classroom, the teachers were divided, both amongst one another and, in comparison to, state documents. While all the teachers understand the importance of students' maintaining their home language, not all are clear how to utilize multilingual students' linguistic assets in the classroom. As evidence of teachers supporting home language maintenance, Ashley calls it a "priority" when helping emerging bilinguals, while Megan talks about how their home language "should definitely be valued and we shouldn't try and replace that." All echoed the CA ELD Standards and EL Roadmap, both of which emphasize the importance of allowing students to continue to develop their home language while learning English. Interestingly, this topic never explicitly arose during PD meetings, something admitted by the PD facilitators, which likely affected how teachers were or were not able to utilize student's home language in the classroom.

Because the idea of using students' home language in the classroom was never explicitly brought up during the PD meetings, the teachers discuss utilizing students' home language in the classroom context in different ways. Jaycee, Sue Ellen, Josephina, and Ashley all explicitly talk about regularly encouraging students to use their home language to demonstrate content knowledge in their classrooms. They describe student's use of home language for assignments as "beautiful," "important," or "a part of who they are." These words demonstrate not only an appreciation for the home language of ELs, but also an acknowledgement of the role that language plays in the lives and identity of their students - being "a part of who they are." Sue Ellen, for example, talks about a student asking to use Farsi on an assignment, even though she herself does not know the language, explaining, "I'm like, he knows it, of course. 'Why wouldn't you use that language? You're making it more applicable and relevant to you.'" Jaycee is of a similar mind when she asked her

students to write a letter to their parents and several of them asked her if they could write their letter in Spanish since that is the language their parents speak, saying, "And so they wrote it in Spanish, and ultimately, that fulfilled with the goals of the assignment." Both Sue Ellen and Jaycee encourage their students to use their home language when applicable, particularly in writing to express themselves. This view holds true with seeing ELs' home language as "a part of who they are" - a means to express their thoughts and feelings. This type of linguistic expression is often in the context of informal or creative writing, where teachers implicitly referred to the students' using their own "voice" to express themselves, also consistent with seeing multilingual students' home language as a part of who they are.

For these teachers who incorporate ELs' home language into the classroom, they see the Pathway Project as implicitly having taught them ways to help students use their home language in the classroom; this is likewise echoed with the PD facilitators who discuss the value of students' linguistic assets in the classroom, but never explicitly showed the teachers ways to integrate students' home language into lessons. In fact, when talking about learning to incorporate students' home language, this group of teachers makes an association between language and culture, oftentimes pairing the two together, "culture and language." This association demonstrates the connection teachers made between prior knowledge and cultural and linguistic assets - working to incorporate all three equally. Connecting these three types of knowledge likewise show how this group of teachers sees their multilingual students: their classroom experiences cannot - nor should not - be divided from their experiences and their linguistic identity. Ultimately this perception of ELs gives them agency as learners and contributors to the collective classroom knowledge base.

Important to note is that all these teachers were established teachers who express a high level of comfort in the classroom with ELs. They are at the point in their careers where they feel comfortable adapting lessons and ideas taken from Pathway to fit their own needs, while also being flexible enough to easily adapt their teaching to the needs of their students. They also feel comfortable enough to use students' home language to help them as teachers to better understand the linguistic errors the students make in their writing. Josephina, while not fluent in Spanish, has enough understanding of it to use Spanish to help correct her students and likewise, help her English-only colleagues better understand the mistakes their students make when writing in English; she says, "And I've talked to non-Spanish speaking teachers about this and I've explained to them, this is why the students doing that. And they're like, 'Ooooh.'" Given the negative attitude her colleagues have towards the school's multilingual students, Josephina must be the one to show other teachers that the students' errors are in fact logical given the different syntax used in Spanish, and not evidence of limited ability. While Josephina's efforts are commendable, her need to inform her colleagues about how to use ELs' linguistic resources to help them is indicative of the inconsistent understanding teachers have of the value of ELs' linguistic assets. This issue is a more extreme one compared to the teachers in this study who understand the importance of maintaining multilingual students' home language, but are unsure how to incorporate it into the classroom.

For the two novice teachers who do not integrate students' home language in the classroom, Megan and Eve, they did not make connections between Pathway's strategies and (non-English) language use. Both see strategies learned from PD as limited to students' prior knowledge and cultural assets, but not linguistic. This finding is unsurprising as Pathway

never explicitly addressed utilizing students' home language in the classroom, which these teachers took on face value. They described the Pathway Project as not explicitly telling them to not use students' home language, with both saying that "it never came up." As such, these teachers see language as separate from culture and prior knowledge. They likewise did not have instances of students using their home language in the classroom or even asking to use it in the classroom.

However, the way they talk about not using students' home language in the classroom is different. Eve, while still a novice teacher, does have some experience teaching English in Italy. As such, her experience working with multilingual students makes her more comfortable working with ELs than Megan, who had no prior teaching experience before earning her teaching credential. Therefore, they are at slightly different levels in their teaching abilities. Their differences are evident in Eve's stated desire to "get better" at using students' home language to revise their writing, compared to Megan's doubts about her abilities to understand her multilingual students' home life, culture, and language, and thus explain Megan's apparent inability to make connections to her students to help her reach them. While Eve is ready to start thinking about using language as a resource for learning, Megan is not yet at that point. She struggles with establishing relationships with her students and, as previously discussed, lesson planning.

Since Pathway did not explicitly make this practice visible, Eve and Megan are still trying to reach the point in their teaching where they can utilize their students' linguistic resources as tools for learning. A veteran teacher like Jaycee, on the other hand, can see students' writing to better understand ELs; she states that she uses their writing "to just really bring it into focus that these students' lives are very, very, very, very different" from their

monolingual counterparts. As with the other more experienced teachers who use writing as a way for emerging bilinguals to express themselves, Jaycee also uses writing to help her students express themselves and their identity. However, while Eve speaks of wanting to utilize her students' linguistic assets as tools for learning to write, just as Jaycee and the other experienced teachers already do, Megan is not yet at that point - she is still trying to fully identify the assets her students bring into the classroom that she knows are important but cannot yet leverage as resources for learning.

Novice teachers, particularly ones like Megan who are less comfortable teaching emerging bilinguals, rely heavily on PD to help them with their EL students and are not at the point in their teaching where they feel comfortable adapting their lessons to fit the needs of their students as necessary. As a result, these teachers are in contrast to state documents, including the CA EL Roadmap that states the importance of valuing and utilizing the linguistic resources students bring into the classroom (CDE, 2018). The first principle states the need for learning that "builds on linguistic and cultural assets," while also creating inclusive learning environments (p.19). Therefore, if only some teachers of multilingual populations provide opportunities for students to use their home language as a resource for learning while others are not, the consistent educational experience that the EL Roadmap calls for is not being completed. Likewise, the CA ELD Standards were created within a framework that values students' cultural AND linguistic assets; they were designed to help educators to support ELs to "recognize their home language and cultures as resources to value and draw upon in building English proficiency" (CDE, 2014, p.175). If novice teachers do not feel confident enough to make this recognition happen in their classrooms, then there is a clear inconsistency in how ELs are being taught. This inconsistency again demonstrates

that the vision of the EL Roadmap is not being attained by new teachers who lack the experience or training to make this aspect of Principle One happen.

However, there is one outlier in my data in terms of the teacher participants understanding the linguistic assets ELs bring into the classroom. While Jaycee does speak about the importance of students' maintaining their home language, a goal likewise discussed in Principle Two of the EL Roadmap ("Students' home language...when possible, is developed to high levels of literacy and proficiency along with English," CDE, 2018, p.14), Jaycee also talks about not wanting students to use their home language in her class. She states why:

Example 10

01 I don't really want them accessing or utilizing their home language, except for
02 when it's a cognate, or except for when they have an experience that they
03 need. I think for most of the students I have, this is a crutch. I don't speak a lot
04 Spanish [to them]. I can say you can only speak English in here and I can say
05 listen to me in Spanish, but it's not something that I actively try to use.

…

06 I think it's a crutch. I think for newcomers, maybe that's important. But these
07 students, every student, every ELL I have in my classes, not everyone. I'd say
08 the majority of them are born and raised in Santa Barbara, and so at this point
09 they need to be adopting this academic language that we have here.

Jaycee talks about students using their home language to decode vocabulary ("except for when it's a cognate," lines 1-2) or to help her better communicate an idea to them through prior knowledge ("when they have an experience that they need," lines 2-3). However, in

terms of using their home language in place of academic language, she does not support that (line 5). She calls it a "crutch" (line 6), explaining that "they need to be adopting this academic language that we have here" (line 9). She feels this is particularly important as members of a city that speaks predominantly English (lines 8-9). Later in the interview, she explains why, "But if I allow my students to practice all year in their home language, and they're asked—they're assessed in English, I'm not doing my job. I might be making them feel welcome, developing relations for them, helping them understand the American school system. I might be doing all wonderful things, but ultimately my job is to help them survive in an academic English setting." Ultimately, she feels responsibility towards making sure students are prepared to do well on standardized testing that is conducted in English ("...they're assessed in English, I'm not doing my job.") and the realization that these assessments affect the future of students ("...ultimately my job is to help them survive in an academic English setting."). Additionally, her statement that "I might be doing all the wonderful things," shows a paradox between what Jaycee thinks is good teaching versus what she feels obligated to teach.

While Jaycee understands and values multilingualism in her students, she cannot let that outweigh the accountability she feels from her school and district to score well on standardized testing. An unstated tension exists in the creation of the EL Roadmap and CA ELD Standards. The State can say that it values the linguistic resources of students and push for teachers to use students' linguistic assets in the classroom, but as long as students are being tested in a standardized way and primarily in English, then ultimately teachers still need to prioritize teaching academic English over anything else. Perhaps that is why the phrase "when possible" precedes the idea of helping multilingual students to develop their

literacy in their home language (CDE, 2018, p.14). “When possible” can be read as in “when not preparing” for the many tests that EL students are constantly completing and that Eve referred to in a previous section (“So I don't love the idea of a state test, and a county test, and a school test, and a district test, and my test.”).

2. Meaningful interactions: Student edition.

The participants also discuss the importance of providing multilingual students chances to meaningfully interact with one another. This type of interaction is consistent with the framework of the CA ELD Standards, which refer to the necessity of teachers helping ELs to “apprentice” students into engaging in academic conversations about texts, foster reading comprehension, and acquire the language of academic discourse (CDE, 2014, p.149). Meaningful interactions are likewise brought up often in Pathway in different contexts and practices, such as talking about having students engage in book circles to discuss their readings and various small group work activities. Moreover, the teachers did not limit meaningful interactions to just amongst multilingual students. Sue Ellen, for example, talks about how she wants all her students to talk and work with one another, not only for academic purposes, but also to create a positive learning environment,

Example 11

01 I want - just as much as I want English learners to be talking with English-
02 only students - I want English-only students to be talking with English-
03 learning students and getting that perspective as well. I definitely think that
04 should happen. It helps them practice the language. It hopefully helps them
05 feel comfortable with some different people, and confident in some ways. I
06 think setting them up for success in those situations is important because it

07 can be really scary. I think you really need to be intentional of who they are
08 working with, and how you are setting them up for success, and feeling
09 comfortable in that they should do it.

First, Sue Ellen states that she wants ELs to talk to their English-only peers to help them develop their English proficiency (lines 1-3). She understands the importance behind interaction when it comes to learning and language acquisition (Vygotsky, 1978). This view is consistent with the research behind the CA ELD Standards (CDE, 2014). Having students of different levels work together gives them chances to learn from one another. Expert students can guide novice students and students are able to demonstrate their expertise in a variety of ways when working to complete different tasks in groups. Eve also sees this, stating that "all of the students benefit if they're in a room with different levels. They come up with more ideas, they're more creative...because they could really learn and gain knowledge from those students." This view likewise connects to the first principle of the EL Roadmap where schools create programs that "value and build upon the cultural and linguistic assets student bring to their education" (CDE, 2018, p.36). When collaborating, students can draw from the expertise of their peers, including the varied assets that ELs bring to the classroom.

Second, Sue Ellen also realizes that monolingual students also benefit from talking to emerging bilinguals to help give them "that perspective, as well" (line 3). She thus sees meaningful interactions as not just an academic necessity ("practice the language," line 4), but also a socio-emotional and environmental one. These interactions help create confidence in ELs (line 5) and a comfortable, inclusive learning environment (lines 5, 9). This excerpt illustrates that Sue Ellen not only values academic learning, but also socio-emotional

learning for her emerging bilinguals. Other teachers also talked about the socio-emotional aspect of meaningful interactions. For example, Josephina states that ELs need to feel safe because "Classroom community, you know is really important and I think that's on the teacher, to create a safe space." Teachers in this study are concerned with not just academic learning but educating the whole student. The fact that these teachers understand both the academic and socio-emotional significance of providing students opportunities to work together, talk to one another, and create a "safe space" to learn is encouraging. Creating this type of learning environment also aligns with the first principle of the EL Roadmap that talks about supporting "the socio-emotional health and development of English learners" (CDE, 2018, p.36) and creating a school climate that is inclusive and safe (p.19). Like these teachers, the EL Roadmap understands the importance of educating the entire student. While not explicitly mentioning meaningful interactions in the EL Roadmap, both the state and these teachers understand the role of interactions as both an academic tool and a socio-emotional one.

However, like the struggles that Megan has as a less experienced teacher when it comes to incorporating the students' home language in the classroom, she also struggles with making lessons interactive. Megan talks about the trouble she has consistently including meaningful interactions in her lessons:

Example 12

01 I also think that, you know, just working with junior high, I get myself in
02 trouble with my lessons when they're not interactive. And so I think that
03 students really need that. There are different learning styles and that is
04 just…you know, one lesson is more interactive, but I feel like that is more

05 accessible for students.

The phrase “I get myself in trouble” (lines 1-2) demonstrates that Megan is aware of the need for providing students with opportunities to be interactive and collaborative. This statement likewise shows that she knows lessons that are not interactive are less effective, getting her “in trouble” with her teaching effectiveness. In fact, later in the interview Megan talks about reading books by Carol Booth Olson, an educational researcher of teacher practice and pedagogy, to aid her as she tries to help her students “access the content in a more interactive way.” Pathway has also helped her with this, but she is not yet at the point in her teaching where she can easily adapt their activities and ideas to independently and consistently make these interactions occur. Even though Megan struggles to make this happen, she is still cognizant of the fact that meaningful interactions can make the content “more accessible for students” (lines 4-5). Thus, as discussed in previous sections, Megan needs help teaching her ELs; she understands what she needs to do - create opportunities of meaningful interactions and utilize her students’ cultural and linguistic assets - but she depends on PD, such as Pathway, to help her with that. Veteran teachers, on the other hand, draw ideas from Pathway and can incorporate them to reflect the needs and assets of their students, consistent with the EL Roadmap and CA ELD Standards.

3. English language development integrated through content.

Similar to how the teachers realize the importance of utilizing students’ cultural and linguistic assets, and creating opportunities for meaningful interactions, they all also recognize the need to develop students’ English proficiency through different contexts and integrated with content. This perspective is consistent with the CA ELD Standards that recognizes that multilingual students develop academic English “through multilayered and

multicomponent approaches that focus on the way English works in different contexts" (CDE, 2014, p.151). Likewise, ELs develop English proficiency through both general academic and domain-specific vocabulary, as well as being exposed to and practicing with academic registers used in different academic settings and texts from all subject areas (CDE, 2014, p.151). These ideas are also discussed in the second principle of the EL Roadmap, where teachers are to "engage in intellectually rich, developmentally appropriate learning experiences that foster high levels of English proficiency," (CDE, 2018, p.14). Thus, teachers across all content areas are meant to provide rigorous texts to develop their academic and discipline-specific English, unlike the isolated vocabulary and grammar lessons that were found in the previous 1999 ELD Standards.

Additionally, this type of language development is in alignment with what the teachers and facilitators talk about during Pathway meetings. Pathway consistently provides teachers with ideas on how to help students expand their English language skills through content-area texts that are complex and engaging. For example, using "mentor texts" as models for students to study and emulate when experimenting with new genres or forms of writing. Similarly, the cognitive strategies that Pathway talks about help students access and comprehend rigorous texts, while also monitoring their own learning and comprehension. Because the teachers have been exposed to multiple ways to help their students develop their English proficiency through content, they all talk about doing it often while teaching. Josephina, for instance, speaks about how teachers need to make sure to provide students opportunities to practice using academic English during all their classes,

Example 13

01 I don't think that learning vocabulary and grammar in isolation is helpful,

02 and also, you know, in order to learn a language, you need to be practicing
03 the language, and teachers need to be providing their students with
04 sentence starters and communication opportunities in order for the student
05 to ever feel confident enough to speak.

Josephina specifically states that "learning vocabulary and grammar in isolation" is not helpful (line 1). She realizes that language learning involves practice ("communication opportunities," line 4) and that teachers need to help their students feel comfortable enough to practice using academic English ("feel confident enough to speak," line 5). This again refers to the school culture and confidence the teachers talked about previously (example 11). Josephina even mentions using sentence starters as a teaching strategy to help students develop their English proficiency (line 4), while scaffolding them as a way to help them feel comfortable speaking. Her statements make it apparent that Josephina wants multilingual students to learn English in a genuine context by "emphasizing engagement, interaction, discourse, inquiry, and critical thinking with the same high expectations for English learners as for all students in each of the content areas" (CDE, 2018, p.14).

The other teachers are of similar minds when it comes to integrating English language development through content. Eve, for example, explains that new vocabulary needs to "be applied to content repeatedly in order for them to truly understand what the heck that is. Or grammar, like you've gotta read multiple things with that correct grammar usage or stuff like that." Like Josephina and both state documents, Eve understands that without providing context for new vocabulary and grammatical structures, academic English language development will not stick. Contextualizing and exposing students to how English works in different contexts ("...you've gotta read multiple things...") is the most effective way to

develop English proficiency. Sue Ellen also agrees, even stating that she is "not good at teaching vocabulary isolated and grammar isolated," but instead teaches vocabulary "through our daily writing, and our daily readings, and going over an article together, and infusing vocabulary and content in there is a lot more natural for me." Just as Josephina talks about using sentence starters to help emerging bilinguals practice speaking, Sue Ellen integrates ELD into their daily writing, readings, and other content area texts. She even states that this type of ELD teaching is "more natural" for her than doing isolated vocabulary and grammar lessons. This statement is interesting in that just as it seems more natural for students to learn a language through contextualized reading, writing, and speaking, it is more natural to teach it that way, as well. In fact, Ashley even states that "I struggle more...if I ever have to or feel like I needed to have isolated vocabulary and grammar. I would much rather do it in the content." Like Sue Ellen, Ashley feels it is more natural to teach ELD integrated through content because she would "struggle" if she had to teach "isolated vocabulary and grammar." As demonstrated through their discourses, these teachers not only have been given a variety of ways to help students develop English language proficiency through Pathway, but they also genuinely understand and support the pedagogy behind this idea.

While Jaycee supports contextualized ELD, she is not completely aligned with the other teachers. She does agree that what has been taken from Pathway is effective, but she has choice words regarding her school's ELD curriculum. The other teachers speak minimally of their district's ELD curriculums, *Read 180* and *English 3D*, with only Eve talking about teachers at her school adapting some of the lessons to fit the needs of their students better. Jaycee, however, goes beyond talking about adapting their ELD curriculum, to speak about replacing *Read 180* or *English 3D* completely. She talks about how they are

ineffective in teaching academic language integrated through content, particularly compared to the teaching practices Pathway has given her,

Example 14

01 And I know that things have changed since we purchased those programs, but
02 put all of our faith in that curriculum and we don't see the need to integrate
03 two areas. The academic work with the content work. I really think, because I
04 feel they get discouraged, because they're doing boring shit all day long. The
05 same boring crap, all day long. But what if they're using that same strategy
06 with their independent reading book that they chose on their own? Or what if
07 they're working in lit. circles where they've chosen the book? We're still
08 working on academic vocabulary and plot language, but we're doing it in a
09 group where they chose the book that they wanted to. I just feel like it's so
10 boring. I feel like *Read 180* and *3D* are so boring. And yes, there's something
11 to be said for routine and predictability, but it is too boring in those books.
12 And so, I think I would ask them to do a better job of integrating those two,
13 what is now separated areas of instruction.

Jaycee's main issue with *Read 180* and *English 3D* is that they are "boring" (lines 4, 5, 10, 11) and do not effectively integrate academic English development with content. Because those curriculums ask students to do the same, predictable work over and over ("routine and predictability," line 11), ELs are not being challenged to engage with the "rigorous instructional materials [that] support high levels of intellectual engagement" that the EL Roadmap promotes (CDE, 2018, p.14). Making matters worse is that Jaycee feels that the district has "put all of our faith in that curriculum" (line 2). Thus, while Pathway has given

these participating teachers ways to integrate independent reading books (line 6), literature circles (line 7), the cognitive strategies that Josephina speaks of (example 13), and the daily reading and writing that Sue Ellen mentions, the rest of the teachers in the district rely on *Read 180* and *English 3D*. As a result, teachers who have not participated in Pathway are not necessarily integrating ELD into content as consistently or perhaps as effectively as Pathway teachers. This assumption cannot be confirmed as that is beyond the scope of this study, but given that Jaycee has serious concerns about the district's ELD curriculum and that the other teachers focused on Pathway strategies when talking about supporting ELs' English development, the effectiveness (or lack thereof) of district ELD programs is something to consider since the EL Roadmap pushes for a consistent EL educational experience within and across systems in California.

4. Scaffolding, yes, differentiation, maybe.

One teaching practice that should be built into the all teaching practices is the importance of scaffolding and differentiated instruction. All the teachers talk about meeting the needs of ELs through scaffolding their instruction in different ways. Scaffolding supports students to do tasks today that they will eventually be able to do independently tomorrow (Bruner, 1983; CDE, 2014, p.149). Specifically, differentiation refers to the teacher's responses to the diverse learning needs of each of their students (Tomlinson, 1999). Usually scaffolding is done at the whole class level and differentiation is done at the individual student level. The teachers also discuss the role that scaffolding and differentiation play for all students to learn, but acknowledge that they take particular consideration in integrating supports for multilingual students.

This priority is likewise echoed by both the EL Roadmap and the CA ELD Standards to build in scaffolds for emerging bilinguals at different levels develop their English proficiency. For example, the second principle of the EL Roadmap states that "explicit scaffolding enables meaningful participation by English learners at different levels of English proficiency" (CDE, 2018, pp.14-15). Interestingly, scaffolding is specifically mentioned in both documents, but differentiation is conspicuously absent in the CA ELD Standards. The EL Roadmap, however, does discuss the need for differentiation in Principle One, emphasizing that "there is no single EL profile and no one-size-fits-all approach that works for all English learners…and instruction must be responsive" to that (CDE, 2018, p.13), although not using the term "differentiation" in the Roadmap.

Effective scaffolding ensures that all ELs have access to rigorous curriculum in ways that can help support their English language development. The teachers realize this. Sue Ellen, for instance, discusses how she uses the cognitive strategies talked about in Pathway meetings to help her multilingual students work through complex texts:

Example 15

I just feel like it's more interactive in a way where students are interacting with texts in a variety of ways, instead of just one formatted way of marking the texts, and circling a few words, and finding the claim. That's kind of what I feel like was four years ago and now it's like, "What more connections can you make from this? How does this apply to life? What questions to do you have about it?" Yeah, some of those things I feel like are really… has made the material more engaging for students and hands on. A lot more hands-on. So it's not just me reading the text, and me circling the words they need to

09 circle, it's them having to do something with the material, but that could look

10 like a few different things.

Sue Ellen talks about how much more "interactive" (line 1) her instruction has become since she started using the cognitive strategies to help students unpack class readings. This instruction includes making connections to their prior knowledge and experiences ("What more connections can you make from this? How does this apply to life?," lines 4-6) - also discussed in a prior section - as well as asking questions as students read to help them verbalize their thinking ("What questions to do you have about it?," line 5). Sue Ellen also mentions that "four years ago" (line 4), she used to be the one doing all the work for her students, using only one method to unpack a text with her students ("...me reading the text, and me circling the words they need to circle," lines 8-9). This old approach positioned her students as very passive learners compared to the interactive learning they are doing now through the scaffolding that the cognitive strategies provide her students.

The other teachers also talk about using the cognitive strategies from Pathway to help meet the needs of their students. Eve talks about trying out different "approaches," saying, "we'll try it from different angles to try and help them learn it." The "different angles" refer to the scaffolds she puts in place to help her students ("...help them learn it.") have opportunities to engage with the texts in different ways, while still feeling supported. They also talk about other cognitive strategies they used to support ELs; Jaycee discusses frontloading vocabulary and Megan speaks of having her students write out their ideas in KWL charts to track what her students know, what they want to know, and what they learned before, during, and after lessons. Additionally, for a new teacher like Megan, using the cognitive strategies helps her "to see their thinking," causing her to reflect and say, "'Wow,

this is what you're thinking when we're reading,' like I don't get to see that when all we're doing is reading the text together as a class." Just as Sue Ellen sees the benefits of using the cognitive strategies to help her students connect to their learning compared to using a singular method to unpack a text, Megan also sees their benefits ("Wow, this is what you're thinking…") over simply "reading the text together as a class." Josephina sums the benefits of Pathway up best when she says, "I think it [Pathway] has helped me to make my instruction - period - more differentiated and intentionally designed." For Josephina, she attributes Pathway to improving her instruction - "period." Clearly, the teachers use scaffolds not only because they have proven to be effective in helping their ELs to engage with rigorous texts, but also because Pathway has given them a variety of cognitive strategies, fifteen in total in fact, to make this happen in their classrooms on a regular basis.

Scaffolding is evidently happening in these teachers' classrooms. The problem lies in providing differentiation on a regular basis. While scaffolding is done at the whole class level, differentiation is done on the individual student level. Through Pathway, the teachers have the cognitive strategies, which can also be used to help students on an individual level. To do this at the individual student level does take time for all students to master all fifteen strategies, however. Because differentiation is meant to meet the needs of individual students, teachers do not always have the time to make this happen. For Ashley, especially, time was an issue for meeting the needs of all her students, something she admits to struggling with year-to-year. Below, Ashley talks about having the tools to differentiate, the cognitive strategies, and meeting the overall needs of her students, but not having the time to do it on a one-on-one basis for all students:

Example 16

01 Like I said, I think there are tools for doing that [differentiation]. I think I can
02 identify them [students' needs] and attack them. I think it's more about the
03 time to set up a classroom that is differentiated enough so that I know that this
04 student is working on this one and this student is working on this one. In a
05 classroom of 36 students or 30 students, teaching 2 plus subjects, is we do a
06 third type of subject. It's really hard to wrap my head around figuring out how
07 to differentiate to the individual person and skill level.

Teaching large classes and two subjects at a time, English and Social Studies, Ashley has a hard time "figuring out how to differentiate to the individual person and skill level" (lines 6-7). She sees differentiation as a "third type of subject" (line 6) because of the amount of time it takes for a teacher to differentiate. Differentiating is especially more time consuming with large class sizes and students at varying levels of English language proficiency. Because she poses differentiation as a third subject to teach, she talks about not having the proper amount of time to dedicate towards making it happen ("it's more about the time to set up a classroom that is differentiated enough," lines 2-3). This difficulty is despite having the knowledge as a veteran teacher to identify (line 2) the needs of her students and the "tools" (line 1) - the cognitive strategies from Pathway - to actively address them ("attack," line 2).

Not having enough time to consistently differentiate with her students is such a significant concern for Ashley that she mentions it six separate times during her two interviews. In fact, she even admits that while she does not support tracking students, she sees the benefits of it when it comes to differentiation. In classes of different levels, it becomes hard to effectively differentiate, compared to a class with students at the same level; she explains, "Because when you put everybody in the classroom together - this is on the

teacher to differentiate well enough - be able to differentiate well enough that they can really reach and help to grow all of their students. Challenging the ones that are ahead and supporting the ones that are behind. It's a beautiful thing when it works, but it's so difficult to do…" She calls differentiation a "beautiful thing when it works," showing Ashley's understanding of the effectiveness of differentiation for students at different levels ("Challenging the ones that are ahead and supporting the ones that are behind."). "It," or meeting the needs of students, is a "beautiful" part of teaching and learning. However, she also realizes that it is very hard to do in large classes with students at so many different levels. Sue Ellen also sees these struggles, saying that she does what she can to support multilingual students (example 15), but oftentimes "it's not necessarily differentiating what they're looking at, it's just to provide that extra support. Which is not differentiation." She does what she can by chunking texts, but realizes this is a simple solution that is not actually working to address the complexity that is the individual needs for all her multilingual students.

Like Ashley, Sue Ellen does not have the time to effectively differentiate for all her students, particularly when she also has large class sizes, saying, "We have these English support classes, which then you would think enrollment would be, the class size would be lower so you can give more personalized instruction, and they're full of 30 students. Then how are we supposed to do that?" However, because Sue Ellen still wants her students to engage with complex texts, she does her best by finding what solutions she can, such as scaffolding for the entire class, which is still a solution, although not her ideal one. Important to note is that over-enrollment is another piece of evidence of poor district policy, like the

lack of communication and poor curriculum choices made by the district, and is a contributor to the difficulties the teachers have when trying to find time to differentiate for their students.

Thus, it is evident through these discourses that all the teachers understand and see the importance of differentiation and scaffolding. Aligning with the EL Roadmap and CA ELD Standards, all the teachers talk about the importance of providing ELs with the appropriate level of support to succeed in their classes through scaffolding (CDE, 2014, p.149). Using the cognitive strategies and teaching techniques talked about during Pathway meetings, the teachers have a variety of tools to draw from to help their students unpack the rigorous texts that the State wants ELs to engage with in all content areas, as discussed by Eve, Jaycee, and Sue Ellen. They have seen evidence of the effectiveness of these tools, with Megan being able to see her students' thinking more clearly and Sue Ellen talking about making her teaching more interactive compared to before.

However, another instance of tension is apparent in what the State calls for in EL education. That is, while the CA ELD Standards can talk about the important role that scaffolding plays in multilingual students' learning, the role that differentiation plays in meeting the INDIVIDUAL needs of multilingual students is neglected. The EL Roadmap does include a caveat in Principle One when talking about meeting the needs of ELs at different levels, stating that "no single program or instructional approach works for all EL students" (CDE, 2018, p.14). Thus, the State is aware that students need scaffolding AND differentiation, yet California does not consistently state the need for both in BOTH policies, which should be consistent with one another. The State also does not address district policies that allow for overcrowded classes that make it difficult for teachers to support individual students. Thanks to Pathway, scaffolding is clearly happening in these teachers' classrooms.

But no amount of PD can help teachers find the time to meet the needs of all their students daily. Therefore, Ashley refers to differentiation as a "third type of subject" that she teaches, needing another class period-worth of time to truly meet the needs of all ELs who, as the State will agree, "have different needs and capacities" (CDE, 2018, p.13).

5. What English Language Development Standards?

A final theme that emerged regarding teaching ELs was not about specific practices, but rather about a lack of familiarity with EL policies and documents. This lack of familiarity includes being able to talk about the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap. Overall, nearly all the teachers admit to having little to no familiarity with the CA ELD Standards. While they could talk about what teaching practices work for supporting multilingual students in the classroom, they were less able to give specifics about the actual ELD Standards or how they differ from the previous 1999 ones. For example, Ashley, a veteran teacher, realizes that she needs a better understanding of the ELD Standards, when she talks about her understanding of them currently,

Example 17

01 I think I should also find out what our ELD standards are, so I know what I'm
02 doing, but also know how to help my students. Because I think that it has been
03 a long time since I got my credential and I'd love to know the more updated
04 strategies to help students be successful. As much as I want Pathway to solve
05 all my problems, I think it would be good to have more in my tool kit.

Ashley realizes that the last time she had a chance to familiarize herself with the ELD Standards was back in her credential program (line 3). She takes ownership over not knowing the ELD Standards well ("I should also find out what our ELD standards are," line 1)

because her lack of knowledge only hinders her ability to help her students with "more updated strategies to help students be successful" (lines 3-4). It is clear that Ashley wants the opportunity to improve her teaching for ELs, but has not had that opportunity. Sue Ellen also takes ownership over her lack of knowledge (discussed in example 3), stating that, "Maybe I need to put in the extra work to do it, but I also just feel like can't someone just easily tell me these things?" While she admits that it may be her job to familiarize herself with the ELD Standards ("Maybe I need to put in the extra work"), she also does not understand why someone who is more knowledgable cannot help her unpack them. And while Pathway may provide some help providing teachers with new practices for supporting emerging bilinguals in the classroom (lines 4-5), Ashley knows it is not enough. In fact, Pathway was not designed to focus on or teach educators about the CA ELD Standards. Both facilitators talk about the focus being more on the "agency of teachers" to provide them with the tools and the confidence to adapt their teaching to meet the needs of ELs. As such, schools and districts should be filling this gap in themselves to help teachers understand state standards, not outside PD programs. This gap on the part of schools and districts is directly related to the previous section that discussed the lack of support felt by the teachers from their schools and/or districts to effectively teach ELs; such implications will be discussed further in the next chapter. However, it is apparent that teachers need support to work through the CA ELD Standards as it is a time-consuming task that they cannot take on alone.

In addition to having limited familiarity with the CA ELD Standards, none of the teachers were familiar with the EL Roadmap. None of them had heard of the EL Roadmap and even one of the PD facilitators was unfamiliar with this state policy. Like the CA ELD Standards, the EL Roadmap was not a consideration in the design of Pathway, due to the EL

Roadmap being adopted after Pathway was implemented with Cohort One. Being a state policy that directly impacts the way ELs are educated in this state, teachers should have at least have been exposed to the EL Roadmap by their district and schools, if not having read it for themselves. Further implications of this lack of familiarity with the EL Roadmap will be discussed in the following chapter.

Beyond having limited to no familiarity with state policies and documents, the teachers also have an unclear understanding of the process surrounding getting ELs redesignated, or "RFEP-ed" (Reclassified Fluent English Proficient). Josephina, for instance, admits that she has been teaching for eight years now and "I still vaguely know what the requirements are" for students to get redesignated. She describes her understanding as "vague," not sure what to do to help multilingual students on the path towards redesignation. As discussed in a previous section (example 3), Sue Ellen still is unsure about how to help her students get redesignated. When asking for help from the EL TOSA, she received an email full of state documents. Why the EL TOSA did not break down the process for Sue Ellen could be for various reasons, from time to misunderstanding Sue Ellen's question. However, it could also be due to the EL TOSA not having a clear understanding herself of the process, with California having recently replaced the old process (California English Language Development Test, CELDT) with the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) in September 2018 (CDE, 2019). Eve had a similar experience with her vice principal. When asking for help with the ELPAC from him, she received no answer because "I think he was...busy. Or maybe he was confused about the ELPAC, too." Giving him the benefit of the doubt, Eve first says he was "busy," but then admits that he may have been "confused" by the ELPAC like her, later stating, "Because I think he also was like,

'What is this and how do I administer it?'" Understandably, district and school officials also had to unpack and wrestle with the ELPAC, so it is unsurprising that they were unclear or unresponsive when teachers asked for guidance. However, the district could have brought teachers into the process of learning about the ELPAC as colleagues. This solution would have not only helped expedite the unpacking of the new state policy, but more importantly ensured that both administration and faculty had a thorough understanding of it.

Going back to the EL Roadmap, teachers need to be supported by their schools and districts to ensure EL achievement. As discussed before, the third principle talks about how "each level of the school system provides resources and tiered support to ensure strong programs and build the capacity of teachers and staff to leverage the strengths and meet the needs of English learners" (CDE, 2018, p.15). Providing resources and support includes making sure teachers have a clear understanding of how the CA ELD Standards work to make the vision of EL Roadmap achievable. Thus, having administrators and teachers work together to build a collective school knowledge that supports ELs would be an ideal way to fulfill Principle Three, truly building the capacity of all school personnel to meet the needs to multilingual students.

Of all the teachers, Jaycee was the only one who felt she had a solid understanding of the CA ELD Standards. Being a veteran teacher who has taught many ELD classes, she talks about working with other ELD teachers two years ago to gain a better understanding of the CA ELD Standards:

Example 18

01 I'm very familiar with them [ELD standards]. I couldn't spout them out to you

02 right now. But when I was teaching *3D* pretty intensely and working with a

03 good team—which I was for a few years—we took it upon ourselves, sort of
04 as a cohort, to map the ELD Standards onto the ELA Standards. So, I'm pretty
05 familiar...it was a helpful exercise for me to see how they compare to the ELs,
06 just the language arts standards.

What is notable about Jaycee's familiarity with the CA ELD Standards is that this was not because of her school or district's help. Rather, as a team, she and other ELD teachers worked together to unpack the standards and align them with the ELA Standards (line 4). This type of collaboration, while admirable, was done without district support; the teachers organized and took up by the task themselves to align the CA ELD Standards with the ELA ones. As Jaycee notes, this was "a helpful exercise" for her, providing a clearer understanding of the purpose and use of the CA ELD Standards (lines 5-6). This alignment is consistent with the purpose of the CA ELD Standards as they are meant to accompany content area standards, not replace them (CDE, 2014). The standards specifically state that they are meant to "amplify the language knowledge, skills, and abilities of these standards, which are essential for ELs to succeed in school while they are developing their English" (p.8). Unpacking and aligning these standards is a perfect example of teachers understanding the necessity and purpose of the CA ELD Standards. Jaycee, being a veteran teacher, is aware of this importance and was able to work with like-minded teachers to make that happen, independent of PD or school/district support ("...we took it upon ourselves…," line 3). The problem remains that not all teachers have colleagues interested in doing this, such as Josephina whose school is more interested in pushing out their multilingual students than supporting them (example 8). As such, it is apparent that teachers need support systems to help them grow as educators and better serve emerging bilinguals. This support includes

providing PD that is collaborative, giving teachers opportunities to work and learn from one another, which will be discussed in the next section.

To summarize, the participating teachers all are aware of and use various teaching practices that help their multilingual students develop their English language proficiency. As such, they are oftentimes in alignment with the CA ELD Standards and EL Roadmap that stress the use of specialized skills and knowledge to support emerging bilingual learning. For example, all the teachers are cognizant of the benefits of utilizing students' prior knowledge and cultural and linguistic assets to make connections to new knowledge. They talk about valuing what students bring into the classroom (example 9) and the different ways that Pathway has showed them to make this happen regularly in their classrooms. These practices include mirror texts and book matching. However, not all the teachers are able to incorporate opportunities for students to use their home language in the classroom, particularly with the less experienced teachers, such as Megan and Eve, who feel that because Pathway did not explicitly talk about using a student's home language in the classroom, they feel unprepared to do that in their classrooms. Furthermore, Jacyee speaks of valuing multilingual students' home language, but not wanting to use it in the class, referring to it as a "crutch" (example 10). This view is in the context of knowing that her students will be assessed in English and as their teacher, she cannot ignore her responsibility to prioritize their English language development first and foremost. As such, while all teachers speak of wanting to use students' varied assets in the classroom, not all are doing that, which creates inconsistencies in how the EL Roadmap is applied.

Similarly, all the teachers speak about providing their students with chances to interact in meaningful ways. These types of interactions help multilingual students to engage

in discussions with their peers to increase reading comprehension and practice using academic English in a variety of contexts and purposes. They are likewise consistent with the type of learning that is discussed in the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap. The teachers tie these sorts of interactions to fostering inclusive learning environments where students feel supported and safe to practice speaking (example 11). They also see the benefits of having ELs and English-only students speak to one another as part of creating that safe space for learning. As a newer teacher, Megan sometimes struggles with making her lessons interactive enough (example 12). Her struggle demonstrates the importance of providing teachers with PD opportunities to help teachers like Megan who need more help incorporating meaningful interactions into their lessons.

Also discussed by the teachers are the ways that they support ELs' English language development by integrating it through content. Again, this view is consistent with the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap that talk about multilingual students developing academic English "through multilayered and multicomponent approaches that focus on the way English works in different contexts" (CDE, 2014, p.151). Because of Pathway, the teachers not only have a variety of teaching practices to do this, but they also speak about feeling uncomfortable teaching vocabulary and grammar in isolation (example 13). That kind of approach to ELD was pushed for in the 1999 ELD Standards and made language learning decontextualized and less rigorous when it came to content-specific knowledge. All the teachers felt that Pathway has given them a significant amount of support in this area, but only Jaycee explicitly referred to the district's EL curriculums as weak and "boring" (example 14). As such, teachers who have not had the benefit of participating in Pathway or other high-quality PD that supports teachers of ELs may not understand the benefits of

integrating ELD into content, or may understand it, but not be sure how to do it. This inconsistency is particularly important given that this view on language learning is perhaps one of the biggest paradigm shifts between the 1999 ELD Standards and the current ones.

These teachers also understand how important it is for emerging bilinguals to feel supported in their learning through scaffolding and differentiation. Both the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap talk about providing students with supports to be able to participate in rigorous and complex material and texts; for example, the EL Roadmap states that "explicit scaffolding enables meaningful participation by English learners at different levels of English proficiency" (CDE, 2018, pp.14-15). All the teachers discuss different cognitive strategies that they took from Pathway to support ELs (example 15). Strategies included accessing prior knowledge, asking questions, and frontloading vocabulary. The biggest concern for the teachers, however, is not having the time or support to differentiate for their students at the individual level. Both Ashley and Sue Ellen talk about how large class sizes and lack of time impact their ability to effectively differentiate (example 16). Interestingly, the State does not address differentiation explicitly, but does state in one policy that "no single program or instructional approach works for al EL students" (CDE, 2018, p.14). The problem remains, though, that with the adoption of the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap, teachers are not suddenly able to effectively and efficiently support the needs of all their students all the time, even when given the tools for it from high-quality PD.

Lastly, there is a clear lack of teacher familiarity with state policies and documents regarding EL education (example 17). This lack of familiarity is understandable regarding the very recent implementation of the ELPAC that school and district officials are still working to understand. However, having at least a passing familiarity with the CA ELD

Standards is important, particularly given that they are meant to be used in all subject areas and by all teachers. Likewise, not all teachers have colleagues who are willing to work together to unpack these state documents such as Jaycee had (example 19). Therefore, it is evident that a better effort needs to be made by schools and districts to help teachers understand how these policies impact their teaching. This effort is not the sole responsibility of PD programs, such as Pathway, to do this for teachers when each program has their own goals. Schools and districts need to fill those gaps, supporting student learning by supporting teacher learning that is relevant to the needs of the students and teachers. Given that reading and unpacking the CA ELD Standards and EL Roadmap was not the focus of Pathway, it makes sense that the teachers in this study have the tools to support and teach multilingual students, but not the understanding of how their practices align (or not) with State policies.

Since these teachers are not clearly being supported by their schools and/or districts to gain the specialized skills and knowledge needed to teach ELs, they turned to an outside PD program, Pathway, to improve their teaching. The teachers who participate in Pathway learned teaching practices that support students to meet the sociocultural learning discussed in the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap. Both policies and Pathway drew on sociocultural theory and understandings of second language acquisition that do not rely on decontextualized grammar and vocabulary. Thus, Pathway can be considered a high-quality PD program. As such, there are certain aspects of Pathway that demonstrate why it has been so effective for these participating teachers. Characteristics include providing teachers with time to collaborate in meaningful ways and meeting the needs of teachers at different levels of their careers, the final two themes I will discuss next.

C. Professional Development: What Teachers Need

To further address the second (i.e., what similarities and differences exist between stakeholders in EL education?) and third research questions (i.e., in ways do the stakeholders influence teachers of ELs?) concerning PD, like the previous sections, I continued to focus on identifying speech events that contained assumptions, dialogicality and intertextuality across the data sets (Fairclough, 2003). When the teachers talk about their experiences and beliefs regarding PD, they reveal various assumptions about certain characteristics that make PD effective. They also reveal differences, similarities, and influences between one another, the PD facilitators, and the State in terms of what can be considered high-quality PD. Two major themes emerged in my analysis of the teachers' ideologies regarding PD and will be discussed in this section: (1) the importance of providing teachers time to collaborate and demonstrate their expertise as educators during PD; and (2) the benefits of providing PD that can meet the needs of educators at different stages in their teaching careers.

1. Meaningful interactions: Teacher edition.

Every teacher in this study revealed how important it is to them to have time to collaborate with their colleagues. This collaboration time provides teachers with opportunities to work together, using their expertise as teachers to collectively solve issues, share ideas, and brainstorm lessons. Collaboration is not just time to work together, but an acknowledgement of the knowledge and experience that teachers bring with them to PD meetings and the relationships that emerge from those interactions. As such, all the teachers see Pathway as one of the few PD programs that "respects" their work as professionals. Jaycee talks about this when discussing the types of conversations that take place at Pathway meetings:

Example 19

01 And I get to sit and talk about it with you. And I get to problematize this
02 overly simplistic solution that one scholar's offering, and that's where we find
03 our meaning. We're like, "yeah, I tried this revision tutorial. I didn't think I
04 could do it with my college prep students, but they could. You should do it."
05 That's sort of like, that's the support that I get. But that is from Pathways.
06 That is not from my school site. It is not from my district level team, or
07 district.

…

08 It was nice to be treated with respect, to be fed good food, and just be treated a
09 professional. So that felt really, really good, and had never, ever happened.
10 All of us were like, "This must be what it's like in other professions."

She talks about getting the time "to sit and talk" (line 1) about ideas with other teachers, to build relationships with other participant teachers. She also mentions working "to problematize" (line 1) issues that scholars simplify because they are not in the classroom to see the complexities behind teaching practices and pedagogy. "Problematizing" issues is relevant to the perspective on teaching as a profession, where there is a consistent need to reflect and consider one's practice in relation to classroom content and curriculum (Englund, 1996). Jaycee realizes the value of problematizing and likewise the value that collaboration can bring when reflecting on teaching. The way she voices her and other teachers' conversations ("I tried this revision tutorial. I didn't think I could do it with my college prep students, but they could. You should do it," lines 3-4) demonstrates Jaycee's understanding of why Pathway was so effective to her. First, it provided time for her to talk to other teachers to get new ideas and solve problems (lines 1-4). But secondly and more importantly,

Pathway gave teachers time to use their experiences as resources for these ideas and problems. She ends her description of their conversation by saying that this kind of support is what she gets from Pathway and not her district (lines 5-7). This statement illustrates the themes brought up earlier: these teachers are not getting the type of support needed from their districts, and the PD they do get is unrelated to what these teachers want PD for.

Sue Ellen speaks of Pathway similarly, discussing the time the teachers got to collaborate and work through their ideas. She describes Pathway as a "process" that gave teachers time for meaningful interactions; she states that Pathway "was thoughtful, not like a quick fix but, 'Hey, this is something that's going to take time, but we want to pour into people what we have envisioned for this.' I want to be a part of that." Their meetings were thoughtful and her use of the water metaphor ("...we want to pour into people what we have envisioned for this") illustrates that thought - where PD facilitators carefully "pour" into the teachers the time and thought to make their vision to create teacher agency and confidence possible. As Sue Ellen stated, it was a "process" and not a quick fix that would be less effective to their teaching; this "quick fix" is reminiscent to the quick fix "cheat sheets" on the CA ELD Standards that Ashley talked about receiving from her school when they were seeking accreditation that proved ineffective in the long run. Additionally, in the example above, Jaycee states, "It was nice to be treated with respect, to be fed good food and just be treated a professional" (lines 8-9). That feeling of being respected that Jaycee speaks of, coupled with the feelings of being invested in that Sue Ellen speaks of ("we want to pour into people what we have envisioned for this"), shows that teachers want and benefit from PD that is collaborative and allows them to build relationships with one another. Giving teachers

this kind of time to work together to find solutions respects the knowledge that teachers bring to PD meetings.

Respecting the knowledge of teachers is also beneficial when teachers collaborate with teachers at different levels of their career. Both Megan and Eve discuss drawing from the knowledge of more experienced teachers during Pathway and other PD meetings. For example, when describing how she feels during Pathway meetings, Megan talks about growing "on a personal level and also just talking with them [other teachers] about what they're doing in their classrooms...it feels like this really, nice…like, welcoming community." Being a novice teacher, Megan benefits from the "community" that is created between Pathway cohorts. These communities work collectively to do the work that Jaycee describes (example 19) and to feel welcomed and invested in, just as Sue Ellen describes ("Hey, this is something that's going to take time, but we want to pour into people what we have envisioned for this.").

Outside of Pathway, Megan also wants to collaborate more, describing a time when she met with her 8th-grade teaching team to calibrate essay grading, and saying it "was really nice and helpful. We printed out a couple of student essays and we calibrated. But that was one time in the year." Despite being helpful for her as a new teacher to align and better understand her colleagues' expectations, this meeting was a one-time event in an entire school year. Megan wanted more than that to help her grow as an educator. Eve also draws from the knowledge of more experienced teachers, saying that other teachers have "been really helpful in giving me materials, or showing me places I can get them, stuff like that." Her colleagues give her teaching materials that work. This type of collaboration helps Eve to understand that she does not have to start from scratch as a new teacher, making and finding

her own teaching resources. Thus, newer teachers like Eve and Megan can benefit from the knowledge and expertise that more experienced teachers bring into the room; likewise, veteran teachers, such as Jaycee and Sue Ellen, feel that they can continue to grow and be treated as professionals when allowed to demonstrate their knowledge during PD meetings.

The importance of collaborative PD is discussed in the CA ELD Standards. The research base for the standards recognizes that a major shift has been taken by the State regarding EL education. As such, "this complex undertaking requires deep commitment, collaboration among groups of educators, support for teachers to develop and refine instructional practices…" (CDE, 2014, p.175). The standards particularly recognize the significance of collaboration, stating that districts need to "adopt an appropriate paradigm of support" that gives teachers time to collaborate over time and issues that are relevant to the teachers' classrooms (p.175). While this kind of language about PD is promising, the State is not without contradictions. The contradiction lies in the EL Roadmap that does not have the same emphasis about the importance of collaboration for teachers to make this paradigm shift in EL education happen. In fact, the only mention of PD at all is in the fourth part of the fourth principle of the EL Roadmap, stating, "Professional learning and collaboration time are afforded teachers" (CDE, 2018, p.15). That wording is not in the actual EL Roadmap, in fact, but in the additional descriptors of the actual policy. The EL Roadmap itself only says the CDE will provide guidance in "professional development" (CDE, 2018, p.37). This tension between what the ELD Standards stand for and the vision for how the standards will be achieved according to the EL Roadmap are not in unison. Nor does the State specify the kind of PD that teachers need to engage in professional learning that will effectively improve their teaching practices. Even the use of the word "collaboration" by both policies is vague

enough to be interpreted in many ways by schools or districts that differs from the relationship-building collaboration that the teachers in Pathway were engaged in here. Further implications for this tension will be discussed in the next chapter, but it is clear that the state needs to provide greater clarity when it comes to the need for collaborative PD in order to complete the vision for a consistent EL educational experience in California. Consistency can only happen through opportunities for teachers to build relationships through teacher learning to work towards better aligning their teaching practices and beliefs with one another.

Making the need for this type of consistency even more apparent is the experience of Josephina. As discussed in a previous section, Josephina is at a school whose priorities differ greatly from her own when it comes to EL education (example 8). Unfortunately, it is unsurprising that she also has a different perspective about collaboration than her colleagues at her new school. First, she talks about how the PD meetings at her new school are after school, but that no one stays because they are optional; as a result, she tried to set up a meeting to start changing her department's culture around PD, but was unsuccessful:

Example 20

I got in trouble, because I had said to someone, "Why does everyone just leave?" and they're like, "Duh, because we're not getting paid." And I'm like, "but what about the kids?"

...

I tried to do one meeting at the beginning of the school year and it didn't really work, because all those teachers aren't really used to collaborating.

Josephina's dedication to her students and her teaching is visible in her response to her colleagues' absence from PD when she asks, "but what about the kids?" (line 3). What is disheartening is that despite her efforts to incorporate more collaboration into her department, her colleagues were unwilling to work with her (lines 4-5). She voices them in a very negative manner that prioritizes time and money over student learning ("Duh, because we're not getting paid," line 2). This statement reveals Josephina's frustration with the lack of care her colleagues show towards building any collaborative relationships with one another, something she values and similar to Jaycee's view on the opportunities she gets to "problematize" from Pathway, but not from her school or district (example 19). As such, teachers like Jaycee and Josephina rely on the network of teachers created by Pathway to expand their EL-centered teaching practices.

This type of school culture is an unfortunate reality for teachers, as not all educators are interested in collaborating and participating in PD. Ashley, for example, while at a school with teachers who have a more positive outlook on collaboration than Josephina, realizes that not all teachers view PD in a positive light, stating, "Wouldn't that be amazing if we had that time to sit down with other teachers? I know a lot of people would complain and groan about that. Well, I don't know - I don't know if they would, because it would make us better teachers." Ashley assumes that not all teachers necessarily value PD ("I know a lot of people would complain and groan about that."). She herself sees the importance of it, describing the idea of a set, weekly PD meeting as "amazing" because she knows that "it would make us better teachers." She does catch her assumption, however ("I don't know..."), when she says that it would help their teaching. While Ashley understands the connection between collaboration and growth as an educator, she struggles with an assumed teacher cultural value

that sees PD as a waste of time. However, this view is inconsistent with her experiences at Pathway, where having the "time to sit down with other teachers" makes "better teachers." Statements like these demonstrate the effort and value that needs to be made in providing teachers with regular time for teachers to collaborate. This effort is something that the State needs to make clearer in their policies pertaining to EL education: PD that respects teacher knowledge and expertise to solve problems, develop new teaching practices, and create alignment in promoting practice-proven teaching practices to ensure quality instruction for multilingual students.

2. Meeting the needs of novice vs. expert teachers.

Finally, along the same lines of needing time to collaborate, teachers also want PD that is tailored to the stage they are at in their teaching career. Teachers benefit from PD that meets the needs of novice teachers, the needs of teachers established teachers, and the needs of more veteran teachers who may be leaders of their department or schools. As discussed in the previous section, new teachers like Megan and Eve want help with grading and gathering practice-proven teaching practices. This desire also applies to Sue Ellen who started teaching her first ELD class this past year. For instance, when talking about her ELD class, Sue Ellen admits that she still has a way to go with understanding how best to support them, stating,

Example 21

01 But I think I understand it [teaching ELs] a lot more now. I think I understand
02 the vocabulary and fluency more than I really thought. I - I was really floored
03 by that, like surprised by that. But I think I still have a lot more to learn. So
04 yeah. I don't know. I'm at a very beginner stage at a level of understanding,
05 but yeah.

Sue Ellen repeatedly uses the word "understand" (lines 1, 1, 4) to show the work she is still doing to best support and teach multilingual students, particularly with supporting their "vocabulary and fluency." While she is "surprised" by the amount of time it is taking (line 3), she still wants to improve her teaching practices. This sentiment is like Megan who benefited from calibrating her essay grades with the other teachers ("...was really nice and helpful, we printed out a couple of student essays and we calibrated, but that was one time in the year."). New teachers need this kind of support that helps them feel confident in their teaching practices, supporting students, and giving students productive feedback.

More established and veteran teachers need PD that helps them reaffirm good teaching practices. Ashley sees Pathway as having done this for her. She did not necessarily gain entirely new teaching practices, but rather gained a better language to teach with. She explains that Pathway "helped me to have more of a natural language and strategy to support these skills - that the skills the students need to be working on and need to have instead...the tools that I think that help make it easier to teach it." She describes Pathway as giving her a "more natural language" to use when supporting ELs; Pathway, for her as a veteran teacher, helped her to refine her teaching practices ("...helped me to have more of a natural language and strategy to support these skills…"). Pathway reaffirmed that what she was already doing was in the right direction, helping her to more effectively support multilingual students.

Similar to using PD to build confidence in novice teachers, confidence can also be built in more established teachers. Josephina, for example, feels that Pathway made her more confident as a teacher. She describes herself as a teacher before and after Pathway, saying, "I guess, before, I was scared to go outside the box of what I was supposed to be doing, but after the Pathway Project, I was like, 'Forget this! I'm doing what's best for my students.'"

Pathway reaffirmed Josephina's commitment to her students ("I'm doing what's best for my students."), something that is particularly important for her teaching given the attitudes of her new school (example 8). Through this confidence, Josephina now is unafraid to push against the status quo and teach the way she thinks is correct - and has had reaffirmed through Pathway. This type of teacher agency is exactly what the PD facilitators want to promote in teachers, as discussed in a previous section. Pathway hopes to give teachers the tools and ability to feel comfortable enough to adjust their teaching to fit the needs of their multilingual students, fostering teacher agency and the capacity to be leaders in their school.

Some of these teachers have had negative experiences where their experience, or lack of experience, has impacted the effectiveness of the PD. Starting with novice teachers, such as Megan, they can feel unheard during PD meetings. Megan's school has professional learning communities (PLCs), which as a PD program fit the criteria for high-quality PD (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Grossman et al., 2001). Unfortunately, her school has taken this time for professional learning and turned these meetings into more of a compliance activity required by the school to complete certain administration-chosen tasks. As a result, Megan sees PLCs only as "gossip fests" where her need for support as a new teacher are not being met. She talks about her frustrations with the unproductive PLC meetings, "Because it wasn't happening in those meetings. That meant I had to do it on my own outside of…school and so that was really, like, it really wore me out and brought me to tears a lot…Those teachers could afford to not use that time productively because they're experienced." Megan's ire is evident ("... it really wore me out and brought me to tears a lot…") because while the more experienced teachers had time to talk and not work on curriculum development ("Those teachers could afford to not use that time productively

because they're experienced."), Megan wanted to use that time to collaborate. If Megan had been able to collaborate with teachers who also wanted to work on curriculum development, whether with other novice teachers or with a mentor teacher for guidance, her needs as a new teacher would have been met. Additionally, if her school's PLCs had been more structured to meet the needs of both novice teachers and experienced ones, as Pathway was, Megan may have been able to benefit from her school's attempt at providing time for teacher learning.

On the other end of the spectrum, veteran teachers sometimes feel that they are being exploited when it comes to PD at the expense of furthering their development as teachers. Both Jaycee and Ashley have had instances where they were expected to attend PD meetings and, being veteran teachers, come back and teach the practices gained from PD. This work also includes explaining to other teachers Pathway's practices. Jaycee discusses her frustration with her district expecting her to reteach everything she gained from Pathway:

Example 22

01 But I really, the idea is that so we're experts now, and now we teach our
02 colleagues. That's where the district drops the ball every time. It's like, it takes
03 organization, and logistics, and people taking it up as a cause, and making it
04 important.

Jaycee sees this kind of role that district places on veteran teachers, such as her, as not a true solution to providing PD ("That's where the district drops the ball every time," line 2). Given her years as a teacher, she realizes that true PD takes "organization and logistics" (line 3), in other words, not sending a few teachers to PD and then giving them the responsibility to communicate the same ideas in a watered-down version to the rest of their colleagues. While Pathway was appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of participating teachers, the

district undermines those efforts in several ways. First, by not giving all teachers the opportunity to fully engage with a PD program that has been designed to be relevant, collaborative, and reflective over time. Jaycee knows this, saying that good PD "takes organization and logistics, and people taking it up as a cause and making it important" (lines 2-4). Instead, teachers like Jaycee have to deliver a two-year program in a watered-down one-shot summary or workshop. Second, the district assumes that veteran teachers are "experts" who can teach their colleagues (line 1), but not necessarily be given the time to work out their own ideas during or after PD. As a result, high-quality PD is turned into an ineffective workshop that deprives the veteran teachers time to experiment and reflect on what they learned from PD, and non-participant teachers opportunities to participate in high-quality PD.

Ashley, also a veteran teacher, feels the same way, voicing how her district uses PD, "'OK, English teachers, you teach the science teachers how to do it,' because that's awkward and no one wants to do that." The main issue here is that relying on veteran or established teachers to teach their colleagues is not true collaboration. Ashley calls it "awkward" for her as the presenter, but also that "no one wants to do that," implying that this type of PD is both ineffective and unfair to all teachers involved. Collaborative PD, as discussed in the previous section, is when teachers can establish working relationships to collectively solve and brainstorm teaching practices to use in the classroom. Jaycee and Ashley instead would benefit from PD where they can work on their own teaching over time alongside colleagues, not having to worry about how to distill the information down to fit into a quick meeting or presentation to their colleagues. For teachers in this study, it appears that their schools and districts have yet to realize this.

In sum, since these teachers are seeking out their own opportunities for PD, such as Pathway, they have their own ideas of what effective PD looks like. Characteristics include two aspects of Pathway that appeal to these teachers that they do not get from their schools and/or district. First, teachers benefit from PD that is collaborative because it helps them feel respected as professionals, giving them opportunities to use their teaching expertise as resources for brainstorming and problem-solving together (example 19). However, beyond Pathway, not all teachers have had opportunities to collaborate, such as Josephina whose school has a negative perception of PD (example 20).

Additionally, teachers in this study benefit from PD that is designed to meet their needs at whatever stage in their teaching career they find themselves. For novice teachers, Pathway was able to provide the teachers with teaching practices and materials to help them feel more confident in the classroom when teaching their multilingual students (example 21). PD that helps novice teachers feel confident in the classroom is important, but likewise helps ensure that all students receive high-quality teaching derived from the teachers' PD experiences. For more experienced teachers, they benefit from PD that helps remind or reaffirm for them what good teaching practices they can use in the classroom. This benefit is especially important with the new EL-centered teaching practices that the State is finally recognizing as effective compared to with the previous 1999 ELD Standards. However, exploiting the expertise of more veteran teachers to teach their colleagues a watered-down version of PD is not effective, as shown by Jaycee and Ashley's experiences (example 22). Instead, all teachers need equal opportunities to have time to collaborate and work through good teaching practices, collectively working together to meet the needs of all educators at all stages in their teaching careers.

D. Conclusion

In this chapter, the findings of this study were discussed across three main areas, resulting in eleven themes. The three main areas included (1) the perception of teachers feeling supported or not by their schools and/or districts to effectively teach their EL students; (2) the various ways teachers, PD facilitators, and California educational documents and policies talk about using language and literacy practices to support the language development of multilingual students; and (3) different ways in which teachers talk about how PD helps them to expand their EL-centered teaching practices. The findings across these three areas suggest the intersection of PD and EL education is complex. Clearly, teachers in this study do not feel sufficiently supported by their schools and/or districts to give them the proper training to effectively teach multilingual students. The lack of communication, unclear supporting roles of school administrators and district officials, lack of teacher input, and differing priorities between teachers and school and district officials regarding ELs work collectively to make teachers feel disempowered. This perceived lack of support results in inconsistencies in curriculum and teaching practices for ELs, despite what the State calls for in the EL Roadmap.

Furthermore, the teachers in this study have benefited from their involvement with Pathway. Their discussions of the many teaching practices that they rely on to support their multilingual students demonstrates a deliberate effort on their part to effectively teach ELs. In fact, many of the teaching practices that they discuss are in direct alignment with the research behind the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap. The language of the cognitive strategies that Pathway gives the teachers helps them to access the prior knowledge and cultural and linguistic assets that students bring into the classroom, create meaningful

interactions for students, encourage English language development through content, and scaffold their teaching. What cannot be ignored, however, is the lack of knowledge and familiarity that the teachers have regarding the CA ELD Standards and especially the EL Roadmap. This gap in teacher knowledge cannot be placed on the shoulders of Pathway, however. Pathway works to promote teacher agency through their teaching and with students, countering the diminishing agency they feel because of their school administrators and district officials. Making sure teachers understand how their teaching is impacted by state policy and documents is not the job of outside PD programs and since schools and districts are not doing it either, teachers do what they can to support their own professional learning.

Lastly, since these teachers are seeking out their own opportunities for PD, such as Pathway, they have their own ideas of what effective PD looks like. All the teachers speak highly of Pathway as a PD program, indicating that Pathway is doing something right for these teachers. Evidence is likewise demonstrated by the many teaching practices that the teachers report using to support their multilingual students. The impact of Pathway on these teachers reveals the importance of providing teachers time to collaborate and demonstrate their expertise as educators during PD. Respecting teachers' knowledge and experiences also rebuilds that agency they feel is lacking when it comes to their relationship with school administrators and district officials. Also important is the need to provide PD that can meet the needs of educators at different stages in their teaching careers. Giving teachers genuine opportunities to engage in high-quality PD that meets their needs fosters confidence in them, again, building up that agency to feel comfortable and confident enough to adjust their teaching practices to fit the needs of their students. Also significant is that this confidence helps teachers to challenge the status quo, doing what they feel is right as teachers for their

students. In the next, and final, chapter of this dissertation, I will offer a discussion of the ideas that have emerged as a result of this qualitative study, as well as address the implications for EL teaching practices, PD, and state policies. I also offer recommendations for further research in this area of study.

Chapter V. Summary and Discussion

This study was conducted to explore the influence and role high-quality PD has on teachers of ELs in times of policy change in California. The final chapter of the dissertation restates the research questions and reviews the methods used in the study. The major sections of this chapter first summarize results and then discuss their implications.

A. Statement of the Problem

The general question this study attempted to answer was, "In what ways, if any, does an ongoing PD program and the State of California influence teacher practices and beliefs to provide equitable and rigorous education for multilingual students?" That larger question subsumes several related questions:

1. What ideologies do inservice junior high and high school ELA teachers hold regarding…
    a. Teaching multilingual students?
    b. Receiving support to teach multilingual students?
2. What, if any, similarities or differences in teaching multilingual students exist between teachers and other stakeholders in EL education, including…
    a. A high-quality PD program, the Pathway Project?
    b. The State of California, via two state documents, the CA ELD Standards and the CA EL Roadmap?
3. In what ways, if any, does an ongoing PD program and the State of California influence teacher practices and beliefs to provide equitable and rigorous education for multilingual students?

B. Review of the Methodology

As explained in chapter 3, the research was a combination of CDA and ethnographic methodology of the influence and role high-quality PD has on teachers of ELs in times of policy change in California. This research used a qualitative perspective to examine the ideologies and influences surrounding teacher support to teach multilingual students.

This study relied on ethnographic interviews and observation data. The researcher interviewed six teachers and two PD facilitators, as well as observed three PD meetings. After transcribing the oral discourses using ExpressScribe, a transcription software, each discourse was analyzed according to Fairclough's three-dimensional framework (1995). For this dissertation, this framework was applied to each discourse, working to interpret each text through textual analysis that focused on finding evidence of assumptions and intertextuality in the participants' discourses. Next, each discourse was described in the context of receiving support and teaching ELs, then open-coding was done to create categories and identify key concepts, to finally interpret how each of these discourses interact with one another given California's shifting views and change in policy regarding EL education.

C. Summary of the Results

During this study, it became evident that these teachers do not feeling supported by their schools and districts to become stronger teachers for ELs. This lack of support is due to several reasons:

- There was a lack of communication between districts, schools, and teachers when it came to communicating changes or decisions being made that impact teachers. The consensus of the lack of communication the teachers had between their administrators and district was in contrast to the EL Roadmap that called for school leaders to be responsive to the needs of ELs, but also did not explicitly mention the importance that

clear communication plays in addressing those needs through regular communication with teachers about curricular decisions and changes that may impact their teaching.

- Teachers had an unclear or even apathetic perception of how their schools or districts were supporting them to teach their multilingual students. While the EL Roadmap talked about the need for educators and school leaders to be knowledgeable enough to support EL learning, it is evident that these groups were not working together to collectively develop strong EL programs and curriculum to create a unified vision for EL education in their school.
- There was a lack of teacher input when it came to decisions made by the school or district concerning emerging bilinguals. A lack of input was visible in weak curriculum or poor course planning made by administrators or district officials in the name of creating consistency across schools, but without talking to teachers about the validity of these decisions. This lack of teacher input made visible an area of tension in the EL Roadmap. On the one hand, the desire to create consistency across schools aligned with the EL Roadmap's vision for a consistent EL educational experience; however, the EL Roadmap also called for differentiation and an awareness of the needs and strengths of ELs.
- Teachers had different priorities when it came to ELs compared to the priorities of schools or districts. Many of the teachers felt that technology had become a bigger priority than literacy and language learning. One teacher was at a school concerned with pushing out EL students. These misaligned priorities contrasted to how the State talked about EL education, where schools need to supporting teacher growth, effective pedagogy, and create a positive educational system.

Additionally, the participating teachers were aware of and used various teaching practices to help their multilingual students develop their English language proficiency. As such, they were oftentimes in alignment with the CA ELD Standards and EL Roadmap that stressed the use of specialized skills and knowledge needed to support emerging bilinguals. Several examples of these teaching practices included:

- Utilizing students' prior knowledge and cultural and linguistic assets to make connections to new knowledge. The teachers talked about valuing what students bring into the classroom and the different ways that Pathway showed them to make this happen regularly in their classrooms. However, not all the teachers were able to incorporate opportunities for students to use their home language in the classroom, particularly with the less experienced teachers who felt unprepared to do that in their classrooms. As such, while all teachers spoke of wanting to use students' varied assets in the classroom, not all were doing that, which created inconsistencies in how the EL Roadmap was being followed.
- Providing students with chances to interact in meaningful ways. These types of interactions were consistent with the type of learning that was discussed in the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap. The teachers associated meaningful interactions with fostering inclusive learning environments. Again, novice teachers struggled with making their lessons interactive enough. As such, another inconsistency was revealed in how the EL Roadmap was being implemented, particularly with novice teachers.
- Integrating English language development through content. Again, this was consistent with the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap that talked about multilingual

students developing academic English in different contexts and content areas. Because of Pathway, the teachers had a variety of teaching practices to do this. They also spoke about feeling uncomfortable teaching vocabulary and grammar in isolation. Unfortunately, teachers who have not had the benefit of participating in Pathway or other high-quality PD that supports teachers of ELs may not understand the benefits of integrating ELD into content, or may understand it, but not be sure how to do it. The need for support was particularly important given that this view on language learning is perhaps one of the biggest paradigm shifts between the 1999 ELD Standards and the current ones.

- Supporting emerging bilinguals in their learning through scaffolding and differentiation. Both the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap talked about providing students with supports to be able to participate in rigorous and complex material and texts. All the teachers discussed different cognitive strategies that they took from Pathway to support ELs. The biggest concern was not having the time or support to differentiate for their students at the individual level. The problem was that with the adoption of the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap, teachers were not suddenly able to have time to support the needs of all students all the time, even when given the tools for it from high-quality PD.
- Lastly, there was a clear lack of teacher familiarity with state policies and documents regarding EL education. This lack of knowledge was understandable given the recent implementation of the ELPAC and that school and district officials were still working to understand it themselves. Some of these teachers did not have the support to unpack these state documents, leaving them with many unanswered questions about

reclassification. Given that reading and unpacking the CA ELD Standards and EL Roadmap were not the focus of Pathway, it makes sense that the teaches in this study had the tools to support and teach multilingual students, but not the understanding of how their practices align (or not) with state policies.

Since these teachers were seeking out their own opportunities for PD, such as Pathway, they had their own ideas of what effective PD looked like. Pathway appealed to two main characteristics that these teachers were not getting from their schools and/or districts:

- Teachers benefited from PD that was collaborative, allowing them to build working relationships with one another. Collaborative PD helped them feel respected as professionals and gave them opportunities to use their teaching expertise as resources for brainstorming and problem-solving together. However, beyond Pathway, not all teachers have opportunities to collaborate at their school or district PD.
- The teachers in this study also benefited from PD that was designed to meet their needs at whatever stage in their teaching career they found themselves. For novice teachers, Pathway provided the teachers with teaching practices and materials to help them feel more confident in the classroom when teaching multilingual students. PD that helped the novice teachers feel confident in the classroom was important, but likewise ensured that students were receiving high-quality teaching derived from the teachers' PD experiences. More experienced teachers benefited from PD that reminded or reaffirmed for them what good teaching practices they can use in the classroom. However, veteran teachers had experiences of being deemed expert teachers by their schools and districts and thus expected to teach their colleagues a

watered-down version of PD that they found ineffective and unfair to their own professional learning.

D. Discussion of the Results

Based on this study alone, it is difficult to make assumptions about the support that all teachers are or are not receiving from their school administrators and/or district officials to effectively teach multilingual students. However, many indications emerged from the interviews with the teachers that suggested that what is being done policy-wise is meant to give back multilingual students' agency in the classroom as active and engaged learners; at the same time, deliberate decisions need to be made by schools and districts to give teachers that same agency to effectively enact California's vision for consistent and rigorous EL education.

1. Relationship of the current study to prior research.

Previous studies (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Desimone, 2009) acknowledge PD as an important part for enacting policy changes and improving student achievement. The present study yielded a similar result in terms of teachers adapting their teaching towards the CA ELD Standards. Through their participation in Pathway, the teachers in this study gained the necessary knowledge and skills needed to effectively support and teach ELs. Teachers talked about the cognitive strategies that were discussed during Pathway meetings and how they utilized them in different ways. For example, this included using these strategies to scaffold and differentiate for students, access prior knowledge, and integrate English language development into content matter teaching, all of which align with the type of teaching discussed in the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap. Pathway was not focused on explicitly teaching to the CA ELD Standards, but it is

demonstrative of how a high-quality PD program rooted in strong research and theory that aligns with the frameworks followed by state standards can support policy changes and student achievement. The value of PD to these teachers' classroom practices is evident in how Pathway supported their EL-centered teaching, something their districts and schools did not do for them.

Additionally, the teachers in this study discussed PD in ways that were consistent with prior research (Collinson, 2012; Pedder et al., 2005). These teachers all sought out PD on a regular basis. They saw PD as opportunities for them to grow as professionals. Several of them mentioned asking their principals to attend conferences or other forms of PD to help expand their teaching practices. Each of the teachers also wanted PD that was related to their specific classroom experiences, including content matter PD and PD related to EL-teaching practices and pedagogy. This finding is also consistent with past studies into high-quality PD that found PD should be relevant to teachers' experiences in the classroom (Justi & Van Driel, 2005) and expand their pedagogical content knowledge (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone et al., 2002; Jeanpierre, Oberhauser, & Freeman, 2005; Ingvarson et al., 2005; Phelps & Schilling, 2004; Saxe, Gearhart, & Nasir, 2001). Being able to apply Pathway's content to their teaching, sometimes even the day after a meeting, proved to be one of most beneficial aspects of Pathway. The teachers were able to take what they learned from Pathway and fit it into their lesson plans, with experienced teachers adapting the activities to fit their needs and novice teachers being able to add these lessons to their teaching repertoire. Pathway appealed to teachers at different points in their teaching career, consistent with Ashdown and Hummel-Rossi's (2005) study that demonstrated the benefit of PD programs that are differentiated to meet teachers' needs at different phases of their

careers. Having the opportunity to work with teachers at different levels during Pathway supported all participants as they collectively worked together to support one another's teaching.

The collaborative aspect of Pathway is likewise demonstrative of past research (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Desimone et al., 2002; Sahin & Yildirim, 2016) that has shown that effective PD should also include opportunities for teachers to participate in active learning with their colleagues. Being able to engage in discussions with other teachers to brainstorm, ask questions, and solve issues helped the teachers in this study to form a network of colleagues to turn to when they needed support. Collaboration also helped them to feel confident in their abilities as teachers to have the knowledge and ability to contribute to the conversations that took place during meetings. This finding is also consistent with past research that has repeatedly shown that PD is most successful when teachers have regular opportunities to meet and discuss their perspectives and questions (Ball, 1996; Collinson, 2012; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Guskey, 1986; Jenlink & Kinnucan-Welsch, 2001; Shulman & Shulman, 2004; Stewart, 2014). Pathway gave the teachers time to reflect on students' work, talk about their teaching practices, and share their observations. These activities were what the teachers in this study found beneficial; these were also activities the teachers were not given time to do from their schools or districts. The little collaboration time they did have was to meet in their PLCs; however, time dedicated towards their PLCs was co-opted by the administration, was too short, and left little time for true reflection. In fact, Franke, Carpenter, and Levi's (2001) study of an ongoing PD program revealed that PD that was both collaborative and relevant to the teacher's classroom experiences was more likely to change the teacher's classroom practices

in the long run; this result was likewise seen in this study. Pathway teachers gained relevant teaching practices to help support and teach their ELs through active learning that made time for collaboration amongst the teachers and the facilitators.

Finally, previous studies have shown that the culture of the school greatly affects teacher participation in PD, including access, support, and encouragement to participate (Heck et al., 2001; Opfer & Pedder, 2011; Opfer et al., 2011). The present study showed the effects of creating a culture of collaboration and professional learning on teachers. This finding was particularly evident with one teacher whose school made PD optional and as a result, the teacher found herself to be the only teacher who wanted to collaborate. However, the collaborative culture of Pathway helped her, along with the other teachers in this study, embody similar attitudes and talk about the benefits of having time to work and talk with other teachers. Related to the idea of school culture is the idea of principal support for effective teaching, as discussed in Heck et al.'s (2001) study. Several of the teachers in this study expressed the desire for their administrators to support their participation in Pathway. The teachers had unclear perceptions of the ways the district or school supported their teaching, making them feel uncared for and sometimes apathetic, demonstrating the effect the attitudes and beliefs school leaders can have on teacher change.

Likewise related to school culture is providing PD opportunities that are ongoing and sustained for longer than one workshop (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Supovitz & Turner, 2001). Pathway is a two-year program that provides teachers with both full day and after school meetings. The significant amount of time for professional learning gave the teachers in this study regular opportunities to collaboratively work on their teaching over time. This consistency gave the teachers time to truly work on

their craft while also creating time for teacher buy-in to organically happen regarding the effectiveness of the Pathway's teaching practices and pedagogy (i.e., the cognitive strategies). Pathway also provides continued support and follow-up after the PD program has ended, consistent with a characteristic of high-quality PD (Guskey, 1986). These continued opportunities to meet and talk likewise embody the culture of ongoing collaboration and support that these teachers craved, particularly given the absence of this type of support they were receiving from their schools and districts.

In sum, through their participation in Pathway, the teachers had the time, support, and collective teacher knowledge that past research has shown is important in creating changes in the teaching practices and ideologies of educators. When teachers are provided with high-quality PD that is related to teachers' classroom experiences, collaborative, and ongoing, they can change their teaching practices to become more effective teachers that support student achievement. Providing this type of professional learning is particularly vital when it comes to enacting changes in policy, such as is the context of the present study and the recent evolution in how California educates multilingual students.

2. Theoretical implications of the study.

Vygotsky's (1978) theory of sociocultural learning calls attention to the connections between people and the sociocultural context in which they interact in collaborative experiences and lifelong learning. For teacher learning, these connections include looking at the interactions between teachers, their colleagues, school leaders, PD facilitators, school culture, and even students (Borko, 2004; Jeanpierre et al., 2005). The teachers in this study were repeatedly impacted by the sociocultural context in which their teaching and professional learning took place. This impact was evident, first, in the professional learning

that took place at Pathway. As discussed before, the collaborative culture of Pathway helped support the teachers to expand their EL-centered teaching practices. The teachers' feelings of support and the professional learning that occurred at Pathway emerged from their interactions with the PD facilitators and their fellow participants. Thus, a collective culture of learning, reflection, and inquiry was established at Pathway. This type of professional learning demonstrates the connection between people, learning, and interactions to make clear how Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural learning framework can be successfully applied to teacher learning.

Another aspect of sociocultural theory as it applies to teacher learning is the history of a school and educational policies, and the past experiences and understandings of the teachers that can affect learning (Ball, 1996; Jurasaite-Harbison & Rex, 2010). In the context of this study, the teachers were most often negatively affected by their school and district's perception of support. All the teachers in this study expressed a lack of clarity in understanding how their school or district was supporting their ability to gain the specialized skills or knowledge needed to teach multilingual students. This view played out in feelings of apathy for a veteran teacher who feels unheard and doubts that anything will improve. This view also played out in one teacher feeling uninvested in because none of her administrators or district officials were able to help her understand EL policy and curriculum. This view likewise played out in another teacher feeling frustrated because her school would not send her to PD that applied to her classroom content and experiences, but instead PD related to the newest trend in technology. Finally, this view played out in one teacher feeling alone in her efforts to support multilingual students because her school wanted to push out the EL students accused of bringing down their testing scores. These larger forces that surround the

teachers at their schools and districts work to lessen their agency in the classroom. Teachers feel powerless and disconnected from decisions that directly impact classroom teaching and students made by district officials and school administrators. In turn, a school culture is created that devalues the experience and knowledge teachers bring towards these matters.

This type of negative environment works in the opposite manner of Pathway. Pathway placed teachers alongside PD facilitators to collectively problematize and reflect on teaching, using teachers' knowledge and experiences as resources for learning and problem-solving. As a result, a culture emerged from Pathway that helped teachers feel valued and respected as professionals who have control over their curriculum and classrooms. While Pathway built up the teachers' confidence and agency, their schools and districts appeared to do the opposite. Pathway's design demonstrates Vygotsky's (1978) theory on sociocultural learning in teacher learning, revealing how a lack of meaningful interactions can impede teacher learning and development.

Ultimately, the different environments and interactions the teachers found themselves in are demonstrative of the role that sociocultural learning plays in teacher learning and PD. Pathway demonstrates the positive role of sociocultural learning, providing the teachers with supportive and reflective interactions and cultures; conversely, the schools and districts in this study were indicative of a lack of sociocultural learning that provided little to no opportunities for relevant support or meaningful interactions. Creating opportunities for sociocultural learning to occur, therefore, should be taken into consideration when discussing the content of PD programs for teachers.

3. Implications for multilingual students and their teachers.

It is clear from this study that some schools and districts are not sufficiently working with teachers to ensure that ELs are receiving effective and consistent education. This lack of connection between teachers and their administrators/district officials diminishes teacher efficacy. As a result, districts and schools become power structures that limit teacher agency. While teachers may be able to control day-to-day decisions surrounding classroom management, grading, and lesson planning, they are being consistently left out of higher-level decisions that impact their ability to effectively teach emerging bilinguals. For instance, teachers in this study were left out of many decisions concerning EL-courses and students. These included decisions about choosing ELD curriculum that teachers find most effective, not only as a curriculum that is engaging and rigorous, but also as one that serves the needs of students at their school. While districts may want to create alignment across the schools in a district, it should not be done purely for the sake of consistency. Decisions should center around benefitting the needs of a school's student population and teachers are one of the best resources for understanding those needs. The logical choice would be for districts to actively work with schools and teachers to collectively make curricular decisions that impact vulnerable students. And yet this is clearly not being done based on these teachers' perceptions. Committee work at the district level that involves a small handful of teachers seems a poor solution when so many other teachers feel left out and unheard. A more deliberate effort needs to be made to represent the voices of teachers and even out the relationship between different levels of the educational system.

With teachers being left out of district-wide decision-making, it is unsurprising that the priorities of teachers, school administrators, and district officials are also at odds. This misalignment plays out in the kind of support that teachers receive to expand their teaching

practices. Unfortunately, the priorities of districts often lean towards the newest buzz word or trend that bring in money and recognition, such as STEM or technology. Teachers in this study felt that was happening at their schools and district with too many district PD sessions focusing on technology and little else that was relevant to their interests. As a result, students who do not easily fit into these trends, who are unfairly deemed unproficient, or deemed incapable are left behind. Too often, ELs are the ones who are forgotten, as well as their teachers.

Just as marginalized students are left behind, their teachers are also marginalized by the power structures surrounding them. Teachers who want to expand their teaching practices in ways that directly impact their everyday classroom practices are left to fend for themselves. This imbalance against marginalized students and their teachers persists even now, despite changes in EL-education taken by the State. Even though California has completely shifted its approach to teaching multilingual students, schools and districts are not taking the necessary steps to ensure that teachers are getting the support needed to gain the specialized skills and knowledge required to move ELs out of their position as marginalized students. While some more experienced teachers may independently be able to find resources to grow, not all teachers can make this happen. This imbalance is where inconsistencies occur in the quality of teaching that ELs receive. As structures of power within an educational system, it is the job of schools and districts to ensure that all teachers have the tools to be successful, particularly in times of policy change. That support to teach well is what ensures multilingual students receive the education that the State promises them. However, this cannot happen if teachers are being left out of the conversation about what topics they want their PD to cover.

These differing priorities and lack of input from teachers also play out in other decisions that affect ELs negatively. Course planning, for example, reveals what a district values. When the scheduling of ELD courses is not a priority, ELs get treated as an afterthought. The needs of multilingual students are neglected and ELD classes get scheduled after the needs of other students are first met. This type of scheduling creates an imbalance in how students are valued and perceived by districts and schools. As is the case in this study, ELD classes get plugged in where they can fit, not taking note of the cognitive fatigue that these students are under by seventh period as they work to develop their English proficiency. Placing an ELD course at the end of the day or making ELs take two to three English classes a day does not take into consideration the needs of ELs; if anything, it completely disregards their needs. Again, this perpetuates the marginalization of these students, reducing their agency to be successful. Additionally, the marginalization of particular teachers of particular students also occurs, not providing teachers of ELs with the same voice as other teachers who have historically been more valued or prioritized by schools and districts. As a result, this collectively creates an EL-educational experience that is weak, inconsistent, and imbalanced.

The implications for multilingual students focus on reworking power structures in education to rebuild teacher agency. As structures of power, schools and districts need to invest in building strong relationships and communication with teachers to create a stronger balance between different levels of the educational system. Teachers need to feel invested in and heard by districts and schools. Efforts need to be made to ask for teachers' input on curricular and course planning decisions to best serve the needs of their EL students. Also an important part of this is asking and providing teachers with the kind of PD they need to grow as educators. When schools and districts invest in promoting teacher agency through

inclusion in large-scale decisions that impact their teaching, teachers feel that they are professionals whose opinions and experiences in the classroom matter. This investment is a clear and deliberate way to value teachers by helping them to do their jobs well.

This type of investment also creates a stronger relationship between different levels of the educational system that more equally depend AND support one another. Districts support teachers through relevant PD, while teachers depend on districts to help them grow as educators; likewise, districts depend on teachers to help them support students on the road towards academic success. Investing and listening to teachers can realign the power structures in an educational system to collectively work together to serve the needs of multilingual students. In turn, this impacts the educational experience that multilingual students receive from a district, their schools, and their teachers. This trickle-down effect is important and cannot be ignored as strengthening teacher agency is a central component in enacting the State's vision for consistent and effective EL education across California.

a. Recommendations for practice.

Although one group of teachers cannot provide a sound basis for unpacking the relationship between districts, schools, teachers, and ELs across California, this study would suggest that there needs to be a more concerted effort to maintain strong relationships between these stakeholders in EL education. As shown in this dissertation is an imbalance between different levels of the educational system, with districts and schools acting as power structures that limit teacher agency. In turn, a weakened EL-educational experience is the result. Instead, the main goal in these relationships should be to promote teacher agency to help teachers feel respected, invested in, and confident. Rebuilding this agency includes addressing two main areas in the relationship between districts, schools, and teachers.

First, districts need to create opportunities for teachers to provide input on large decisions that impact their teaching. This input goes beyond asking teachers for their opinions on textbooks; teachers need to be heard when it comes to sweeping changes made that affect curriculum, instruction, and course planning. Logistically, this is not an easy task, but that does not mean it cannot be done by district and school officials to ensure that their teachers are being heard. Positions like an EL TOSA are a good start; these positions enable classroom teachers to become specialists, focusing on the needs of ELs and their teachers, while remaining engaged with the district and other teachers. Opportunities like this position should be encouraged and expanded to give many teachers more opportunities to work across schools in a district, both collaborating and helping one another. However, this type of position is only a start and can be complicated by the politics or budget of a district. Thus, it is up to districts and schools to ensure there are multiple avenues for teachers to be heard and involved in higher-level decisions that impact their teaching to prevent the marginalization of particular students and particular teachers.

Because teachers are the ones who follow the curriculum, provide the instruction, and teach the courses, it is important to hear from them about what is working and what needs to be fixed – especially for multilingual students. Teacher input should be taken into serious consideration before districts make changes based on their own assumptions or priorities. This consideration is especially important for teachers of particular populations, such as ELs. Not only are multilingual students consistently marginalized in schools, but their teachers can likewise become marginalized when they are ignored and underserved to do their jobs well. When the needs of ELs and the needs of their teachers are neglected, a disservice is done to emerging bilinguals and the teachers who are trying to serve them. Multilingual students

need to be advocated for and if their teachers are not being heard - the ones who interact with them five days a week - then students' needs are not necessarily being addressed by the district, let alone the State. Thus, districts need to make a deliberate effort to hear what teachers of ELs need to do their job well through regular and open communication that more evenly distributes the power between districts, schools, and teachers.

Second, and related to the above recommendation, is the need for districts and schools to provide teachers with the tools they need to be successful. In other words, not just listening to what teachers need, but also providing them with those tools - investing in them. Investment includes providing the necessary PD needed for teachers to gain the specialized skills and knowledge to effectively support and teach emerging bilinguals (Heritage, 2015; Santos et al., 2012; Walqui et al., 2010). Inservice teachers need to continue to grow as educators. This growth promotes teacher agency, giving teachers the tools they need and want that are relevant to their students and classrooms. Teachers also need to stay up to date on the latest teaching practices, particularly in a time where California's EL education has undergone a significant paradigm shift. As such, it becomes the job of districts and schools to not only fixate on the latest trend in education, but also to address the needs of those who are often left behind, like ELs. While school administrators may want to send their teachers to PD to learn about the next big thing in education, the teachers themselves may want support in an entirely different area. Acknowledging this need is particularly important in this context, where teachers in all content areas, including science and math, are expected to utilize the CA ELD Standards in their everyday teaching and may need support in this endeavor. The teachers in this study wanted PD to help them support and teach their multilingual students. Having no viable options within the district, they had to seek out their

own PD, Pathway. While that is commendable on the part of the teachers, it is not ideal. Districts and schools cannot depend on outside PD programs to do this work for them. Ignoring this work abdicates the role of districts and schools in the educational system as supporting teachers and teacher agency. By not promoting teacher agency, they instead act as limiting forces and thus, diminish teacher efficacy in the classroom. Districts and schools must do the work to serve the needs of their teachers who, in turn, serve the needs of multilingual students.

4. Implications for professional development.

Related to the previously discussed implications for ELs, is a visible need for teachers to regularly engage in high-quality PD. Effective PD programs help teachers grow as educators by providing them with the necessary time to develop the tools that can expand their teaching practice and pedagogy, including EL-centered practice and pedagogy. Thus, it is logical that for teachers to regain agency in their teaching, they need to engage in particular types of PD that provide them with the tools and knowledge to feel confident in the classroom.

There were clear indications of the important role that collaborative PD plays in building teacher agency. Specifically, collaboration that allows teachers the time to build relationships between one another and explore common goals and questions. Wenger's (1998) concept of "communities of practice" can serve as a suitable model for the type of collaboration that teachers can benefit from, where groups of people with a common concern or interest for something they do learn how to do it better through regular interaction (see also Lave & Wenger, 1990). This type of sociocultural-based learning becomes a source of power for teachers by giving them opportunities to amass, utilize, and leverage their

collective knowledge. Workshops offered by guest speakers may have their place in bringing outside resources to teachers when needed; however, those types of PD disregard the communities of practice that teachers benefit from, as well as the expertise that inservice teachers bring with them. As discussed in a previous section, sociocultural PD opportunities where teachers can work together to talk, unpack, and brainstorm solutions helps educators in a myriad of ways, just as Pathway did for these teachers. First, teachers can draw upon the collective expertise of their colleagues to help them grow as educators. Their experiences in the classroom are resources for teacher learning, just as students' prior knowledge and experiences are resources for classroom learning. This type of collaboration is particularly helpful for addressing the needs of teachers at different places in their careers. Teachers in this study had different needs depending on their teaching experience. Novice teachers, for instance, needed help adding to their teaching repertoire to build their confidence. Collaboration can give them those resources. More experienced teachers needed their teaching practices reaffirmed and refined, helping them to not remain stagnant as educators and keeping them up to date with new teaching practices and pedagogies. Collaboration can provide that reaffirmation. The collective knowledge of teachers acts as a resource for them to draw upon, reflecting and refining their teaching across grade levels, departments, and subjects. These communities of practice build teacher confidence to help teachers feel supported by one another, creating a network that they can draw upon to support and strengthen their teaching collectively.

Second, providing time for teachers to work together helps build collegiality. Collegiality creates a culture of collaboration that values PD and empowers teachers. This culture was something absent for one teacher and thoroughly affected her ability to work

with her colleagues, even getting her in "trouble" once. A teacher should not be punished for wanting to collaborate; rather, the school administration should be working towards encouraging teacher collaboration to promote teacher agency. Furthermore, collaboration helps promote consistency and alignment across classrooms within a school. As discussed in the previous section, teachers, schools, and districts need to have similar priorities when it comes to student achievement. By making time for regular collaboration, teachers can focus on issues that are relevant to their classrooms and students in their communities of practice. In turn, teachers do not have to solely be made to focus only on topics decided upon by district officials with their own priorities, or even on random topics presented by outside speakers who have no understanding of the school's culture or student population. Ongoing collaboration enables teachers' voices to be heard, in addition to the voices of administrators and district officials. Regular and collaborative PD reorganizes the power structure of a school to give more of a priority to the voices and needs of teachers. A school culture that leverages and values teacher knowledge creates a stronger sense of collegiality within schools and districts. This type of collegiality also illustrates the type of sociocultural learning that schools ask of their students, providing strong learning models for students to emulate. Thus, regular and ongoing collaboration that allows for sociocultural learning amongst teachers benefits schools and districts by giving more agency for teachers to become stronger educators.

Finally, acknowledging the resources that teachers bring into professional learning environments treats them as the professionals that they are. Teaching is a peculiar career in that sense; everyone has been in a classroom and has experienced many teachers from kindergarten through grade twelve. As a result, people who are not educators think they have

some idea of how to teach and what teachers should (or should not) be doing. This type of attitude, coupled with teachers feeling unheard and unsupported by their administrators and district officials, only succeeds in diminishing teacher agency. Thus, PD that provides opportunities for teachers to work together and build communities of practice helps them feel invested in by their colleagues, their school administration, and their district officials - the same idea discussed in the previous section. This investment helps teachers feel as if their school and district cares about what is happening in their classrooms as they collectively work together to build a professional community of educators. As a collective voice, the teachers' needs and ideas become a priority and thus, elevated from the marginalized position of being unheard and unsupported. Unfortunately, this was absent in the experiences of the teachers in this study who felt limited by the power structures of their schools and districts and had to find their own PD opportunities.

a. Recommendations for practice.

This study is only indicative of how two school districts structure their support for teachers to expand their teaching practices. However, the findings from this study would suggest that schools and districts need to regularly incorporate opportunities for collaborative PD amongst teachers. The main goal in offering regular and collaborative PD for teachers should be to promote teacher agency to help them feel respected, invested in, and confident as educators - particularly as professionals who regularly engage in communities of practice to improve their teaching to benefit their students. These implications align with the same implications for multilingual student achievement. As such, rebuilding this agency includes addressing two main areas in teacher professional learning.

The first area is clear: schools and districts need to create school schedules that consistently provide times for collaborative PD. This goes beyond a once a month half-day; a once a month PD meeting is doing the bare minimum to help teachers feel heard and at all empowered. Once a week PD, built into school hours, enables teachers to have sustained conversations about their practice over time. Consistent with past research, PD that is in workshop form is often too decontextualized from the classroom experience of teachers and thus, ineffectual (Stein, Silver, & Smith, 1999). This type of PD makes teacher learning and teacher input an afterthought of districts and schools, diminishing teacher agency. Scheduling regular PD likewise demonstrates that collaboration and teacher learning are a priority for the school and district. By incorporating PD into the weekly school schedule, schools and districts send the message that they want teachers to have time to work on their craft. In turn, a culture of collaboration can be created that prioritizes teachers who are knowledgeable and supportive. Ultimately, this type of teaching environment is what can contribute to promoting teacher confidence and agency.

Making time is not enough. The PD offered must be directly related to teachers' experiences in the classroom and cannot be turned into meetings that become compliance activities that have been co-opted for school administrators' or district officials' purposes. In this study's case, that means creating PD that gives teachers the time to gain the skills and knowledge needed to effectively teach ELs. Past research has shown that high-quality PD relates directly to teachers' classroom experiences (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone et al., 2002). Therefore, teacher concerns should be considered when determining what teacher learning should focus on. Given that teachers in all content areas are expected to have familiarity with the CA ELD Standards and the goals of the EL Roadmap, it is logical

that California schools and districts need to make EL-centered PD one of their main priorities. All but one of the teachers in this study had little to no familiarity with the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap. And while science and math teachers were not included in this study, it would not be a stretch to assume that most STEM teachers do not have a strong familiarity with these policies and documents either. Because California has undergone a major shift in its approach to EL education, California's schools and districts need to make sure all teachers understand what changes have occurred and how that impacts their classrooms. Schools and districts should not rely on outside PD to do this job for them. By incorporating regular and collaborative PD that directly relates to teachers' classroom experiences and concerns into the school schedule, teachers will gain the necessary support, skills, and knowledge needed to feel confident as educators. Schools and districts need to recognize that as educational power structures, part of their role is to provide regular, high-quality PD to promote teacher agency.

5. Implications for English learner-related policy.

Lastly, this dissertation is only the experience of six teachers and their understanding of how they, their schools, and districts understand and enact state policy and documents related to EL education. But based on the findings of this study, there were indications that the State is on the right path towards improving EL education with the 2012 CA ELD Standards and the adoption of the EL Roadmap in 2017, helping multilingual students to have more agency in the classroom as active and engaged learners. Conversely, there exists some tension in what the State identified as needs for ELs and what was occurring in these classrooms.

The good news is that after the 1999 CA ELD Standards were dropped, EL education in California could really only go up. That improvement happened with the adoption of the 2012 CA ELD Standards. Overall, the new CA ELD Standards have four main aims: (1) to value student's prior knowledge and experiences (Bailey & Wolf, 2012; Bunch et al., 2012; CDE, 2012; Durán, 2014); (2) to develop students' metacognitive skills to monitor their learning (Bransford et al., 2000; CDE, 2014); (3) to view language and interaction as playing an important role to mediate linguistic and cognitive development (CDE, 2014); and (4) to use complex texts in different contexts to help students learn and develop English proficiency across all content areas (CDE, 2014; Quinn & Valdes, 2012; Walqui & Heritage, 2012). The teachers in this study were able to gain the necessary tools and skills to make this type of teaching happen through their participation in Pathway. Collectively these tools give emerging bilinguals opportunities to have agency in the classroom.

The CA ELD Standards provide emerging bilinguals opportunities to be engaged, build confidence, and feel supported as they develop their English language proficiency. This type of teaching can be seen when the teachers used the students' prior knowledge and cultural assets as resources for classroom learning. Acknowledging what all students, including multilingual students, bring into the classroom respects their perspectives, their cultures, and their lived experiences (Moll et al., 2001). It likewise helps build upon what they already know, making connections to new knowledge (Bransford et al., 2000). These kinds of opportunities are what ELs need to feel connected to the content being taught and to recognize that they have valid ideas that contribute to classroom knowledge. Engaging students in this way builds their confidence to speak up and interact with their peers, providing them the necessary agency as a student to be successful.

Moreover, using meaningful interactions to increase comprehension and practice with the English language help build student confidence. Students need opportunities to develop their English language proficiency in contexts that differ from social interactions amongst family or friends (Cazden, 2001). Creating activities that utilize regular interactions in low stakes settings helps ELs to feel like they can practice their academic English without being judged or graded is important. These types of interactions again work to engage students with the classroom content and with their peers. Peer interaction creates chances for students to learn from one another. "Expert" students can help more "novice" students as they collectively work together on group tasks working in their ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978). This type of learning environment promotes collective classroom knowledge that becomes a source of power for students to utilize in the learning process, like the power of teacher knowledge discussed in the previous section.

Connected to working within a students' ZPD is the State's realization of the importance of providing students with scaffolds as they learn. Putting scaffolds in place guides students along the road to eventually gain mastery (Bruner, 1983). Teachers in this study understood the importance of providing this type of guidance and used the cognitive strategies as scaffolds for students to unpack complex texts. These cognitive strategies also worked to develop students' metacognitive skills, helping them to monitor their own learning to become more independent learners (Bransford et al., 2000; CDE, 2014). As such, supporting students through clear scaffolds, while also building their metacognitive skills, helps ELs to engage with the course content at a rigorous level. With the necessary supports in place, curriculum does not need to be watered down, as was done in the past, because multilingual students now have the linguistic scaffolds in place to achieve at high levels.

These supports give students more opportunities to engage with their peers, the curriculum, and in turn, have agency as learners.

Lastly, teachers use these scaffolds to support students as they read complex texts in all content areas. Again, using the cognitive strategies to support emerging bilinguals, teachers in this study helped students develop their English language proficiency through class content and texts. These strategies help expose students to and encourage them to use discipline-specific vocabulary (August & Shanahan, 2006; Snow & Uccelli, 2009). Collectively, using students' prior knowledge and experiences, meaningful interactions, scaffolding, and complex texts encourage multilingual students to thoughtfully engage with their peers and the course content. Feeling comfortable and confident in the classroom is what leads to agency as a student. The 2012 ELD Standards work to rebuild the power structure of the previous 1999 ELD Standards that saw multilingual students as passive learners who needed a watered-down curriculum. Through Pathway, the teachers in this study were able to build the confidence and agency of the ELs in their classes. The CA ELD Standards provide a framework for all of California's teachers to likewise do this for their multilingual students, demonstrating that California is headed in the right direction for EL education.

This positive shift in the State's approach to EL education was also visible in the EL Roadmap that echoes the above approach. Additionally, the EL Roadmap provided a larger vision for EL education by setting up four principles that cover school climate, curriculum, leadership, and consistency across school systems (CDE, 2018). And while this vision for an aligned and effective EL educational experience is forward thinking, findings from this study indicate that this was not happening in these schools. Related to the two earlier sections,

these teachers were not being clearly supported by their schools and/or districts to effectively teach their multilingual students. The previous section laid out the implications of this study for EL education and PD for schools and districts. There are also implications for state educational policy in terms of making changes in policy happen effectively and seamlessly. Good policy is important but putting out good policy does not automatically result in everything improving in districts or schools.

In this instance, new standards and a new vision for EL education have not sufficiently made it down the line to teachers, particularly novice ones. This discrepancy was evident in the teachers who struggled to integrate students' linguistic assets, make lessons interactive, have time to differentiate, or talk about their familiarity with the CA ELD Standards and EL Roadmap. Classroom sizes do not immediately shrink; teachers do not suddenly have time to understand the new framework for teaching ELs; and teachers do not automatically gain the necessary skills needed to adapt their teaching to the new framework. Likewise, priorities for ELs do not magically shift. In the case of these teachers, discussions about multilingual students only came up around high stakes testing. While new policies may speak towards supporting emerging bilinguals and giving them agency, as long as standardized testing holds them accountable, schools and districts will focus on test scores. Discussions limited to test scores perpetuates ELs' status as marginalized students. The irony lies in that if the State truly wanted to invest in the education of ELs, then there should be clearer efforts on the part of the State to help districts and schools better support teachers to effectively teach multilingual students that extends beyond standardized testing.

a. Recommendations for practice.

This study's focus was limited to how teachers in two school districts understood and enacted state policy regarding EL education. However, the findings from this study would suggest that the State needs to do more to make it possible for schools and districts to enact changes in educational policy, particularly for multilingual students. The main goal should be for the State to provide not only good policy, but guidance for districts and schools to follow to allow for a more streamlined implementation of new policy. Clearer guidance from the State should focus on the importance of providing high-quality PD for teachers to explore ways to shift their EL-centered practice and pedagogy. In turn, this type of professional learning will promote teacher agency, helping teachers to feel confident as educators. These implications align with the same implications for multilingual student achievement and PD: leveraging the power of districts, schools, and the State to help teacher agency flourish and thus, improve the education of ELs. As such, state guidance should be used to foster teacher agency through high-quality PD that emulates the type of learning being promoted by the State for ELs.

Because strong policy that promotes sociocultural learning and EL agency is evident with the adoption of the CA ELD Standards, the State should follow with clear and distinct recommendations about the need for inservice teachers to be provided with high-quality PD that promotes sociocultural professional learning. These recommendations should align with the Quality Professional Learning Standards put out by the State in 2015, while also making it clear the importance of collaboration that follows a sociocultural framework, as shown to be effective by the Pathway teachers in this study. Sociocultural learning foregrounds sociocultural aspects of learning, not solely cognitive or social ones. PD with a sociocultural design helps teachers to learn in the same way that they expect their students to learn,

particularly ELs as outlined by the CA ELD Standards. Thus, state policy needs to go further than just putting out new standards. Although the State may prefer to limit providing pedagogy for schools and teachers to follow, there needs to be a greater emphasis on the degree to which the State values and recommends particular types of PD as a way for teachers to best align with state policy. While the EL Roadmap may have been intended to do this, that connection is unclear. If anything, the EL Roadmap added extra layers of complexity to EL education. As a policy, it calls for alignment across school systems in curriculum and leadership as a larger vision for California. However, this vision cannot happen if the State does not provide strong and clear recommendations for professional learning that districts and schools can follow to ensure that all teachers across the State are aligned.

This alignment starts with making sure that schools and districts provide teachers with a clear explanation of the CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap. In terms of the standards, teachers across all content areas need to be familiar with them and how they are to be used in conjunction with their own content area standards. While this recommendation would appear to be a given, the ELA teachers in this study had little to no familiarity with the CA ELD Standards and most likely, their colleagues in other content areas probably have similar levels of familiarity. Thus, the State needs to make it clear to districts and schools that there needs to be a deliberate effort to ensure that all teachers can speak about how the CA ELD Standards affect their teaching. As for the EL Roadmap, none of the teachers in this study knew about this policy. Again, the State needs to make it a priority for all districts and schools to help teachers understand how they contribute to this vision for an aligned EL educational experience. Moreover, this policy holds schools and districts accountable as

power structures in EL education, as discussed earlier in this study. As such, it should be a priority for teachers to understand how other levels of the school system will support them to effectively support and teach ELs for transparency's sake. If teachers understand their role, as well as the role of districts and schools to support them, then this can lead to a unified front and a more equal distribution of power across the educational system to provide multilingual students with the education the State is promising them.

Part of this guidance from the State should also include recommendations for specific topics that teachers can explore during PD meetings to help them work towards aligning their teaching with the EL Roadmap and the CA ELD Standards. These topics include the areas discussed in this paper that closely fit within a sociocultural framework, including how to utilize students' prior knowledge and cultural and linguistic assets, how to create lessons that incorporate meaningful interactions, how to develop students' English language proficiency through content, and how to integrate scaffolds and differentiation to support their students. In this study, the teachers relied on cognitive strategies to support their multilingual students' learning, which also helped students develop the metacognitive skills to monitor their own learning. Developing these types of sociocultural practices, as the teachers in this study did during Pathway meetings, could be something that the state uses as an example for teachers do during PD meetings to help them adapt their teaching to support EL-learning.

Additionally, addressing PD topics for teachers in different content areas should be included in those recommendations, particularly how all teachers can effectively implement best teaching practices for multilingual students. In fact, a recent report put out by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018) recognizes the need for STEM teachers to better address the needs of ELs, showing the demand for this type of

guidance. This urgency is further exacerbated by the recent publishing of Global California 2030 by the CDE in 2018, a state document calling for a multilingual California by 2030, with implications for both monolingual English-speakers and English-learners. The State has prioritized ELs as far as putting out new policy goes; however, these documents need to provide clear and practical recommendations for PD that districts and schools can follow to ensure that teachers have the means to develop the necessary skills and knowledge needed to teach multilingual students. These PD-focused recommendations are how different levels of the educational system can work together to make California's vision for a consistent and effective EL educational experience happen.

Ultimately, the State needs to provide not only strong policy, but also the necessary steps for schools and districts to follow to make the changes in EL policy occur. First, the State needs to make it clear that districts and schools take the time to ensure that teachers understand the implications that the CA ELD Standards and EL Roadmap have for their teaching, and the types of support they should receive. The State also needs to provide deliberate recommendations for the types of PD and topics covered that teachers are to receive for the State's vision for EL education to occur. Teacher support should aim for providing teachers with the time to develop the specialized skills and knowledge needed to support and teach multilingual students in a way that is rigorous, engaging, and aligned across California - as outlined in both the ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap. Thus, the role of the State should not end after putting out new educational policy, particularly when it comes to EL education that has recently undergone a significant evolution towards helping emerging bilinguals become more engaged in their learning. To effectively give multilingual students that agency discussed in the EL Roadmap, teachers must also be given agency to do

their job well. That level of responsibility lies in the lap of the State to make sure that districts and schools know what needs to be done to support teachers, and in turn, ELs.

6. Recommendations for further research.

Additional research appears needed surrounding EL education, focusing on three main areas discussed in the present study: teaching multilingual students, PD design and focus, and the impact of state EL policy on teaching practices.

First, as noted above, the teaching practices and pedagogy that the participant teachers used to support and teach emerging bilinguals aligned well with the framework of the CA ELD Standards and EL Roadmap. This alignment was mainly due to the cognitive strategies that helped the teachers to engage the students' prior knowledge, develop their metalinguistic knowledge, understand the relationship between language and interaction, and use complex texts in different contexts to help students develop their English language proficiency. However, this is just one approach to teaching ELs. Given that California has undergone a major shift in EL education, teachers need many activities and skills to support and teach the multilingual students in their classes that align with this new additive vision for EL education. This type of teaching requires a deeper understanding of language and content knowledge. Coupled with the general inequity of resources for teaching emerging bilinguals (Abedi & Liquanti, 2012), there needs to be further research done into specific teaching practices that best support ELD that provides multilingual students opportunities to engage in complex texts and meaningful interactions through content (Faltis & Valdes, 2016; Lucas, 2011). Making this type of research even more essential is the need for teachers in all content areas to be able to support and teach ELs through content. Thus, there is a distinct need for more research into how teachers across disciplines, particularly STEM disciplines, can

support ELs to develop content knowledge and language proficiency while engaging in meaningful interactions in the classroom and participating in the kinds of activities in which experts and professionals in different disciplines regularly engage (NASEM, 2018).

Second, is the need for additional research into the role that PD can provide to help teachers make the above happen. It has been established that inservice PD can support teachers' deeper understanding of content and teaching strategies to assist students' attainment of content and English language development. As discussed earlier is the lack of guidance provided by the CA ELD Standards or the EL Roadmap in terms of how to effectively implement changes in curriculum and PD. Therefore, an effort needs to be made by researchers to continue exploring how PD can help teachers to develop lessons and strategies based on the CA ELD Standards. Again, this pertains to all content areas and not just to teachers who only teach ELD classes as the CA ELD Standards are meant to be used alongside content area standards. Moreover, teachers in this study discussed the lack of PD focused on giving them EL-teaching practices and supports to use in the classroom. If more research can focus on the role that PD plays in helping make improve the educational experience and achievement of multilingual students, then ideally this can lead to school administrators and district officials seeing the benefits of offering this type of PD on a regular basis.

Third, the EL Roadmap is still in its infancy as a state policy. This type of policy that lays out a vision for EL education across an entire state is a first for state educational systems to create and adopt. Policy like this is novel because it lays out a larger vision meant to unify districts and schools across an entire state for a student population that has too often been neglected or misrepresented. Important to note is that this policy has been adopted in the face

of the current, national political climate, one that oozes of negative attitudes towards immigrants and people of color. Given these significances of the EL Roadmap, research needs to be done to examine the impact that this type of policy can have on all levels of the school system. This type of research includes the effect the EL Roadmap has on district policies, school practices, teacher instruction, and student achievement. Research on the impact of the EL Roadmap can determine if this type of policy is worth emulating in other states or if there are improvements that need to be made to make policies with this visionary focus more effective (such as the ones offered in the present study). Longitudinal studies should also be done to determine the long-term effects of the EL Roadmap on different levels of the school system, with particular attention given to multilingual student achievement as the main motivation for adopting this policy.

Lastly, a repeated theme that emerged in this dissertation was the change in teacher agency because of the support (or lack of support) that teachers felt as they attempted to expand their teaching practices to support multilingual students. The impact of the three areas above, EL-teaching, PD, and policy, each affected the confidence and likewise agency of the teachers. Therefore, it is suggested that research into teacher agency be further developed. In particular, research that explores the ways in which teachers can gain confidence through participation in high-quality PD, maintain that confidence by demonstrating strong teaching practices in the classroom, and be supported to continually build that confidence through policy that supports them to do their job well, from novice to experienced teachers. Teachers cannot do their jobs well if they do not have confidence in themselves to teach well (Nolan & Molla, 2017; Stronge, 2007). Confidence that the teachers have in themselves leads to

teacher agency and student achievement. And so, research into teacher learning, curriculum development, and educational policy needs to support teachers and in turn, students.

E. Conclusion

The intersection between policy, marginalized students, and teacher professional learning is a complex one that cannot be ignored. These connections are evident in California, which is in a state of change thanks to recent changes in policy surrounding EL education and the adoption of the CA ELD State Standards. Also demonstrating a new additive perspective on ELs is the recent adoption of the CA EL Roadmap, promoting an aligned and consistent educational experience for emerging bilinguals across the State. These policies work to counteract the backwards approach to second language learning of the 1999 CA ELD Standards that prevented ELs from engaging in the complex and rigorous texts and content of their monolingual peers. The current CA ELD Standards and the EL Roadmap have the potential to provide emerging bilinguals the chance to finally be challenged and learn at the same level as English-only students. However, this can only happen if their teachers are able to make the State's vision for equitable and inclusive learning work in their teaching practices.

Despite the State's rationale that the standards and CA EL Roadmap are a road for California's educators to follow, teachers are not necessarily being supported by their districts or schools to follow this road to provide the kind of education that California envisions for multilingual students. Too often, teachers are being forced to navigate without a map, forging their own path towards expanding their EL-centered teaching practices, contrary to what the State calls for, but consistent with the need for more research into teacher education to better address the needs of ELs to ensure their academic success (Faltis

& Valdes, 2016; Lucas, 2011). And while the EL Roadmap is "visionary" in its scope, that vision cannot come to fruition if the State abdicates its duty to help all levels of the school system support teachers along that road. Good policy is only the first step in paving the road for the future of multilingual student education. The role of teacher learning and teacher agency likewise need to be acknowledged as important paving stones for this vision. Only then can the needs of marginalized students truly be the driving force behind creating an equitable educational experience across California.

References

Abedi, J. & Linquanti, R. (2012). *Issues and opportunities in improving the quality of large scale assessment systems for English language learners.* Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Retrieved from http://ell.stanford.edu/papers/policy.

Adesope, O.O., Lavin, T., Thompson, T., & Ungerleider, C. (2010). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the cognitive correlates of bilingualism. *Review of Educational Research, 80*(2), 207-245.

Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock: Understanding the culture of conversation* (pp. 140-163). New York: Perennial.

Anderson, J. R., Reder, L. M., & Simon, H. A. (1996). Situated learning and education. *Educational Researcher*, *25*(4), 5-11.

Ashdown, J. & Hummel-Rossi, B. (2005). The impact of program adoption on teachers' professional lives. In D. Beijaard, P.C. Meijer, G. Morine-Dershimer, & H. Tillema (Eds.), *Teacher professional development in changing conditions.* (pp.213-230). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bailey, A.L. & Wolf, M.K. (2012). *The challenge of assessing language proficiency aligned to the Common Core State Standards and some possible solutions.* Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Retrieved from http://ell.stanford.edu/papers/policy.

Ball, D.L. (1996). Teacher learning and the mathematics reforms: What we think we know and what we need to learn. *Phi Delta Kappan, 77,* 500-508.

Bartholomew, S.S. & Sandholtz, J.H. (2009). Competing views of teaching in a school-university partnership. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 25(2), 155-165.

Bishop, R. S. (1990). Mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors. *Perspectives, 6*(3), ix-xi.

Blakemore, D. (1992). *Understanding utterances: An introduction to pragmatics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Boardman, A. & Jensen Lasser, C. (2016). Using strategy instruction to promote reading comprehension and content learning. In C.P. Proctor, A. Boardman, & E.H. Hiebert (Eds.), *Teaching emergent bilingual students: Flexible approaches in an era of new standards* (pp.99-118). New York: Guilford Press.

Booth Olson, C.B. & Land, R. (2008). Taking a reading/writing intervention for secondary English language learners on the road: Lessons learned from the Pathway Project. *Research in the Teaching of English, 42*(3), 259-269.

Booth Olson, C.B. & Land, R. (2007). A cognitive strategies approach to reading and writing instruction for English language learners in secondary school. *Research in the Teaching of English, 41*(3), 269-303.

Booth Olson, C.B., Land, R., Anselmi, T., & AuBuchon, C. (2010). Teaching secondary English learners to understand, analyze, and write interpretive essays about theme.

Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 54(4), 245-256.

Booth Olson, C.B., Kim, J.S., Scarcella, R., Kramer, J., Pearson, M., van Dyk, D.A., Collins, P., & Land, R.E. (2012). Enhancing the interpretive reading and analytical writing of mainstream English learners in secondary school: Results from a randomized field trial using a cognitive strategies approach. *American Educational Research Journal, 49*(2), 323-355.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher, 33*(8), 3-15.

Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L., & Cocking, R.R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brisk, M.E. & Proctor, C.P. (2012). *Challenges and supports for English language learners in bilingual programs.* Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Retrieved from http://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default /files/pdf/ academic-papers/11-Brisk%20Bilingual%20Programs%20FINAL_0.pdf.

Brown, J.S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational researcher, 18*(1), 32-42.

Bruner, J. (1983). *Child's Talk.* New York: Norton.

Bucholtz, M. (2001). Reflexivity and critique in discourse analysis. *Critique of Anthropology, 21*(2), 165-183.

Bunch, G.C. Kibler, A.K. & Pimentel, S. (2012). *Realizing opportunities for English learners in the Common Core English language arts and disciplinary literacy standards.* Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford University, Stanford,

CA. Retrieved from http://ell.stanford.edu/publication/realizing-opportunities-ells-common-Core-english-language-arts-and-disciplinary-literacy.

Boardman, A. & Jensen Lasser, C. (2016). Using strategy instruction to promote reading comprehension and content learning. In C.P. Proctor, A. Boardman, & E.H. Hiebert (Eds.), *Teaching emergent bilingual students: Flexible approaches in an era of new standards* (p.99-118). New York: Guilford Press.

Brenner, M.E. (2006). Interviewing in educational research. In J. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore, (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 357-370). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

California Department of Education (CDE). (2019). English language proficiency assessments for California (ELPAC). Retrieved from https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ep/index.asp

California Department of Education (CDE). (2018). California English Learner roadmap policy: Strengthening comprehensive educational policies, programs, and practices for English learners. *California Department of Education.*

California Department of Education. (CDE). (2018). Global California 2030. *Communications and English Learner Support Divisions, California Department of Education.* Retrieved from https://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/documents/globalca2030 report.pdf.

California Department of Education (CDE). (2017a). California English learner roadmap policy: California English learner roadmap State Board of Education Policy: Educational program and services for English learners. *California Department of Education.* Retrieved from http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/elroadmappolicy.asp.

California Department of Education (CDE). (2017b). Facts about English language learners in California - CalEdFacts. Retrieved from https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/cefelfacts.asp.

California Department of Education. (CDE) (2015). *Quality professional learning standards.* Sacramento: Professional Learning Support Division, California Department of Education. Retrieved from https://cacompcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/CA-Quality-Professional-Learning-Standards_Revised-March-2015.pdf.

California Department of Education. (CDE) (2014). *California Department of Education. California English language development standards: Kindergarten through grade 12.* Sacramento: English Learner Support Division, California Department of Education. Retrieved from https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/documents/eldstndspublication14.pdf.

California Department of Education. (CDE). (2010). *California common core state standards: English language arts & history/social studies, science, and technical subjects.* Sacramento: State Board of Education. Retrieved from https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/documents/finalelaccssstandards.pdf.

Calderheard, J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 5(1), 43-51.

Cazden, C.B. (2001). Variations in lesson structure. *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning* (pp.53-79). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Chang, F., Crawford, G., Early, D., Bryant, D., Howes, C., Burchinal, M., Barbarin, O.,

Clifford, R., & Pianta, R. (2007). Spanish-speaking children's social and language development in pre-kindergarten classrooms. *Early Education,* 18(2), 243-269.

Cisneros, S. (1991). *The house on mango street.* New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1984).

Clark, D.J. & Hollingsworth, H. (2002). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18,* 947-967.

Cobb, P., & Bowers, J. (1999). Cognitive and situated learning perspectives in theory and practice. *Educational researcher*, *28*(2), 4-15.

Cohen, D.K. & Hill, H.C. (1998). Instructional policy and classroom performance: The mathematical reform in California. *Consortium for Policy Research in Education.*

Collinson, V. (2012). Leading by learning, learning by leading. *Professional Development in Education,* 38(2), 247-26.

Cook, G., Linquanti, R., Chinen, M., & Jung, H. (2012). National evaluation of Title III implementation supplemental report: Exploring approaches to setting English language proficiency performance criteria and monitoring English learner progress. *Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development,* US Department of Education.

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (2012). *Framework for English language proficiency development standards corresponding to the common core state standards and the next generation science standards*. Washington, DC: CCSSO.

Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of first-and second-language proficiency in bilingual children. *Language processing in bilingual children*, 70-89.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M.E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional*

development. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Richardson, N. (2009). Teacher learning: What matters? *Educational Leadership,* 66(5), 46-53.

Desimone, L.M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher, 38*(3), 181-199.

Desimone, L., Porter, A.C., Garet, M.S., Yoon, K.S., & Birman, B.F. (2002). Effective professional development on teachers' instruction: Results on a three-year longitudinal study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*, 81-112.

Duke, N.K., Pearson, P.D., Strachan, S.L., & Billman, A.K. (2011). Essential elements of fostering and teaching reading comprehension. In S.J. Samuels & A.E. Farshup (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (4th Ed.). International Reading Association.

Durán, R.P. (2014). Beyond educational standards? Latino student learning agency and identity in context. In P.R. Portes, S. Salas, P. Baquedaño-López, & P.J. Mellom (Eds.), *US Latinos and education policy: Research-based directions for change.* (pp.204-215). New York: Routledge.

Duranti, A., & Goodwin, C. (Eds.). (1992). *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, Vol. 11. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dutro, S. & Kinsella, K. (2010). English language development: Issues and implementation at grades six through twelve. In *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches.* (pp.151-208). Sacramento: California Department of Education.

Educational Data Partnership. (2018a). *District summary: Oxnard Union High School*

District. Retrieved from http://www.ed-data.org/search/Faceted?query=Oxnard-Union- High-School-District.

Educational Data Partnership. (2018b). *District summary: Santa Barbara Unified School District.* Retrieved from http://www.ed-data.org/district/Santa-Barbara/Santa-Barbara-Unified.

Englund, T. (2002). Are professional teachers a good thing? In *Teachers' professional lives* (pp.83-95). Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2012). Critical discourse analysis. In J.P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The routledge handbook of discourse analysis.* New York: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research.* New York: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of Language.* New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Eds.) *Discourse as social interaction* (pp.258-284). London: Sage.

Faltis, C.J., & Valdés, G. (2016). Preparing teachers for teaching in and advocating for linguistically diverse classrooms: A vade mecum for teacher educators. *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, 549-592.

Foucault, M. (1981). *History of sexuality*, Vol. 1. Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1972). *Archeology of knowledge.* Tavistock Publications.

Franke, M.L., Carpenter, T.P., & Levi, L. (2001). Capturing teachers' generative change: A

follow-up study of professional development in mathematics. *American Educational Research Journal, 38,* 653-689.

Gee, J.P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis.* New York: Routledge.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English Language Learners: A Synthesis of Research Evidence.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Gomez, L., Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2005). Dual language education: A promising 50-50 model. *Bilingual Research Journal, 29*(1), 145-164.

Gramsci, A. (1973). *Selections from the prison notebooks.* London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Gravani, M.N. (2008). Academics and practitioners: Partners in generating knowledge or citizens in two different worlds? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(3), 64.

Green, J., Skukauskaite, A., & Baker, W.D. (2011). Ethnography as epistemology. In J. Arthur, M. Waring, R. Coe, & L. Hedges (Eds.), *Research methods and methodologies in education* (pp.309-321). Sage.

Greeno, J.G., Collins, A.M., & Resnick, L.B. (1996). Cognition and learning. *Handbook of Educational Psychology, 77,* 15-46.

Grossman, P.L., Wineburg, S., & Woolworth, S. (2001). Toward a theory of teacher community. *Teachers College Record, 103,* 942-1012.

Guskey, T.R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching, 8,* 381-391.

Guskey, T.R. (1986). Staff development and teacher change. *Educational Researcher, 15*(5),

5-12.

Guthrie, J.T., Wigfield, A., Barbosa, P., Perencevich, K.C., Taboada, A., Davis, M.H., Scafiddi, N.T., & Tonks, S. (2004). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through concept-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*(3), 403-423.

Hakuta, K., Butler, Y.G., & Witt, D. (2000). How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency? *The University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute,* Policy Report 2000-1.

Hakuta, K., & Santos, M. (2012). *Understanding language: Challenges and opportunities for language learning in the context of Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards.* Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Retrieved from http://ell.stanford. edu/sites/default/files/Conference% 20Summary_0.pdf.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1993). Towards a language-based theory of learning. *Linguistics and Education, 5,* 93-116.

Hammersley, M. (1997). On the foundations of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Language & Communication, 17*(3), 237-248.

Hammond, J. (2006). High challenges, high support: Integrating language and content instruction for diverse learners in an English literature classroom. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5*(4), 269-283.

Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Heck, D.J., Banilower, E.R., Weiss, I.R. & Rosenberg, S.L. (2008). Studying the effects of

professional development: The case of the NSF's local systemic change through teacher enhancement initiative. *National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 39*(2), 113-152.

Heritage, M. (2015). *English language learners and the new standards: Developing language, content knowledge, and analytical practices in the classroom.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Huberman, A.M. (1985). Educational change and career pursuits: Some findings from the field. *Interchange, 16*(3), 54-73.

Ingvarson, L., Meiers, M., & Beavis, A. (2005). Factors affecting the impact of professional development programs on teachers' knowledge, practice, student outcomes and efficacy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 13*(10). Retrieved 26 June 2017, from http://www.redalyc.org/html/2750/275020513010/.

James, M. & McCormick, R. (2009). Teachers learning how to learn. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(5), 973-982.

Jeanpierre, B., Oberhauser, K., & Freeman, C. (2005). Characteristics of professional development that effect change in secondary science teachers' classroom practices. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42*(6), 668-690.

Jenlink, P.M. & Kinnucan-Welsch, K. (2001). Case stories of facilitating professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 705-724.

Jurasaite-Harbison, E. & Rex, L.A. (2010). School cultures as contexts for informal teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(2), 267-277.

Justi, R. & Van Driel, J.H. (2005). Developing science teachers' knowledge on models and

modelling. In D. Beijaard, P.C. Meijer, G. Morine-Dershimer, & H. Tillema, (Eds.), *Teacher professional development in changing conditions* (pp.165-180). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Spring

Kelly, P. (2006). What is teacher learning? A socio-cultural perspective. *Oxford Review of Education, 32*(4), 505-519.

King, F. (2014). Evaluating the impact of teacher professional development: An evidence-based framework. *Professional Development in Education, 40*(1), 89-111.

Kristeva, J. (1986). *The Kristeva reader*. In T. Moi, (Ed.). New York: Columbia University.

Kwakman, K. (2003). Factors affecting teacher participation in professional development activities. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(2), 149.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1990). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, O., Deaktor, R., Enders, C., & Lambert, J. (2008). Impact of a multiyear professional development intervention on science achievement of culturally and linguistically diverse elementary students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45*(6), 726-747.

Little, J.W. (1987). Teachers as colleagues. In V. Richardson-Koehler (ED.), *Educators' handbook: A research perspective* (pp.491-518). New York: Longman.

Los Angeles Times. (2016). California will bring back bilingual education as proposition 58 cruises to victory. Retrieved from http://www.latimes.com/nation/politics/trailguide/la-na-election-day-2016-proposition-58-bilingual-1478220414-htmlstory.html.

Lucas, T. (2011). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for*

teacher educators. New York, NY: Routledge.

Martin, J. (2000). Close reading. In J. Unsworth (Ed.), *Researching language in schools and communities.* Washington, DC: Cassell.

Merriam, S.B. (2009). Qualitative data analysis. In *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (pp.169-208). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Michael, A., Andrade, N., & Bartlett, L. (2007). Figuring "success" in a bilingual high school. *The Urban Review, 39*(2), 167-189.

Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (2001). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132-141.

Mostyn, B. (1985). The content analysis of qualitative research data: A dynamic approach. *The research interview* (pp.115-145). London: Academic Press.

National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *English learners in STEM subjects: Transforming classrooms, schools, and lives.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi: https://doi.org/10.17226/25182.

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Nolan, A. & Molla, T. (2017). Teacher confidence and professional capital. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 62*(2017), 10-18.

Olsen, L. (2010). *Reparable harm: Fulfilling the unkept promises of educational opportunity for California's long-term English learners.* Long Beach, CA:

Californians Together.

Opfer, V.D. & Pedder, D. (2011). Conceptualizing teacher professional learning. *Review of Educational Research, 81*(3), 376-407.

Opfer, V.D., Pedder, D., & Lavicza, Z. (2011). The influence of school orientation to learning on teachers' professional learning change. *School effectiveness and school improvement, 22*(2), 193-214.

Oxnard Union High School District. (2019). *District office 2018-2019.* Retrieved from https://sk309-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/DO-OrgChart-bp2110-FINAL.pdf.

Palincsar, A.S. & Brown, A.L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension - fostering comprehension - monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 1*(2), 117-175.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative interviewing. In M.Q. Patton (Ed.), *Qualitative research and evaluation methods, 3rd ed.* (pp.339-427). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pedder, D., James, M., & MacBeath, J. (2005). How teachers value and practice professional learning. *Research Papers in Education, 20*(3), 209-243.

Peressini, D., Borko, H., Romagnano, L., Knuth, E., & Willis, C. (2004). A conceptual framework for learning to teach secondary mathematics: A situative perspective. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 56*(1), 67-96.

Phelps, G. & Schilling, S. (2004). Developing measures of content knowledge for teaching reading. *Elementary School Journal, 105*(1), 31-48.

Proctor, C.P., August, D., Snow, C., & Barr, C.D. (2010). The Interdependence continuum:

A perspective on the nature of Spanish-English bilingual reading comprehension. *Bilingual Research Journal, 33*(1), 5-20.

Putnam, R.T. & Borko, H. (2000). What do new views of knowledge and thinking have to say on research on teacher learning? *Educational Researcher, 29*(1), 4-15.

Quinn, H., Lee, O., & Valdes, G. (2012). Language demands and opportunities in relation to Next Generation Science standards for English language learners: What teachers need to know. Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Retrieved from http://ell.stanford.edu/papers/language.

Richardson, V., Anders, P., Tidwell, D., & Lloyd, C. (1991). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in reading comprehension instruction. *American Educational Research Journal, 28*(3), 559-586.

Riches, C. & Genesee, F. (2006). Crosslinguistic and crossmodal issues. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners* (pp.64-108). Cambridge.

Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & Joseph, G.O.G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 75*(3), 365-416.

Sahin, I. & Yildirim, A. (2016). Transforming professional learning into practice. *ELT J, 70*(3), 241-252. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccv070.

Santa Barbara Unified School District. (2019). *About the district.* Retrieved from https://www.sbunified.org/about/.

Santos, M., Darling-Hammond, L., & Cheuk, T. (2012). *Teacher development to support*

English language learners in the context of Common Core State Standards. Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Retrieved from http://ell.stanford.edu/papers/policy.

Saxe, G.B., Gearhart, M., & Nasir, N.S. (2001). Enhancing students' understanding of mathematics: A study of three contrasting approaches to professional support. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 4,* 55-79.

Schegloff, E.A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society, 8*(2), 165-187.

Schleppegrell, M.J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Short, D.J. & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners - A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Shulman, L.S. & Shulman, J.H. (2004). How and what teachers learn: A shifting perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36*(2), 256-271.

Snow, C.E., & Uccelli, P. (2009). The challenge of academic language. In Booth Olson, D. R., & N. Torrance (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Literacy* (pp.112-133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spörer, N., Brunstein, J.C., & Kieschke, U. (2009). Improving students' reading comprehension skills: Effects of strategy instruction and reciprocal teaching. *Learning and Instruction, 19,* 272-286.

Spradley, J. (1979). Ethnography and culture. In *The ethnographic interview* (pp.3-16). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Stein, M.K., Smith, M.S., & Silver, E. (1999). The development of professional developers: Learning to assist teachers in new settings in new ways. *Harvard Educational Review, 69*(3), 237-270.

Stewart, C. (2014). Transforming professional development to professional learning. *Journal of Adult Education, 43*(1), 28-33.

Stronge, J.H. (2007). *Qualities of Effective Teachers* (2nd ed.). Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Supovitz, J. & Turner, H. (2000). The effects of professional development on science teaching practices and classroom culture. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37*(9), 963-980.

Tomlinson, C.A. (1999). Mapping a route toward differentiated instruction. *Educational Leadership, 57*(1), 12-16.

van Dijk, T.A. (1999). Critical discourse analysis and conversation analysis. *Discourse & Society, 10*(4), 459-460.

van Lier, L. (2004). The ecology of language learning: Practice to theory, theory to practice. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 3,* 2-6.

van Lier, L. & Walqui, A. (2012). *Language and the Common Core State Standards.* Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Retrieved from http://ell.stanford.edu/papers/language.

Verschueren, J. (2001). Predicaments in criticism. *Critique of Anthropology, 21*(1), 59-81.

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

Walqui, A. & Heritage, M. (2012). *Instruction for Diverse Groups of English Language*

Learners. Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Retrieved from http://ell.stanford.edu/papers/policy.

Walqui, A., Koelsch, N., Hamburger, L., Gaarder, D., Insaurralde, A., Schmida, M., & Weiss, S. (2010). *What are we doing to our middle school English learners? Findings and recommendations for change from a study of California EL programs.* (Research Report). San Francisco: WestEd.

Wayne, A.J., Yoon, K. S., Zhu, P., Cronen, S., & Garet, M.S. (2008). Experimenting with teacher professional development: Motives and methods. *Educational Researcher*, *37*(8), 469-479.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Werner, O., & Schoepfle, G. M. (1987). Ethnographic interview. In *Systematic fieldwork, Vol. 1*. 313-343. Newbury Park: Sage.

Wilson, S. (1977). The use of ethnographic techniques in educational research. *Review of Educational Research, 47*(1), 245-265.

Wong Fillmore, L. & Fillmore, C.J. (2012). *What does text complexity mean for English language learners and minority students?* Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Retrieved from http://ell.stanford.edu/papers/language.

Wong-Fillmore, L., & Snow, C.E. (2002). What teachers need to know about language. In C.T. Adger, C.E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (pp.7-54). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Appendix 1

Interview Protocol #1 – Participating Teachers

1) What is your name and age?
2) How long have you been a teacher?
3) Where do you currently teach?
   a) How long have you taught there?
   b) What classes/grades do you teach?
4) What experiences do you have teaching ELs?
5) I'm going to show you various statements about bilingual education to you. Can you please read each card, then rank how strongly you personally agree or disagree with each statement, with 5 being strongly agree, 4 agree, 3 neutral, 2 disagree, and 1 strongly disagree. *(follow up questions and statements below; ask about individual cards as necessary)*
   a) *(follow up question)* Can you explain to me why you gave a ___ for that statement?
   b) *(follow up question)* You seemed unsure about how to rank this statement. What about this statement made it hard for you to decide?
   c) *(follow up question)* Has this type of instruction been a priority for you and your teaching?
      i) If so, why?
      ii) How have you tried to incorporate this into your teaching?
   d) *(follow up question)* Has this type of instruction been a priority at your school site/for your district?
      i) If so, please explain how.
   e) *(Standards statement)* "EL instruction should be interactive, allowing ELs to collaborate with their native English-speaking peers."
   f) *(Standards statement)* "EL instruction should value and build on home language and culture and other forms of prior knowledge."
   g) *(Standards statement)* "EL instruction cannot build academic English and content knowledge at the same time, as ELs need to learn vocabulary and grammar in isolation before content knowledge."
   h) *(Standards/Roadmap statement)* "EL instruction should be differentiated and intentionally designed for a learner's particular needs."
6) *(Standards/Roadmap statement)* "It is more important for ELs to learn English, rather than also continue to develop their home language."
7) *(Roadmap statement)* "ELs should not use their home language in the classroom to demonstrate their content knowledge; only English should be used to demonstrate true content knowledge."
8) *(Roadmap statement)* "It is the not responsibility of every level of the school system (state, county, district, school, pre-school) to be knowledgeable and responsive to the strengths and needs of ELs by utilizing valid assessment that inform instruction and continuous improvement. Giving and using feedback from assessments to determine the strengths and needs of ELs is only the classroom teacher's job."
9) *(Roadmap statement)* "It is the responsibility of every level of the school system (state, county, district, school, pre-school) to provide resources and support to ensure strong

programs and build the capacity of teachers to build on the strengths and meet the needs of English learners."

10) In your opinion, how concerned is your school with supporting ELs to be successful in the classroom?
    a) What about your school district?
11) Has anyone at your school (district official, an administrator, department chair, etc.) ever brought up teaching ELs with you, either personally or during a meeting?
    a) If so, what did they talk about?
12) In your opinion, do you feel sufficiently supported by your school or district to effectively teach your ELs?
    a) Why or why not?
13) How familiar are you with the new California English Language Development (ELD) Standards that came out in 2012?
14) Has anyone at your school (an administrator, department chair, etc.) ever brought up the new CA ELD Standards with you, either personally or during a meeting?
    a) If so, what did they talk about?
15) How familiar are you with the new California State Seal of Biliteracy that recognizes high school graduates who have attained a high level of proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing one or more languages in addition to English?
16) Has anyone at your school (an administrator, department chair, etc.) ever brought up the Seal of Biliteracy with you, either personally or during a meeting?
    a) If so, what did they talk about?
17) *(Optional, if not addressed already*) What challenges have you faced teaching ELs?
18) *(Optional, if not addressed already)* What do you think is the most important skill/lesson ELs need to be successful in school?
19) *(Optional, if not addressed already)* What are some of the challenges you have observed that your EL students have trying to be successful in school?
20) How often does your school offer professional development during school hours (inservice days or early release days)?
21) What kind of professional development (PD) have you participated in at your school?
22) How often do you seek out PD opportunities beyond what is offered by your school or district?
23) What kinds of PD have you participated in beyond what is offered by your school?
24) How did you first learn about the Pathway Project?
25) Why did you decide to participate in the Pathway Project?
26) I'm going to show you a series of statements about bilingual education and PD Can you please rank these cards left to right, with the card you think the Pathway Project has helped you with most on the far left. *(follow up questions and statements below; ask about individual cards as necessary)*
    a) *(follow up question)* I noticed you weren't sure where to place this card. Why was that?
    b) *(follow up question)* You seemed very sure about the placement of this card. Can you talk about why you were so certain about where to place it?
    c) *(follow up question)* You rearranged these cards several times. Why was that?
    d) *(follow up question)* Can you tell me why you ranked this card as the one you agree/disagree with the most?

e) *(Standards statement)* "The Pathway Project has helped me to make my EL instruction interactive, allowing ELs to collaborate with their native English-speaking peers."
f) *(Standards statement)* "The Pathway Project has helped me to make my EL instruction value and build on my ELs' home language and culture and other forms of prior knowledge."
g) *(Standards statement)* "The Pathway Project has helped me to help my ELs build academic English and content knowledge at the same time, as opposed to teaching them vocabulary and grammar in isolation."
h) *(Standards/Roadmap statement)* "The Pathway Project has helped me to make my EL instruction differentiated and intentionally designed for a learner's particular needs."
i) *(Standards/ Roadmap statement)* "The Pathway Project has helped me to understand that it is important for ELs to continue to develop their home language, in addition to learning English."
j) *(Roadmap statement)* "The Pathway Project has helped me to understand that ELs should have the option to use their home language in the classroom to demonstrate their content knowledge."

27) In what ways, if any, has the Pathway Project helped you to become more confident teaching your ELs?
28) In what ways, in any, has the Pathway Project helped you to effectively understand the CA ELD Standards?
29) Besides the Pathway Project, have you sought out other PD programs to help you effectively teach ELs?
30) What do you look for in a PD program when choosing programs beyond what is offered by your school?
31) How did those programs compare to the Pathway Project?
32) (Optional, if not addressed already) How important is it for you to find PD focused on effectively teaching ELs?

Appendix 2

Interview Protocol #2 – Participating Teachers

1) In general, how would you describe your relationship with your EL students?
2) In general, how would you describe your level of comfort teaching ELs?
3) As a teacher, what is your main goal for your ELs inside the classroom?
    a) Outside the classroom?
4) Please rank in order which area of teaching ELs you feel most confident in and explain why you ordered these in that way:
    a) Accessing and utilizing students' prior knowledge and culture in the classroom?
    b) Accessing and utilizing students' home language in the classroom?
    c) Helping students to develop their English through content (as opposed through isolated vocabulary and grammar instruction)?
5) How would you describe your level of understanding of the struggles and areas of support that ELs need to be successful in school?
6) How would you describe your relationship with your school administrators when it comes to feeling supported to effectively teach your ELs.
    a) How about your relationship with the district?
7) How would you describe the level of communication between you and the district when it comes to understanding:
    a) General changes in policy or curriculum that will affect you?
    b) Changes in policy or curriculum related to ELs that will affect you?
8) If your district approached you and asked how they could better support you to effectively teach your ELs, what would be your dream request?
    a) More realistically, what would you request?
9) If your site administrator approached you and said you could do something on campus to do with ELs, what would be your dream project?
    a) Outside the classroom?
    b) Inside the classroom?
10) In what ways, if any, did the Pathway Project support you and your teaching career inside the classroom?
11) In what ways, if any, did Pathway Project support you and your teaching career outside the classroom?
12) In what ways, if any, could the Pathway Project have supported you and your teaching career inside or outside the classroom?
13) In what ways, if any, did the Pathway Project affect your department or school culture?
14) Is there anything else you would like me to know about teaching ELs or professional development?

Appendix 3

Interview Protocol #1 - P.D. Facilitators

1) What is your name and age?
2) Tell me about your teaching experience and what led you to becoming a PD facilitator with the Pathway Project?
3) What experiences do you have teaching ELs?
4) In your own words, tell me about the mission of the Pathway Project.
5) In your own words, tell me how the design of the Pathway Project works to accomplish that mission.
6) What should teachers have accomplished or be able to do by the end of their participation with the Pathway Project?
7) I'm going to show you a series of statements about bilingual education and PD. Can you please rank these cards left to right, with the card you think the Pathway Project does the most of for teachers on the far left. *(follow up questions and statements below; ask about individual cards as necessary)*
    a) *(follow up question)* I noticed you weren't sure where to place this card. Why was that?
    b) *(follow up question)* You seemed very sure about the placement of this card. Can you talk about why you were so certain about where to place it?
    c) *(follow up question)* You rearranged these cards several times. Why was that?
    d) *(follow up question)* Can you tell me why you ranked this card as the one you agree/disagree with the most?
    e) *(Standards statement)* "The Pathway Project shows teachers how to make their EL instruction interactive, allowing ELs to collaborate with their native English-speaking peers."
    f) *(Standards statement)* "The Pathway Project shows teachers how to make their EL instruction value and build on ELs' home language and culture and other forms of prior knowledge."
    g) *(Standards statement)* "The Pathway Project shows teachers how to help their ELs build academic English and content knowledge at the same time, as opposed to teaching them vocabulary and grammar in isolation.
    h) *(Standards/Roadmap statement)* "The Pathway Project shows teachers how to make their EL instruction differentiated and intentionally designed for a learner's particular needs."
    i) *(Standards/ Roadmap statement)* "The Pathway Project shows teachers why it is important for ELs to continue developing their home language, in addition to learning English."
    j) *(Roadmap statement)* "The Pathway Project shows teachers that ELs should have the option to use their home language in the classroom to demonstrate their content knowledge."
    k) *(Standards statement)* "The Pathway Project shows teachers how to understand the CA ELD Standards."
    l) *(Standards statement)* "The Pathway Project shows teachers how to incorporate the CA ELD Standards into their daily teaching."

8) What makes the Pathway Project different from other PD programs aimed at helping teachers to effectively teach their ELs?
9) The State recently released the English Learner Roadmap to help articulate a common vision and mission for educating ELs and supporting local education agencies as they implement state policy. To your knowledge, has the Pathway Project been working to incorporate the principles outlined in it?
    a) If so, in what ways?
10) The State recently amended the bill that awards students the California State Seal of Biliteracy that recognizes high school graduates who have attained a high level of proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing one or more languages in addition to English. To your knowledge, has the Pathway Project been working to help teachers support their ELs to be eligible for this award?
    a) If so, in what ways?
11) How important are the CA ELD Standards to the design of the Pathway Project?
12) How important is state standardized testing to the design of the Pathway Project?
13) How much communication does the Pathway Project have with different levels of local educational agencies? State, district, etc.?
14) How much input or consideration from the district or individual schools does the Pathway Project take into the curriculum or design of the PD?
    a) What about from teacher input?
15) What challenges do participating teachers talk about when teaching their ELs?
16) What do you think is the most important skill/lesson that the Pathway Project helps participating teachers with that ELs need to be successful in school?
17) Beyond the classroom, what other skills or lessons do you hope participating teachers gain from participating in the Pathway Project?
18) *(Optional, if not addressed already)* What are some of the challenges participating teachers have observed their EL students struggling with while trying to be successful in school?
    a) In what ways, if any, does the Pathway Project work to help teachers overcome these challenges?

Appendix 4

Participating Teachers Recruitment Survey

DIRECTIONS: Please complete the following questions if you are interested in participating in a study about professional development related to teaching English learners (ELs). If you are chosen as a participant, you will be asked to participate in 1-2 interviews to help the researcher collect qualitative interview data on professional development related to teaching ELs. All data collected from these interviews will remain anonymous. Thank you for your help.

---

1. Full name: _____ Email: _____
2. How long have you been teaching? _____
3. What grades/classes do you currently teach? _____
4. Please rate how much experience you have teaching ELs. (1 = very experienced; 5 = minimal to no experience)
   1 2 3 4 5
5. In your experience teaching ELs, how challenging has it been for you to help your ELs be academically successful? (1 = very challenging; 5 = minimal to no challenge)
   1 2 3 4 5

Please briefly explain your number choice below.

_____
_____
_____
_____

6. In your experience, how important is it for all your students to do well on state- required standardized testing? (1 = very important; 5 = minimal to no importance)
   1 2 3 4 5

Please briefly explain your number choice below.

_____
_____
_____
_____

7. In your opinion, how important is it for teachers to align their teaching to the Common Core State Standards? (1 = very important; 5 = minimal to no importance)
   1 2 3 4 5

Please briefly explain your number choice below.

_____
_____
_____
_____

8. In your opinion, how important is it for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities? (1 = very important; 5 = minimal to no importance)
   1 2 3 4 5

Please briefly explain your number choice below.

_____
_____

_____
_____

9. About how often a year do you participate in professional development beyond what your school requires during teacher inservice days or early release days for students?

5+ times a year 3-4 times a year 1-2 times a year Never

10. Why are you participating in the Pathway Project?

_____
_____
_____
_____