

Special Issue
Preparation and Development of Mainstream Teachers for
Teaching Linguistically Diverse Classrooms

Guest Editor
Ana Maria Ortega

- Preparing Mainstream Teachers to Teach English Language Learners: A Review of the Empirical Literature
- Historical Preparation for Mainstream Teachers of English Language Learners: A Review of the Empirical Literature
- Beyond Competence: US Faculty Perspectives on Preparing General Education Faculty for EL Instruction
- Learning from Immigrant Linguistically Diverse Students: What a Contribution of Immigrant Teacher History
- Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of Middle School English Learners: Building on What We Know Works Effectively
- What Does Research Tell us About Educating Mainstream Teachers to Work with ELs?
- Transforming Education by Embracing Multilingual Learners

KAPPA DELTA PI
Routledge

ISSN: 0013-1725 (Print) 1938-8098 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/utef20>

Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of Middle School English Learners: Building on What We Know Works Effectively

Eric Haas, Julie Goldman & Christian Faltis

To cite this article: Eric Haas, Julie Goldman & Christian Faltis (2018) Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of Middle School English Learners: Building on What We Know Works Effectively, The Educational Forum, 82:2, 208-226, DOI: [10.1080/00131725.2018.1420865](https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2018.1420865)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2018.1420865>



Published online: 13 Mar 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of Middle School English Learners: Building on What We Know Works Effectively

Eric Haas 

College of Education and Integrative Studies, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Pomona, California, USA

Julie Goldman

San Diego County Office of Education, San Diego, California, USA

Christian Faltis

College of Education and Human Ecology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, USA

Abstract

Improving the writing of middle-school English learners can improve their academic thinking, literacy, and content knowledge. The Writing Reform and Innovation for Teaching Excellence (WRITE) program uses six high-leverage writing practices and develops teacher capacity through professional learning activities anchored in the group grading of common writing assignments. A recent 2-year evaluation of the WRITE program found that it increased middle-school teachers' implementation of best writing practices and also improved English learners' general literacy scores.

Key words: *English language arts, English language learners (ELLs), English language proficiency, English learners (ELs), literacy, middle school, teacher learning, teacher professional development, WRITE program, writing.*

Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of ELs

Writing is both a complex task that involves and enhances content-specific thinking (Bunch & Willett, 2013; Lee, Mahotiere, Salinas, Penfield, & Maerten-Rivera, 2009; Nar-gund-Joshi & Bautista, 2016) and an academic task required in classrooms and on many standardized tests (Lee et al., 2009; Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career, n.d.; Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, n.d.). For English learner students (ELs), writing ability has been linked consistently with greater academic achievement (Brown, 2005; Echevarria & Short, 2010). Thus, improving the writing ability of ELs should be a focus of all teachers, but for many, especially at the middle-school level, that requires building teachers' capacity to teach writing and expanding writing activities to make them a core part of every subject (Faltis & Coulter, 2008). In other words, math and science teachers, for example, must not only *include* writing in their classes but also *teach* writing in ways that will improve the writing ability and content knowledge of all learners, including ELs, reclassified ELs who are still progressing to academic fluency, and native English speakers or other students considered fully fluent in English.

Moving a school to writing across the subjects can be difficult and often requires fundamental shifts in how teachers teach and how schools operate as a system (Faltis & Coulter, 2008; Graham, Capizzi, Harris, Hebert, & Morphy, 2014; Yi, Kao, & Kang, 2017). Few secondary teachers have both subject matter expertise and bilingual or second-language acquisition expertise (Faltis & Coulter, 2008; Yi et al., 2017). Further, subject matter teachers may resist any push to have them *teach* writing as part of their class activities, even if they already include some writing in their teaching. Equally important, secondary students can struggle to develop strong writing abilities across subjects and genres given the increasing complexity of content knowledge and growing language demands of schooling as they progress from grade 6 to grade 12. For example, compared to EL students in third grade, sixth-grade ELs have been found to need much higher levels of English language proficiency (ELP) to reach the same passing rates on grade-level content tests in math and English language arts (ELA; Haas, Tran, & Huang, 2016).

Despite the likely difficulties, we contend that educators should work to implement high-quality, school-wide writing practices in secondary schools as a primary means of moving ELs and former ELs to full academic fluency in English, including levels of content knowledge that are comparable to their English-fluent peers. To accomplish this, educators in those schools must align what is known about second language literacy development for middle- and high-school ELs with classroom practices and professional learning that will enable teachers across the content areas to implement effective writing practices on a regular basis.

One program that works to improve EL writing is the Writing Reform and Innovation for Teaching Excellence (WRITE) Institute of San Diego County, California (<https://writeinstitute.sdcoe.net>). Initiated nearly 30 years ago, the WRITE Institute has developed a comprehensive secondary EL writing program that is accompanied by professional learning opportunities designed to equip teachers for its successful implementation. With funding from the Institute of Education Sciences, we recently evaluated the effectiveness of this program with middle-school ELs at the intermediate ELP level (Haas, Abedi, et al., 2016). The study examined the effectiveness of professional learning opportunities provided

through the program to promote desired changes in the practices of participating teachers and the effect of those practices and curriculum on the English literacy and writing ability of ELs. This article presents the results of that evaluation study (Haas, Abedi, et al., 2016), giving special attention to resulting changes in teacher practices and EL student outcomes. We begin with a brief review of the professional literature on second language acquisition and best practices for teaching writing with ELs. We then explain how the WRITE Institute drew on documented best practices in teaching and structured those ideas into a school-wide writing model for middle-school students, including an ongoing professional learning component. This explanation is followed by a presentation and discussion of key findings from the evaluation of the WRITE Institute and a brief concluding comment.

The Literature on Writing and Writing Instruction

Teachers who work in mainstream classrooms have an uphill battle to extend their pedagogical knowledge and practices for teaching writing effectively to all students, given the growing numbers of ELs they are finding in their classes. This is particularly true for middle-school teachers (Yi et al., 2017) who, on the whole, have been inadequately prepared to teach writing to ELs and receive very little professional development on this critical topic once they enter the teaching profession (Faltis & Coulter, 2008; Graham et al., 2014).

The research literature points to a need not only for mainstream teachers to receive professional learning on how to teach writing to ELs but also for ELs to receive opportunities across the content areas to learn academic writing practices and engage in the writing process (Yi et al., 2017). Here we provide highlights of the theoretical and empirical literature on writing instruction for second language learners that offers a foundation for teaching writing with these students. In general, this literature shows that over the past 50 years, four main theoretical orientations have influenced the teaching of writing to second language learners of English (Cumming, 2015): contrastive rhetoric, cognitive models of composing, genre approaches, and sociocultural theory. Highlights from this literature are instructive for our purposes.

Contrastive rhetoric and cognitive models of writing were developed primarily for adults in postsecondary contexts. For the most part, these models have largely fallen out of favor in recent years, as newer and more diverse orientations have taken hold in the field of writing (Cumming, 2015). Contrastive rhetoric approaches (Kaplan, 1972), which emphasize the differences in rhetorical conventions between two languages as a means to resolve consistent errors of second language learners in English, have been criticized for oversimplifying the writing of students from diverse cultural and language groups. Research by Purves and Purves (1986) found that the rhetorical structures of written texts varied just as greatly within language and cultural groups as between language and cultural groups, effectively nullifying the approach (Cumming, 2015; see also Heath, 1983; Mohan & Lo, 1985).

The cognitive orientation to writing instruction proposes that writers need to generate and self-monitor text through planning, organizing, and goal setting; convert thoughts into written language; and review and edit written work, while attending to the topic

Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of ELs

and the audience for whom the text is written (Hayes & Flower, 1980). This orientation is credited with promoting the process approach to writing instruction used in secondary and postsecondary education (Krapels, 1990). Research on the process approach to writing compared first and second language writing to understand the procedures students used in the process of writing that were cross-lingual, asking about the differences in effect on transfer between more- and less-able writers (Cummins, 1989). Essentially, this research showed that second language vocabulary, grammatical intuition, and language fluency were shaped by the extent to which learners were able to use writing process abilities learned in their first language for writing in their second language (Fitzgerald, 2006). A major criticism of the process approach to writing instruction is that feedback on form and expression in written work usually comes too late for students to learn from it through incorporating the feedback into their current assignment. Often this feedback is postponed until the end of the writing process, at which time learners are expected only to conduct more superficial reviews, such as proofreading, for the final revisions into the finished draft (Cumming, 2015; Polio, 2003).

A genre orientation to writing instruction aims to help teachers identify and understand the conventional organization of text types that students will need to be able to write in the various academic contexts (Cope & Kalantzis, 1993). Genre writing is about completing a task or meeting a goal, such as telling a story, recounting an incident, requesting a meeting, crafting an argumentative essay, forecasting a future event, describing a process, explaining how something works, or persuading someone to take a particular stance. Each of these genres follows certain conventions for how the message is organized, which can be described and taught to students (Hyland, 2004). In contemporary writing theory, genre is informed mainly by systemic-functional linguistics (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014), which argues that language use for meaningful communication occurs because people make choices among a range of resources to achieve certain functions that are socially recognizable. As Cumming (2015) described it, “Genres are said to occur as conventionally sequenced, goal-oriented, and patterned ways of organizing and combining oral and written discourse for social interactions” (p. 73). Research has shown that English learners use a variety of genres in and out of school settings that teachers can tap to make their writing instruction more culturally relevant (see de Oliveira & Silva, 2013).

Research has also shown that explicit instruction in writing particular genres yields the greatest writing gains among ELs (Fitzgerald & Amendum, 2007). According to Hyland (2004), explicit instruction provides teachers and learners alike with a “visible pedagogy” that makes clear for learners what they are expected to learn. This shift in teaching and learning from implicit and unguided instruction to a more explicit, scaffolded approach (Schleppegrell & O’Hallaron, 2011) enables learners to have more control and choice over the kinds of language best suited for the genre being taught (Schleppegrell, 2004). However, not all writing theorists and educators agree that genres should be taught explicitly to ELs, including those in middle school and high school. Cumming (2015) contends that because genres are linked to writing practices that occur in real life outside of school, it is difficult to create authentic practices with real audiences in classroom settings. Despite this criticism, there is much research that finds value in providing explicit instruction on what genres are and how people use them to get things done (Christie, 2012).

Sociocultural learning theories offer another perspective on how ELs develop writing practices. It is clear that writing is both a cognitive and a social act. That is, writing is developmental, involving understanding and activity as well as movement from self to other, and includes multiple authentic audiences. Sociocultural learning requires that writing instruction be integrated with content, modeled, and scaffolded so that learners become members of writing communities who use a range of genres and attend to a variety of rhetorical devices, depending on the audiences (Pritchard & Honeycutt, 2006). At the core of sociocultural theory is the concept that learners appropriate ways of being, thinking, and doing through continued collaboration with others who work to ensure their development of practices recognized as appropriate for membership in communities. For writing instruction, this means that teachers and students interact in ways that promote membership in writing communities, using genres and conventions valued within those communities. Sociocultural theory applied to writing instruction relies on modeling, scaffolding, and the continuous practice of writing in ways that are expected and valued in school and society (Moll, 1990).

Through six high-leverage writing practices, the WRITE secondary program operationalized the key elements of genre-based writing and sociocultural learning theory, while also including some of the organizational, metacognitive, and writing process elements of the cognitive orientation to writing. An overview of these practices and how they can be used to implement an English learner-supportive school-wide writing program follows.

The WRITE Institute Program: A School-Wide Writing Approach Built on Six High-Leverage Practices

While educational organizations have developed an array of resources to support teachers' implementation of writing instruction, few provide direct guidance for English learner-relevant instruction and foster a shared understanding around high-quality English learner-relevant instructional practices (see, e.g., Stanford University, 2013; TESOL International Association, 2013). Even fewer have specifically addressed the expectations surrounding written language, including its integration with content areas, and how best to structure writing instruction to support ELs' access to rigorous language demands across multiple subjects school-wide (California Department of Education, 2013; DiCerbo, Anstrom, Baker, & Rivera, 2014). To fill this gap, the WRITE Institute provides professional learning support to teams of teachers and administrators throughout California to develop both a shared understanding of and skills in high-quality writing instruction and assessment for language learners. For nearly three decades, the WRITE Institute has developed and refined their approach to innovative best practices in teaching writing for ELA, English language development (ELD), and dual-language Spanish language arts (SLA) contexts. Currently, WRITE's network serves more than 60 school districts, 1,200 language and content teachers, and 36,000 students in 12 demographically diverse California counties.

Research suggests that writing experiences should include practice in a wide range of academic skills, namely critical thinking and literacy skills that nurture independent writers to comprehend challenging content-area texts, value evidence, understand and critique different points of view, and use digital media to produce high-quality writing products (California Department of Education, 2013; Faltis & Coulter, 2008). Nevertheless,

Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of ELs

both language and content teachers often assign mostly writing prompts that require little in higher-order thinking (Vacca, 2002). Experience implementing WRITE over the years has shown that the traditional instructional approach is common in middle schools both in ELA and across content-area classes, where the emphasis has largely been on the drafting process, with little pre-writing activity.

WRITE flips and expands the traditional approach to teaching writing by placing a strong emphasis on the pre-writing process. During pre-writing, teachers engage ELs and other students with rich subject matter content, promote genre-based oral language development, and provide strategic scaffolds to support student writing. The writing activities build on these pre-writing activities. In other words, the WRITE approach focuses on building the capacity of teachers to cultivate academic literacy through complementary pre-writing and writing activities intended to develop the cognitive and tangible skills involved in reading, writing, and academic oral language. This approach draws on six high-leverage writing practices for secondary ELs: (1) teach genre writing as a process; (2) build on students' backgrounds; (3) model writing for and with students; (4) develop students' academic oral language; (5) teach grammar and vocabulary explicitly and in context; and (6) publish (and celebrate!) writing using technology. Developed by Goldman (2013), the six high-leverage writing practices are grounded in the latest theories of writing development discussed previously—genre-based writing and sociocultural learning theory but also selected organizational, metacognitive, and writing process elements from the cognitive orientation to writing—as well as research on best teaching practices for English language literacy and content development (see, e.g., Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2005; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007; Walqui & van Lier, 2010).

The first high-leverage practice—*teach genre writing as a process*—outlines WRITE's conceptualization of teaching writing as a six-phase, genre-based process and provides a frame for teachers and administrators to help them develop a shared understanding of what high-quality writing instruction looks like across content areas. As shown in Table 1, the six phases are organized in two tiers, the first of which focuses on pre-writing activities (introducing the genre, unpacking the genre, collaborating on the writing process) and the second on writing activities, including publishing students' work (drafting, revising, publishing). Nested within the six phases are the other five high-leverage practices, which are emphasized in specific phases but occur throughout the writing process.

In the following section we describe the six phases in the writing process, giving special attention to the high-leverage practices embedded within each and their relationship to one another. We then offer a brief description of salient professional learning opportunities the WRITE Institute offers participating teachers to support their effective implementation of the desired practices, including the group grading of common student writing assignments.

Phases in the Writing Process With Embedded High-Leverage Practices

Phase 1: Introducing the genre/emphasis on Practice 2 (building on students' backgrounds). In Phase 1, teachers create a clear vision for the students of the final writing product they are expected to produce by introducing the analytic rubric that will subsequently be used

Table 1. WRITE High-Leverage Practice 1: Overview of the Writing Process With Embedded High-Leverage Practices 2 through 5

Phase 1: Introducing the Genre (Teacher-Guided)	Phase 2: Unpacking the Genre (Teacher-Guided)	Phase 3: Collaborating on Writing (Student-Guided)
Introduce rubric criteria	<i>Practice 3: Model writing for and with students</i>	Engage in meaning-making: readings, discussions, and writing
<i>Practice 2: Build on students' backgrounds</i>		<i>Practice 4: Develop academic oral language</i>
		<i>Practice 5: Teach grammar and vocabulary in context</i>
Phase 4: Drafting (Student-Guided)	Phase 5: Revising (Student-Guided)	Phase 6: Publishing Writing Using Technology (Student-Guided)
Guide students to organize and draft writing	Score rough drafts Use data to inform instruction	<i>Practice 6: Publish (and celebrate!) student writing</i>

to evaluate their work. This phase places emphasis on assisting students in uncovering connections between their own backgrounds and the genre or content they are learning (Practice 2). To begin, teachers have students respond to a pre-writing prompt that requires them to use the target genre and related language. This activity generates baseline data that enable teachers to identify ELs' specific linguistic needs and design instruction to intentionally address those needs. By the end of Phase 1, all students should have a basic understanding of elements required in the final writing product, the list of criteria for assessing its quality, the phases they will experience in creating their written work, and how the genre and content relate to their own life experiences.

Building on students' background knowledge and experience facilitates opportunities for them to make meaningful connections to what they are learning and construct more accurate and sophisticated understandings in all content areas (Freeman & Freeman, 2007; Walqui & van Lier, 2010). Additionally, in-depth understandings of the diversity and depth of student backgrounds promotes better teaching because it fosters empathetic teacher-student relationships and allows teachers to better tailor their lessons to individual student needs and interests (Dolby, 2012; Osher, Cartledge, Oswald, Sutherland, Artiles, & Coutinho, 2004). An established body of research indicates that writing teachers can strengthen EL students' cognitive skills by encouraging them to develop their independent voices, share their personal perspectives, affirm their values, and view their family and neighbors as valuable sources of knowledge (Banks, 2008; Gay, 2010; Nieto, 2000). These contextualized, personal connections serve as anchors for new learning as students write to explore and think critically about family, school, community, and global issues (Kalyanpur, 2003; Nieto, 2000; Olsen, 2010). When ELs receive instruction that values their home cultures and primary languages, it prepares them for the complex task of writing. While teachers build on ELs' backgrounds throughout the instructional process, the WRITE model calls for them to intentionally design experiences for ELs to make meaningful connections to the genre or content during the pre-writing phase.

Phase 2: Unpacking the genre/emphasis on Practice 3 (modeling writing for and with students). In Phase 2, teachers unpack the genre by diving into the list of criteria and elements set forth

Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of ELs

in Phase 1 to reveal the usually unstated, unobserved processes of writing to their students. Teacher modeling of writing (Practice 3) is central to this process. Such modeling involves teachers writing and thinking aloud in front of the class. In doing so, teachers share their strategies for comprehending, analyzing, and deconstructing a prompt and texts. Students observe their teachers clarifying their thinking relative to text organization, sentence structure, and word choice. Of the six high-leverage writing practices, this one seems to have the greatest impact on students—and may also be the most challenging for teachers to learn (Haas, Abedi, et al., 2016). Modeling the metacognitive process involved in writing initiates discussions, reinforces content, promotes inquiry, fosters new learning, and encourages reflection (Goldberg, Russell, & Cook, 2003). Modeling the writing process not only supports secondary ELs in understanding the organization and structure of the writing product but also creates a space for the class to collectively reason and analyze how to write a text. In explaining the power of teacher modeling, Gallagher (2011) noted:

When my students see me wrestling with decisions as my writing unfolds, it gives them insight on how to compose their own pieces. I don't tell them how to draft their papers; I show them how I draft my papers. (p. 15)

In brief, when teachers model their thinking and decision making relative to a successful writing product, students see evidence of the writing criteria, language to support the specific writing product, and a structure or process for organizing the writing.

Phase 3: Collaborating on writing/emphasis on Practice 4 (developing academic oral language) and Practice 5 (teaching grammar and vocabulary in context). The third, multifaceted phase centers on transitioning ELs from pre-writing to writing activities by focusing on the development of complex skills and deep content knowledge through academic oral language use. Beginning in Phase 3 and extending through Phase 6, the teacher's role transitions from mostly directed guidance evident in phases 1 and 2 to facilitation of student-led activities with some teacher-directed instruction. In other words, ELs, and all students, are expected to take increasing responsibility for their own writing. To support ELs in developing skills as independent writers, teachers sometimes revisit activities begun in phases 1 and 2, such as analyzing the rubric criteria to understand the learning goals, practicing planning exercises to foster student autonomy, and connecting new learning (content or genre) to ELs' backgrounds, but they still require ELs to take the lead in their writing. These activities are frequently conducted in pairs or small groups in which ELs are provided opportunities to develop facility with academic oral language by using it. During Phase 3, teachers also provide explicit grammar and vocabulary instruction within the context of ELs' own reading and writing. In doing so, ELs experience a multilayered writing process: one that builds academic literacy and content knowledge in tandem as well as the metacognitive and self-regulation skills to enable students to draft, revise, and publish their individual writing products during phases 5 and 6.

Practice 4 highlights the need to promote academic talk, writing, and thinking as interdependent and thus the need to use language functions to scaffold all three. As Britton (1983) wrote, "reading and writing float on a sea of talk" (p. 11). Too frequently, secondary ELs have limited opportunities to speak in general or with peers (Soto, 2012). For this

reason, researchers and language experts promote the use of instructional strategies that support daily academic oral language practice, including repeated presentation of content, explicit explanations, modeling, and questioning (Garner & Bochna, 2004). Academic oral language practice involves engaging with the specific language needed to summarize, synthesize, compare, contrast, describe, evaluate, analyze, persuade, propose, narrate, research, and problem solve (Zwiers, 2014). In other words, secondary ELs need to experience how specific language functions work—and they need meaningful opportunities that foster authentic academic talk, like that used by content experts, such as literary critics, scientists, mathematicians, and historians (Bartolomé, 1998; Enright, 2010, 2011).

Learning to use oral academic discourse, just like learning to write, is an incredibly complex process, and a large body of research indicates that reading comprehension and writing ability, including cross-language reading comprehension and writing ability, correlate closely with oral language development (California Department of Education, 2010; Faltis & Coulter, 2010; Schleppegrell & Colombi, 2002). Oral language practice both facilitates reading and writing comprehension within languages and also transfers across languages (Miller & Johnson, 2004; Proctor, Carlo, August, & Snow, 2005). Academic oral language is widely accepted as the foundation on which all literacy skills develop and how ELs, and all students, learn to construct meaning through responding to and interacting with a broad range of texts (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). Thus, Phase 3 emphasizes regular academic talk among students as both an end in itself and as an essential step to successful academic writing.

Practice 5, also emphasized in Phase 3, underscores the need to teach grammar and vocabulary explicitly, both in the context of academic reading and within the context of the students' own writing. Research supports the idea that ELs need an organized way of acquiring focused, high-frequency academic vocabulary, including something as simple as keeping a vocabulary notebook (Olsen, 2010; Reid, 2011; Valdés, 2001). The intensive teaching of vocabulary in context in the ELA writing classroom is a critical skill linked to reading comprehension and academic oral language proficiency for ELs (Alidou & Kelch, 2007; Genesee et al., 2005; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007), with similar results likely across all content areas. The use of both indirect and direct grammar instruction, including word groups and sentence structure, helps secondary writers understand the structure of academic language (Olsen, 2010; Panofsky et al., 2005; Reid, 2011).

Phase 4: Drafting. During the drafting phase, teachers support students in organizing and drafting their writing pieces. The writing prompt provided to students during the drafting phase should be similar in style and complexity to that used in the pre-writing assessment administered prior to instruction. In Phase 4, students read and interpret the prompt and then organize and draft their writing. Additionally, teachers continue to provide mini-lessons and support students' work as needed.

Phase 5: Revising. During the revising phase, teachers score students' rough drafts using indicators included in the writing rubric that they first presented to the students in Phase 1. Based on data gathered from the initial assessment of ELs' drafts, teachers develop and teach mini-lessons on topics of identified need or revisit a specific criterion in small group

Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of ELs

instruction. As part of this phase, teachers also coordinate conferences with their ELs, guiding them through the self- and peer-editing process (Ferris, 2004). Preparing learners to conduct student-led conferences helps build their autonomy and understanding of the genre criteria, provides them with additional strengths-based feedback, and improves their abilities to self-edit.

Phase 6: Publish writing using technology/emphasis on Practice 6 (publishing student writing). Phase 6 and Practice 6 are coextensive and underscore the importance of publishing and celebrating the work of student authors. While there are effective low-tech and high-tech ways to publish student writing, studies show that students who use technology to write tend to write more, collaborate more, question more, and use more complex writing strategies (Goldberg et al., 2005). Research also suggests that publishing students' work can promote greater student engagement and higher quality of final products than when writing assignments are viewed only by the teacher (Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013). One critical component to the publishing practice is maintaining writing portfolios that help ELs understand, evaluate, and reflect on their language goals through multiple revisions of a single piece and connections between writing pieces (Hall & Simeral, 2008). As explained in Practice 1, the high-leverage writing practices approach to writing instruction begins with the published writing product in mind. By doing so, teachers change the far-too-common practice of assigning simplified, disconnected writing tasks that often sacrifice rigor to a practice based in the recursive improvement of a more limited number of demanding academic writing products, supported with intentional linguistic interventions intended to guide ELs toward academic writing proficiency and the development of deep content knowledge (Leki, Cumming, & Silva, 2008).

Supporting Teacher Learning in WRITE Programs

WRITE programs support participating teachers to teach genre writing as a process in their respective subjects by engaging them in learning opportunities specifically designed for this purpose. During professional learning sessions, teachers use the practices to guide their collective work around literacy (i.e., develop writing models and tasks across content areas, assess student work, and set language goals for their students). In these group sessions, teachers experience the six high-leverage practices as learners themselves and also collectively assess student writing using both a general genre-based rubric for the assignment and specific writing ability lenses for different levels of English language proficiency. Together, these two activities form the central components of a continuous improvement cycle around literacy instruction, the results of which the teachers apply in their respective classroom contexts.

To succeed, fundamental reforms in instructional practices also necessitate multiple years of sustained effort and teamwork, with teachers and administrators working jointly in professional learning teams to study and plan, build capacity, and implement the desired practices (Mandinach & Gummer, 2016; Tunison, 2016). One practice that simultaneously embodies all of these actions is gathering student data and grading anchor-writing assignments as a group. To this end, teacher teams in WRITE schools meet at least four times per year to review samples of student writing products. Using a common genre-based rubric and progress guidance instruments or lenses based on different levels of English language proficiency, the teachers score and discuss the student writing and compile

lists of ELs' strengths, areas of need, and likely misconceptions and miscues illuminated in their writing. Next, the group discusses possible causes for the strengths and weaknesses noted and collectively plans concrete actions for improving the effectiveness of the ELs' class experiences and writing achievement. The teachers then implement those actions in their respective classes and the process is replicated in subsequent group-scoring meetings. Teacher teams are centrally coordinated so that insights gained through these experiences can be aligned with school goals. As teacher teams build capacity, school-wide improvement occurs as they align their teaching with the analytic rubrics and language functions emphasized in school goals that are informed by state and national standards.

WRITE Institute: Evidence of Success

From 2011 through 2014, with support from the Institute of Education Studies, we studied the effectiveness of the WRITE program in changing ELD teacher practices and improving the standardized writing and literacy test scores of ELs at the intermediate English fluency level (Haas, Abedi, et al., 2016). Using an experimental design, we compared the practices of ELD teachers and outcomes of their students in the WRITE program (treatment) to the practices of ELD teachers and outcomes of their EL students using their typical practices (control) in two 2-year cohorts of middle schools (2011/12–2012/13 and 2012/13–2013/14). All ELD teachers, in both the WRITE (treatment) and typical practices (control) groups, taught in pullout classes with only ELs. It is important to note that the typical practices of the ELD teachers in the control group varied widely. While many used the type of decontextualized writing exercises that prevail in traditional classrooms, some employed genre-based writing practices similar to those advocated by the WRITE program. Twenty-seven schools, 62 teachers, and 372 students participated in the study for 2 years, and 34 schools, 96 teachers, and 1,195 students participated for at least one year.

The study results showed that after the second year, the WRITE ELD teachers implemented more research-based best writing practices than the ELD teachers, who had not participated in WRITE professional learning activities. There also was some evidence that the ELs of WRITE ELD teachers had greater achievement gains on standardized tests than ELs of the ELD teachers in the control group. Given that these findings are based on only 2 years of implementation, when new programs typically take three to five years to reach full implementation and effectiveness (Fullan, 2001; Hall & Hord, 2001; Taylor et al., 2015), we are confident that a fuller and wider implementation of the WRITE program beyond pullout ELD classes will produce greater improvements in teacher practices and could result in substantial gains in English learner achievement. In the following section we describe areas in which the WRITE program made the most substantive changes in teacher practice and student achievement. We also suggest ways to further enhance the implementation of the WRITE program.

Changes in Teacher Practice

To examine changes in teacher practices, we interviewed teachers using a 10-item protocol of best teaching writing practices. The protocol items overlapped directly with the six high-leverage writing practices promoted by the WRITE program (e.g., "Writing is taught as a genre-based process" overlaps with Practice 1 discussed above), but we added a few items on more general writing practices also drawn from the research literature

Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of ELs

(e.g., “Communication with families about writing program and student progress”). The research team scored teachers on the overall quantity and quality of the implementation of each writing practice on a scale of 1 (rarely used and/or low quality) to 3 (frequently used with a high level of quality). A total of 90 teachers participated in the interviews, 45 from the WRITE (treatment) group and 45 from the control group. Approximately half of the teachers from each group were randomly selected for interviews each year.

Three main findings emerged from the classroom interviews. First, the results of a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) (treatment versus control and Year 1 versus Year 2) showed that professional learning experiences the WRITE teachers received made a difference in five of the 10 best-writing practices examined at a significant level ($p < .05$) or at a level that approached significance ($.05 < p < .075$), but only after Year 2 of program implementation. These five best-writing practices were teaching writing as a genre-based practice, giving students choices that affirm their identities, monitoring student writing progress, providing formal and informal writing feedback, and communicating with families about student writing. Additionally, the total implementation score of individual WRITE teachers was higher than that of the teachers in the control group at a level approaching significance ($p < .07$; Haas, Abedi et al., 2016).

We also learned that for the five best practices for which no statistically significant difference between the WRITE teachers and their counterparts were found—student writing displayed, writing on a daily basis, sharing writing with peers, instruction on writing conventions and structure, and constructive responses from teacher and peers—the implementation scores for both groups of teachers were high, even after Year 1. For example, item 7 asked about the extent to which each teacher’s writing instruction covered writing conventions, sentence and text structures, purpose, and audience. Both the WRITE teachers and the teachers in the control group had average scores of 2.0 (out of 3) at the end of Year 1 of the study and average scores of 2.50 and 2.11, respectively, at the end of Year 2 of the study. Although there was greater improvement by the WRITE-trained teachers, the differences noted after Year 2 were not sufficient to reach statistical significance. This finding suggests that either this teaching practice is also emphasized in the professional learning provided to the ELD teachers in the control group or it is one of the easier best-writing practices for teachers to develop.

We further found that relative to communicating with parents about their students’ writing (item 10), a practice for which a significant treatment effect was noted in favor of WRITE ELD teachers, the results tended to mask an overall low implementation rate in both the treatment and control groups. For this item, the average score was below 2 (low implementation) for both groups at the end of Year 2, even though there was a significant difference between the WRITE ELD teachers (who averaged 1.83) and the ELD teachers in the control group (who averaged 1.22). This finding suggests that this particular best-writing practice is more difficult to master and implement than other practices and may take more than two years of participation in the program to reach at least a moderate level of implementation. Also, improvement in this practice may be dependent on factors other than the professional learning of individual teachers, such as changing school schedules so that teachers can call parents when they are available or having teachers with the ability to speak a second language.

Changes in Student Achievement

The WRITE Secondary program showed initial positive effects in the overall literacy achievement of intermediate ELs, but not in measures of writing alone (Haas, Abedi et al., 2016). In contrast, none of the outcome measures used showed a significantly positive impact in favor of ELs by similar ELD teachers using their usual practices (Haas, Abedi et al., 2016). Using both analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) and hierarchical linear modeling, we found that after completing one year in the WRITE program, ELs taught by ELD teachers who had received WRITE training for 2 years attained higher scores on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), which measures English language proficiency, compared to their EL peers in the control group. For the ANCOVA analysis, which tested the difference between all student scores in the WRITE (treatment) and typical practice (control) groups, the significance level was $p < .001$ and the effect size was 0.28, which is considered moderate (Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedges, 2004). For the hierarchical linear model analysis, which assessed the difference in student scores when grouped by schools within the WRITE (treatment) and typical practice (control) groups, the results approached statistical significance ($p < .10$) and the effect size was 0.15, which is considered small (Nye et al., 2004).

Along related lines, we found a greater reclassification rate (the rate of ELs who tested as fluent on the California English fluency assessment [CELDT]) between years 1 and 2 of the study for students of the WRITE-trained ELD teachers compared to their counterparts taught by the ELD teachers doing their typical practices. The reclassification rate was 30% (232/775) for the WRITE ELs, but a much lower rate of 18% (126/714) for the ELs of the teachers in the control group. The greater reclassification rate after Year 1 of the study may have lessened the influence of the treatment effect during Year 2 as the reclassified students, who had higher levels of English proficiency, exited from the study. Further analysis is needed to test this possible influence.

These preliminary findings point to the promise of the WRITE program in light of three considerations. First, the implementation of a new program in education—especially those that seek fundamental changes in teaching, as the WRITE program does—typically takes three to five years to reach full fidelity and effectiveness (Fullan, 2001; Hall & Hord, 2001). Additionally, research shows that it is difficult to find significant treatment effects on student achievement outcomes in an educational implementation, particularly when multischool randomized controlled trials, as employed in this study, are used (Gersten, 2009; Slavin, 2016; Sparks, 2015; Viadero, 2009). Furthermore, when significant effects are found, the size of the effect is usually smaller in studies using a randomized controlled trial in which the comparison is against a similar, established intervention and student outcomes are measured in terms of scores on standardized tests (Cheung & Slavin, 2015; Hill, Bloom, Black, & Lipsey, 2007).

Conclusions

The WRITE program promotes research-based best writing practices for EL students for use by mainstream teachers across the content areas at the middle- and even high-school levels. After 2 years of implementation, the preliminary results from this experimental study of ELD teachers in pullout classes of only ELs showed that preparing teachers to use the high-leverage practices the WRITE program promotes can lead

Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of ELs

to significant improvements in teaching writing practices. The results also suggest that a longer and broader implementation of school-wide writing across the content areas combined with ongoing, systemic professional learning teams, like those facilitated by WRITE, could lead to greater English learner achievement. The overall evidence suggests the value of further study to determine which aspects of the WRITE program and training are most effective and how to enable these aspects to produce larger effects more consistently in typical school contexts across multiple subjects.

Funding

The U.S. Department of Education Institute for Education Sciences provided funding for this study.

ORCID

Eric Haas  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4456-1083>

References

- Alidou, H., & Kelch, K. (2007). Reading and vocabulary skills in the L2 classroom. In A. Uludag & M. E. Butler-Pascoe (Eds.), *English interactive online (EIO) language policy and educational, cultural, and political concerns*. San Jose, CA: Cisco Learning Institute.
- Banks, J. A. (2008). *An introduction to multicultural education* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bartolomé, L. I. (1998). *The misteaching of academic discourses: The politics of language in the classroom*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Britton, J. (1983). Writing and the story of the world. In B. M. Kroll & G. Wells (Eds.), *Explorations in the development of writing: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 3–30). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Brown, C. L. (2005). Equity of literacy-based math performance assessments for English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(2), 337–364. doi:10.1080/15235882.2005.10162839
- Bunch, G. C., & Willett, K. (2013). Writing to mean in middle school: Understanding how second language writers negotiate textually-rich content-area instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(2), 141–160. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.007
- California Department of Education. (2010). *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches*. Sacramento, CA: CDE Press.
- Cheung, A., & Slavin, R. E. (2015). *How methodological features affect effect sizes in education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research and Reform in Education. Retrieved from http://www.bestevidence.org/word/methodological_Sept_21_2015.pdf
- Christie, F. (2012). *Language education throughout the school years: A functional perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (1993). *The powers of literacy: A genre approach to teaching writing*. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.
- Cumming, A. (2015). Theoretical orientations to L2 writing. In R. Manchón & P. Kei Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of second and foreign language writing* (pp. 65–90). Boston, MA: Walter de Gruyter.

- Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- de Oliveira, L., & Silva, T. (Eds.). (2013). *L2 writing in secondary classrooms. Student experiences, academic issues, and teacher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- DiCerbo, P., Anstrom, K., Baker, L. L., & Rivera, C. (2014). A review of the literature on teaching academic English to English language learners. *Review of Educational Research*, 84(3), 446–482. doi:10.3102/0034654314532695
- Dolby, N. (2012). *Rethinking multicultural education for the next generation: The new empathy and social justice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Echevarria, J., & Short, D. (2010). Programs and practices for effective sheltered content instruction. In California Department of Education (Ed.), *Improving Education for English learners: Research-based approaches* (pp. 251–321). Sacramento, CA: CDE.
- Enright, K. A. (2010). Academic literacies and adolescent learners: English for subject-matter secondary classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44(4), 804–810. doi:10.5054/tq.2010.237336
- Enright, K. A. (2011). Language and literacy for a new mainstream. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(1), 80–118. doi:10.3102/0002831210368989
- Faltis, C., & Coulter, C. (2008). *Teaching English learners and immigrant students in secondary schools*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Ferris, D. (2004). The “grammar correction” debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime ...?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1), 49–62. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.005
- Fitzgerald, J. (2006). Multilingual writing in preschool through 12th grade: The last 15 years. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 337–354). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Fitzgerald, J., & Amendum, S. (2007). What is sound writing instruction for multilingual learners? In S. Graham, C. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 289–307). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2007). *English language learners: The essential guide*. New York, NY: Scholastic.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gallagher, K. (2011). *Write like this: Teaching real-world writing through modeling and mentor texts*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Garner, J., & Bochna, C. (2004). Transfer of a listening comprehension strategy to independent reading in first-grade students. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32(2), 69–74. doi:10.1007/s10643-004-1071-y
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2005). English language learners in U.S. schools: An overview of research findings. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 10(4), 363–385. doi:10.1207/s15327671espr1004_2
- Gersten, R. (2009, October 19). No success like failure? Examining the “no effects” phenomenon in education research. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2009/10/21/08gersten.h29.html>

Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of ELs

- Goldberg, A., Russell, M., & Cook, A. (2003). The effect of computers on student writing: A meta-analysis of studies from 1992 to 2002. *Journal of Technology, Learning, and Assessment*, 2(1). Retrieved from <https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/jtla/article/view/1661>
- Goldman, J. (2013). *Teachers' sense of efficacy in teaching second language writing to middle and high school long-term English learners* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3591993)
- Graham, S., Capizzi, A., Harris, K., Hebert, M., & Morphy, P. (2014). Teaching writing to middle school students: A national survey. *Reading and Writing*, 27(6), 1015–1042. doi:10.1007/s11145-013-9495-7
- Graham, S., MacArthur, C., & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Best practices in writing instruction* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Haas, E., Abedi, J., Faltis, C., Chung, H., Tran, L., Chen-Gaddini, M., & Geary, S. (2016). *Impact of the WRITE program on English learner achievement and teacher instructional practice: Final performance report to the Institute of Education Sciences*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.
- Haas, E., Tran, L., & Huang, M. (2016). *English learner students' readiness for academic success: The predictive potential of English language proficiency assessment scores in Arizona and Nevada* (REL 2017–172). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory West. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hall, P., & Simeral, A. (2008). *Building teachers' capacity for success: A collaborative approach for coaches and school leaders*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hayes, J., & Flower, L. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. Gregg & E. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 3–30). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, C. J., Bloom, H. S., Black, A. R., & Lipsey, M. W. (2007). *Empirical benchmarks for interpreting effect sizes in research* (MDRC Working Paper on Research Methodology). Retrieved from <http://www.mdrc.org/publication/empirical-benchmarks-interpreting-effect-sizes-research>
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Kalyanpur, M. (2003). A challenge to professionals: Developing cultural reciprocity with culturally diverse families. *Focal Point*, 17(1), 1–6.
- Kaplan, R. (1972). *The anatomy of rhetoric: Prolegomena to a functional theory of rhetoric: Essays for teachers*. Philadelphia, PA: Center for Curriculum Development.
- Krapels, A. (1990). An overview of second language writing process research. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 37–56). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Lee, O., Mahotiere, M., Salinas, A., Penfield, R., & Maerten-Rivera, J. (2009). Science writing achievement among English language learners: Results of three-year intervention in urban elementary schools. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 32(2), 153–167. doi:10.1080/15235880903170009
- Leki, I., Cumming, A., & Silva, T. (2008). *A synthesis of research on second language writing in English*. Oxford, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Mandinach, E., & Gummer, E. (2016). *Data literacy for educators: Making it count in teacher preparation and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Miller, M. D., & Johnson, J. S. (2004). Phonological and lexical-semantic short-term memory and their relationship to sentence production in older adults. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, 11(4), 395–415. doi:10.1080/13825580490521331
- Mohan, B., & Lo, W. (1985). Academic writing and Chinese students: Transfer and developmental factors. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(3), 515–534. doi:10.2307/3586276
- Moll, L. (Ed.). (1990). *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Nargund-Joshi, V., & Bautista, N. (2016). Which comes first—language or content? *The Science Teacher*, 83(4), 24–30. doi:10.2505/4/tst16_083_04_24
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Nye, B., Konstantopoulos, S., & Hedges, L. (2004). How large are teacher effects? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26(3), 237–257. doi:10.3102/01623737026003237
- Olsen, L. (2010). *Reparable harm: Fulfilling the unkept promise of educational opportunity for California's long term English learners*. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together.
- Osher, D., Cartledge, G., Oswald, D., Sutherland, K. S., Artilles, A. J., & Coutinho, M. (2004). Cultural and linguistic competency and disproportionate representation. In R.utherford, M. Quinn, & S. Mather (Eds.), *Handbook of research in behavioral disorders* (pp. 54–77). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Panofsky, C., Pacheco, M., Smith, S., Santos, J., Fogelman, C., Harrington, M., & Kenney, E. (2005). *Approaches to writing instruction for adolescent English language learners*. Providence, RI: The Education Alliance at Brown University. Retrieved from <https://www.brown.edu/academics/education-alliance/sites/brown.edu/academics/education-alliance/files/publications/apprchwrtnng.pdf>
- Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career. (n.d.). *Assessments: Next Generation assessments*. Retrieved from <http://parcc-assessment.org/assessments>
- Polio, C. (2003). Research on second language writing: An overview of what we investigate and how. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 35–65). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Pritchard, R. J., & Honeycutt, R. L. (2006). The process approach to writing instruction: Examining its effectiveness. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *The handbook of writing research* (pp. 275–290), New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Proctor, C. P., Carlo, M. S., August, D., & Snow, C. (2005). Native Spanish-speaking children reading in English: Toward a model of comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 246–256. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.246
- Purves, A., & Purves, W. (1986). Viewpoints: Cultures, text models, and the activity of writing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 20(2), 174–197. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40171076>

Writing Practices for Mainstream Teachers of ELs

- Reid, J. (2011). *Writing myths: Applying second language research to classroom teaching*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Schleppegrell, M. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schleppegrell, M., & Colombi, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schleppegrell, M., & O'Hallaron, C. (2011). Teaching academic language in L2 secondary settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(1), 3–18. doi:10.1017/s0267190511000067
- 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.
- Slavin, R. (2016, April 28). Seeking jewels, not boulders: Learning to value small, well-justified effect sizes. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-e-slavin/seeking-jewels-not-boulders_b_9794098.html
- Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. (n.d.). Smarter assessments: Summative assessment: The end-of-the-year test. Retrieved from <http://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments>
- Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Soto, I. (2012). *ELL shadowing as a catalyst for change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Sparks, S. (2015, November 11). RTI practice falls short of promise, research finds. *Education Week*, 35(12), 1, 12.
- Stanford University. (2013). Understanding language [Web content]. Retrieved from <http://ell.stanford.edu/>
- Taylor, J. A., Getty, S. R., Kowalski, S., Wilson, C. D., Carlson, J., & Van Scotter, P. (2015). An efficacy trial of research-based curriculum materials with curriculum-based professional development. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52(5), 984–1017. doi:10.3102/0002831215585962
- TESOL International Association. (2013, April). *Implementing the Common Core State Standards for English learners: The changing role of the ESL teacher. A summary of the TESOL International Association convening*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Tunison, S. (2016). *Cultivating knowledge: Promoting research to enrich everyday practice*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense.
- Vacca, R. (2002). From efficient decoders to strategic readers. *Educational Leadership*, 60(3), 6–11. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Richard_Vacca/publication/296870969_From_Efficient_Decoders_to_Strategic_Readers/links/0f31752e7a8045ac59000000.pdf
- Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Viadero, D. (2009, March 31). “No effects” studies raising eyebrows. *Education Week*, 28(27), 1, 14–15. Retrieved from https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2009/04/01/27rct_ep.h28.html

Haas et al.

- Walqui, A., & van Lier, L. (2010). *Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent English language learners: A pedagogy of promise*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.
- Yi, Y., Kao, C.-C., & Kang, J. (2017). Middle and high school writing. In J. I. Liontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Zwiers, J. (2014). *Building academic language: Meeting common core standards across disciplines, grades 5–12* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.