I’ve slowly come to the realization that there is no one magic way to implement the SIOP® model. If districts are willing to take the necessary time to train, build momentum, and effectively provide follow-up and support, they can be successful. I’ve seen too many examples of successful districts with different approaches to believe that there is a precise formula that everyone must follow.

John Seidlitz, SIOP® National Faculty
In this chapter we showcase a number of SIOP® professional development programs. As mentioned in the Introduction to this book, these examples are by no means the only schools and districts where effective SIOP® implementation and professional development is happening. We meet countless dedicated educators in the United States and abroad who are working diligently to provide quality SIOP® instruction to second language learners, many with impressive results. Our goal here is to provide a variety of examples to reach the widest audience possible: rural schools and urban schools; elementary settings and secondary settings; small districts and large districts; funded programs and unfunded programs; programs at a single school or statewide programs; all from various geographic locations.

We will begin with an overview of implementation options and then present specific implementation and professional development situations.
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Statewide SIOP® Implementation

In some states, the SIOP® Model is part of an overall educational reform effort. For example, in Idaho, SIOP® training began as part of a reading improvement initiative. Initially, twelve school districts from across the state were selected and one representative from each district became a reading fellow responsible for facilitating implementation of reading strategies throughout the district. Over the course of eighteen months, these reading fellows received training from a number of reading experts, as well as learning the SIOP® Model through attendance at a SIOP I Institute®. After receiving reading and SIOP® Model training, the reading fellows brought their new expertise back to their school district and worked with teachers in grades K–8.

In the one district that was the focus of the interview, a reading fellow, Laurie Beebe, spent half a day meeting with teachers during their collaboration time. She helped teachers develop reading strategies and showed teachers where the strategies fit into a SIOP® lesson. The district superintendent was supportive of the SIOP® Model and reading strategies “marriage” and promoted the idea that all teachers are teachers of reading and the SIOP® Model. His support provided the impetus for that thinking throughout the district.

The role of the SIOP® Model was described by Laurie Beebe in the following way:

Most content teachers are not aware of how to teach reading. So, what (SIOP®) provided was an avenue to take content and demonstrate to teachers that language can be taught within content subjects: how to use vocabulary, comprehension, and decoding strategies with the older grades, and what can be done as an intervention with kids who are simply not understanding. Along with that . . . we had to have something in the area of, How do we help our second language kids? . . . In fact, that’s really our main focus: How do we get academic information to the kids who have really limited backgrounds and limited language? They are expected to take (standardized) tests when they don’t even have strong academic language.

With SIOP®, the whole learning process gels together. SIOP® has demonstrated to teachers how to plan a lesson, how to use reading strategies during that lesson, and how to review at the end of the lesson. Reading strategies were being stressed to teachers before SIOP®, so that foundation was already present when SIOP® was presented to the district.

Since the time of the statewide initiative, many universities in Idaho have formed a collaborative, and faculty provide SIOP® professional development at the teacher education level as well as for inservice teachers.

Districtwide SIOP® Implementation

Many districts have made SIOP® professional development and implementation a district priority or district initiative. For example, two urban districts, one in Phoenix and one in Kansas City, Missouri, had similar experiences in quite different settings. Creighton School District in Phoenix has nine schools, serving students in grades K–8. It is located in the Southwest, and English learners have been part of the fabric of the schools for decades. Kansas City Missouri School District (KCMSD), on the other hand, has seventy-two
Schoolwide SIOP® Implementation

In several places, SIOP® Model implementation began at one school. While widespread implementation is impressive, recommendations made in the Epilogue sometimes suggest that starting small is useful so there is a model school for the others to follow. For example, Lela Alston Elementary School in Phoenix was the only SIOP® school in the district for almost four years. Their focus was on developing high-quality SIOP® implementation in every classroom, and they had a strong SIOP® support component (see description in the next section of this chapter). Their student achievement gains on the state standards test brought attention to the school, and interest in the SIOP® eventually spread to other schools in the district.

However, being the only school may create vulnerability. A change in district personnel threatened continuation of the SIOP® Model at Alston School. Although other schools were scheduled to begin SIOP® implementation as well, when a new assistant superintendent for instruction (who is no longer in the district) joined the district, he wanted to have his own “stamp” on the district and did not support SIOP® training. For some time it appeared as though SIOP® training would not be continued, but grassroots support overcame district resistance. Currently, a number of schools in the district have received SIOP® professional development.

Another district reported that a difficulty of being the designated SIOP® school is that while the school staff is focused on sustaining SIOP® professional development activities, the district may have a number of other initiatives that compete for time, effort,
and funds. Sometimes there may not be a good understanding at the district level of the focused effort required to implement any program to a high degree and have it impact student achievement.

In conclusion, there is not necessarily one best way to implement the SIOP® Model. The decision depends on many of the factors discussed in Chapter 2.

**Sample SIOP® Professional Development Programs**

In this section, we will present a number of examples of implementation from around the United States. Essentially three types of models emerged from the interviews:

1. A district representative or team attended a SIOP Institute®, then returned to the district and carried out a professional development program (see Appendix A for a description of SIOP Institutes®);

2. A district representative or team attended a SIOP Institute®, returned to the district, and developed a plan for sending the rest of the staff to SIOP Institutes® or contracted with SIOP® National Faculty to provide staff training.

3. An individual or group began a book study of *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP® Model*, and began learning and practicing the components of the SIOP® Model.

These professional development plans have not been empirically tested, so we are not endorsing them as effective models of professional development. However, they reflect practices that are taking place around the country and have some elements of what we know to be effective professional development, as discussed in Chapter 2.

**Teachers Trained with No Start-up Cost**

**Kansas City, Missouri.** As part of the district’s strategic plan, every teacher in this midwestern urban district of 27,000 students and 4,000 teachers will be trained in the SIOP® Model. In 2002, the director of language services, Alicia Miguel, attended a SIOP Institute® and took the training back to her district. The district practiced job-embedded professional development wherein grade-level or content area teachers are released together during the school day to receive professional development. In elementary schools, specialists (art, music, PE teachers) work with the children during teachers’ release time, and secondary teachers meet during their planning periods.

Alicia targeted one school, Gladstone Elementary, for initial SIOP® training. During the first year, she went to the school twice a week, each time meeting with grade-level teams, the support teachers such as ESL, art, music and PE teachers, and the instructional coach. There were four teachers at each grade level, and there were three ESL teachers; Alicia met with seven groups each week. For example, on Tuesday mornings, she met with kindergarten teachers and the primary ESL teacher from 9:00 to 10:00, then first grade teachers from 10:05 to 11:00, and so on. Each grade-level team met once per week and learned one SIOP® component per month starting with Preparation and ending with Review/Assessment. During the meetings, the group discussed the chapter that corresponded to the component they were focusing on and they watched video clips and
discussed them so that they fully understood each component. As Alicia worked with the teachers, she was deepening her own knowledge and understanding of the SIOP® Model as well. All eight components were introduced and studied in the first year.

The second year focused on implementation. The instructional coach, Charlotte Daniel, met with teachers once per week to plan lessons, observe the lessons, and debrief. She also modeled SIOP® lessons as needed. Then Alicia met with the school’s instructional coach and the teachers once per month to ensure that the components were adequately represented in the lesson plans and that the observations and debriefing sessions were productive. Some of the lessons were videotaped and used in the meetings. The computer teacher at the school assisted the teachers in videotaping the lesson at the same time that teachers were observing and taking notes. The following week, during the regular SIOP® meeting, they watched the video clip together and discussed the notes, questions, or suggestions that teachers had written during the observation. Videotaping was very useful because they could rewind and replay if something was in question or if teachers did not remember how something was done. Lessons were also observed in person by peers. For example, during the third grade teachers’ release time, they would visit a second grade classroom and observe a SIOP® lesson. In this way, the teachers had an opportunity to see a SIOP® lesson implemented and could debrief a specific lesson.

In the third year, Charlotte, the instructional coach, worked with the teachers through weekly grade-level meetings. At this point, all staff knew the SIOP® and had developed “the language of SIOP®,” which facilitated implementation. Observations were done with their own grade levels, e.g., third grade teachers observed a third grade lesson. Teachers felt it was more meaningful to observe a lesson that they would teach themselves.

Aside from the cost of the SIOP® book for each teacher, there were no additional costs to the district for comprehensive training at the pilot school. As professional development expanded districtwide, SIOP® National Faculty (professional developers) were brought in to assist with the district’s widespread effort. The goal for the first year of expansion was to have 60 percent of the district’s 4,000 teachers receive SIOP® professional development and the remaining 40 percent the following year.

New School . . . New Vision

Lela Alston Elementary School, Phoenix, Arizona. This endeavor was funded by a federal Title III grant for professional development. A new K–3 school, Lela Alston Elementary School, had been opened in the district and was selected to receive SIOP® training as a pilot site with other schools in the district to follow if the project was successful. At the end of Alston’s first year, a team of seven people attended a SIOP Institute® in Long Beach, California. The team included two district office personnel, Marcy Granillo and Irma Pastor; two district language specialists, Rueben Huerta and Lisa Kempton; and three people from Lela Alston Elementary School, principal Debbie Hutson, coach Wanda Holbrook, and trainer and lead SIOP® teacher Kendra Moreno. The Alston team consisted of the principal, the coach, and a third grade teacher. After the training, the Alston team was expected to train the rest of the school. The second and third years were when implementation and training took place (2002–2003 and 2003–2004). It was also expected that districtwide workshops would be held to educate others in the SIOP® Model. These districtwide workshops were on a volunteer basis.
The Title III grant provided stipends for training, money for supplies, a full-time coach (Wanda), and a stipend for a lead SIOP® teacher (Kendra). The funding was also used for staff training both years, a weekend staff retreat twice a year for the entire staff, and for substitute teachers. Substitutes were brought in to allow one grade level at a time a day or half a day to work out of their classroom together with Kendra and Wanda. Each teacher at the school received the SIOP® book and some supply materials.

The training team—the lead teacher, principal, and coach—completed a time line for the two years. As they went through the two years, they implemented one component per quarter with a cumulative effect.

The staff was provided training and support in a number of ways.

- The SIOP® coach (Wanda) and lead teacher/coach (Kendra) conducted whole staff trainings (twenty-three teachers, including special education teachers, plus paraprofessionals). The district’s staff development program provided for one early release day per quarter, so those four days were used for SIOP® trainings. The staff met for four or five hours after the children were released. At the training, the staff was introduced to each feature of the selected component, watched the SIOP® videos, and had discussions around the practices they had seen. It took the entire two years to get through all the components in a comprehensive way.

- Substitutes were used to allow Wanda and Kendra to work with individual grade level teachers wherein they did lesson planning, preparation, and sometimes a more in-depth look at the component.

- Each quarter Wanda modeled and/or teamed with each teacher, including the special area teachers, to present a lesson. Wanda and the teacher planned a lesson during a preconference and discussed the lesson later. Most of the lessons were reading based. During the first two years the lessons were given a number rating, and a detailed discussion followed. As the value of the discussion became more obvious, the number rating was discontinued and the observations more focused on the features observed in the lesson.

- Teachers’ lessons were observed and rated. During the first year, teachers used the entire protocol to conduct peer observations with another teacher they felt comfortable with. During the second year, teachers were comfortable enough with the process that their lessons could be rated on the specific components they had studied. Wanda observed a lesson from every teacher using the SIOP® protocol. She met with the teacher during prep time or after school and discussed the observation.

- Videotaping of teachers’ lessons began in the spring of 2004 and continued in the 2004–2005 school year. A video camera was purchased with some of the SIOP® grant funds, and the coach videotaped every teacher doing a SIOP® lesson. Afterward, she and the teacher watched the video together and completed the SIOP® protocol. Then the tape was given to the teacher to guarantee privacy; it was meant for their professional growth only. In the fall of 2005, they began the second round of videotaping, with the teachers taping one another and rating the lesson or asking the coach to be involved. Peer videotaping proved to be more stressful and more of a risk than working with the coach, with whom trust had been built.
Struggling to Get It Going

San Antonio, Texas. This district, located on the south side of San Antonio, had a student enrollment of more than 10,000 students. The schools were experiencing rapid growth resulting from the construction of a new Toyota plant and other satellite industries. At the time of the interview, nineteen new housing developments were accommodating the migration of families to the district, which is expected to double in size over the next few years. The school system was being transformed from a small rural district to a growing suburban one.

In 2005, the district hired a new superintendent and later hired several key administrators, including the assistant superintendent for instruction and support services and the director of bilingual/ESL programs. All had previously worked in larger districts where the SIOP® Model was implemented effectively. When they arrived, their intent was to provide professional development and facilitate use of the SIOP® Model in the schools using an implementation model similar to one they had used before. With approximately 1,500 English learners and growing, and declining test scores at the secondary level, the need was clear. However, there were some struggles they had not anticipated that prevented them from making rapid progress in the implementation of SIOP® Model.

Understanding district culture and systems has been the topic of many “Leadership 101” classes but is sometimes overlooked when creating new initiatives. This case was no exception and required some rethinking of the initial SIOP® implementation plan. While many of the administrators understood ELs were not successful in core subject areas, only a few had an instructional background in effective approaches for English learners. Some were unfamiliar with sheltered instruction strategies and did not know what to look for when they went into classrooms already impacted with English learners.

The second issue that had to be dealt with was the lack of understanding of the importance of academic language. The relationship between academic language and school success had to be understood before SIOP® could be made a priority. Laying the foundations of the interplay between academic language and academic achievement continues to be an area of constant staff development. Administrators and mainstream staff understand the importance of vocabulary instruction; however, explicit teaching of specific language structures that are found in cause and effect relationships, comparisons, etc., needs development. These structures make up a large part of the formation of language objectives, a major feature of the SIOP® Model.

Third, there were programmatic service delivery issues. For example, some students in secondary schools were placed in ESL classes by grade level, not English proficiency level, so that all seventh grade ELs were in the same class regardless of English proficiency, while one school had a sheltered team and the others did not.

Also, funds were used differently from the way to which the new administrators were accustomed. In their previous experience, English learners generated 50 percent more of the regular ADA, so there were ample funds to develop a district program replete with SIOP® coaches, resources, a staff development plan to train all teachers and administrators at the secondary level in SIOP®, and a resource library for sheltered core teachers. Title II and Title III funds were used for intensive staff development of the SIOP® Model and ongoing monitoring and evaluation measures. In this state, funding formulas were different—the use of funds, especially local funds, was more conservative. Keeping ample reserves of funds was prudent, so that the program was not funded to its maximum.
Finally, some teachers had been trained in SIOP® at a regional service center or as part of a university grant, but there was no systemic district program of implementation or monitoring.

In facing these and other obstacles, the director of bilingual/ESL programs saw the need to 1) provide a systematic implementation plan; 2) educate principals and administrators in the effectiveness of the model; 3) use student data and various state monitoring reports as the rationale and impetus for the planned SIOP® training; and 4) develop some key people at campuses to learn and incorporate the SIOP® Model well in their classrooms so that they could eventually become SIOP® coaches and provide support and model lessons for others.

The first year was spent “understanding the system” and forming relationships with key principals. After the state test scores came back in the spring, a group of secondary principals and assistant principals were sent to the Administrative SIOP® training using Title III funds. That fall a new junior high principal, a former bilingual teacher with instructional expertise, attended the three-day teacher training of SIOP®. With her understanding of the model she was then able to go into classrooms of a few teachers who had been previously trained and had instructional conversations about the SIOP® components. In addition, this principal understood the immediate need to have all of her staff trained in SIOP® and a specific sheltered team established in her building.

The following fall, a group of ESL teachers and an assistant principal developed a database that is evolving into a rubric of language proficiency and achievement scores, using the LAS assessment, the state annual language proficiency scores, benchmark scores, and Reading Proficiency Test in English (RPTE) and TAKS scores. Writing scores using writing traits, as well as other reading assessments, will be added to the database/rubric to determine proficiency levels. ESL classes were then structured around proficiency levels. The bilingual/ESL director advised the group as to the content of ESL classes so that they not only developed English language, but were the foundational classes of academic language for success in sheltered classes. They established ESL blocks so that beginning students could have concentrated time to improve their English proficiency around the specific areas of vocabulary and content discourses they would encounter in either their SIOP® or content classes.

At the time of the interview, a state report requesting a plan to improve state testing results of ELs was just completed. All of the secondary principals and their teams were able to review the current programs at their sites and agree to a number of plans: a consistent model of ESL courses for the district; the formation of SIOP®-trained content teams; a plan for more teacher and administrative training in SIOP®; and a building coaching model. (Some content teachers from the secondary schools have attended SIOP® training and have begun learning and practicing the model. Implementation has been quite uneven in classrooms without follow-up support and currently, the bilingual/ESL director is watching for some strong SIOP® teachers to emerge so that they could become SIOP® coaches.) These coaches would facilitate high-quality implementation of the SIOP® Model.

Once all teachers knew the model, the goal was to have the ESL, sheltered, and mainstream teachers on teams so that the ESL teachers understood the expectations of the sheltered and mainstream classes and vice versa. Collaboration among the teachers would enhance service delivery to students by improving instruction through an analysis of student data and using targeted proven interventions to those English learners at risk.
While all schools have agreed to the new model, the degree of “buy-in” is relative to the instructional leadership at the campus level and the marshalling of support from the central office and other entities. The ultimate goal is to have one school serve as a model to others—and generate interest in replicating it—once those teachers have improved instruction to students; student achievement will improve as a result.

Statewide Literacy Initiative That Includes the SIOP® Model

Idaho. As part of a statewide introduction to the SIOP® Model, district staff attended a SIOP Institute® in 2003, learned the model, and then began training teachers in their district. Ten people in the district received training, and those individuals worked together to teach the eight components to the entire district staff, K–12.

Training was tailored to the different grade levels. In K–5, the eight components were presented once a month. Wednesday afternoons were scheduled as collaboration time, and one day a month during teachers’ regular collaboration time, one of the components would be presented to them.

At the middle school, they had weekly collaboration time. Collaboration teams were grade level teachers who met weekly to discuss student issues and schedules, and received professional development instruction. One of the district SIOP® trainers had as part of her job description to go to the middle school once a week and teach reading strategies. Within those reading strategy discussions they would talk about a component of SIOP®. For example, in discussion of a reading strategy she would point out that in order to use the strategy, students’ background needs to be built first. Then she would present the SIOP® component for building background effectively. SIOP® lesson planning and instructor modeling were used to present the instructional segment of the collaboration meeting.

Training was more actual modeling for those teachers in grades K–8—mostly the core teachers—because when the core teachers have their block time for collaboration, that’s when the students go to PE and art and music. In 2005 the specialists (art, music, PE) formed a collaboration team also.

At the high school, teachers were offered inservice days, and some of the teachers took a SIOP® class that was offered during the summer. It was a three-day intensive SIOP® training. The teachers that did not take the SIOP® class in the summer were required to spend three inservice days throughout the school year learning about the model. Those SIOP® inservice trainings were given by the district SIOP® trainers at the school site.

After all teachers in the district were trained in the SIOP® Model, the following year an “observational protocol” class was offered to teachers interested in deepening their implementation of the model. Two or three teachers from the same school attended, for a total of twenty-five teachers. Five class sessions and five peer observations were held, focusing on coaching/observing using the protocol, learning strategies to encourage student engagement, and studying the eight components in greater depth. The class was a two-credit continuing education class that lasted all year. Peer partnerships used the protocol as a tool in observing and conferencing. Those twenty-five teachers have continued implementing the model in their classes.
From the Ground Up: A Successful Grassroots Effort

Creighton, Arizona. This district of nine schools began by using the SIOP® Model in five dual language schools and later expanded training to all teachers in the district. (After English-Only became state policy in 2000 there were seven SEI or Structured English Immersion schools and two dual language schools.) The SIOP® was the basis for their state-mandated sixty hours of Sheltered English Immersion training, which was structured in four modules of fifteen hours. The district employed a system of Teachers on Assignment (TOAs) who had an assigned school site and facilitated collegial coaching clusters at their site. The TOAs had been trained at SIOP Institutes®, typically SIOP I® and SIOP II®. At the school site, coaches were selected based on their knowledge of second language acquisition and the SIOP® Model. If a coach was not familiar with the SIOP® Model, they were required to receive training in the model through a university course or a SIOP Institute®. Widespread, grassroots SIOP® training was accomplished through the collegial coaching process.

Collegial Coaching Cycles. The district’s coaching process was a cycle involving planning, teaching, and debriefing. First, a TOA worked with a site-based coach, assisting him or her in planning lessons and understanding the SIOP® Model to a higher degree. Then the coach planned a lesson that was modeled for a group of three to five peers, with the group debriefing the lesson and discussing the components of the SIOP® Model. Each participant had a copy of the SIOP® protocol with the rating numbers removed. Since the planning was done collaboratively, the Preparation component wasn’t pertinent to the debriefing and was removed from the protocol. Participants wrote what they saw the coach
do and described it on the protocol under the corresponding indicator. The TOA also attended the session to provide support and guidance. For example, when a teacher mentioned something observed, the TOA may say, “Oh, right, when she did that it was part of building background.” In this way, the teachers were learning the model through practice rather than direct teaching of the SIOP® Model.

Next, one of the teachers in the group volunteered to model a lesson during the following quarter (nine- or ten-week period). The coach assisted teacher volunteers in planning the lesson that was modeled for the group. Feedback from the group was not evaluative (see Figure 4.1 for debriefing form) and was limited to positive comments and a discussion of how the lesson matched SIOP® features. The teachers were instructed to “Please use statements that remind the teacher we’re not judging what we see. We’re here to observe and reflect, never to evaluate a teacher!” Because of this type of setting, there wasn’t a problem getting teachers to volunteer to model a lesson for their peers. This cycle resulted in having a different teacher each quarter go through the cycle and model a lesson for the group.

Coaches were teachers practicing the SIOP® Model in their classroom, and as coaches they were responsible for first setting up their room so it was “SIOP® compatible.” The district offered two types of coaching models. One involved providing a coach for grade level clusters, i.e., K–2, 3–5, and 6–8. Those coaches received a stipend of $3,000 and were responsible for conducting four coaching cycles. In this process, with three coaches per site there are twelve coaching cycles, which impacts a large number of teachers.

The other model of coaching is similar but requires less participation. Some school sites wanted a coach for each grade level. In that case, the coach focused on one grade level and received a stipend of $1,000. Responsibilities included keeping their room arranged in a way that supports SIOP® teaching, sponsoring one coaching cycle, and participating in “book talks” with other SIOP® coaches at their grade level.

Coaches were funded through a matching program wherein the district paid for two coaches for every one that the school site funded. For example, at a K–8 school there were nine coaches: six that the district funded and three that the school funded.

**SEI I (fifteen hours).** This first level of training begins with an overview of the model. The components that we introduce are Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction, Practice/Application and Review/Assessment. Although Lesson Preparation and Lesson Delivery are not presented until the second level of training, these components are modeled for the teachers. The rationale for omitting these two components is to focus on objective writing at the next level.

Instead of using videotape examples of the components, actual lessons are modeled by the presenters. There are two model lessons and a simulated coaching cycle. As a follow-up to the SEI I training, teachers participate in a coaching cycle at their school.

**SEI II (fifteen hours).** The focus of this level of training is on Lesson Preparation, with specific attention given to understanding and writing language and content objectives, although the other components are reviewed. Teachers are introduced to writing content and language objectives, and they are provided opportunities to practice writing objectives. In addition, the district has videotaped model lessons showing a variety of language levels. Teachers are asked to identify the language level reflected in the videotape and then write a language objective appropriate for the child.
I noticed...

I heard...

I observed...

I saw...

When you ______, _______ happened.

Thanks for your participation!

Please use statements that remind the teacher we’re not judging what we see. We’re here to observe and reflect, never to evaluate a teacher!
The other six components are reviewed and reinforced using video analysis. Through video analysis, teachers gain a deeper understanding of the features. As a follow-up to SEI II training, teachers participate in a coaching cycle at their school.

**SEI III (fifteen hours).** This advanced training involves twelve hours of instruction and three hours of planning. This module is dedicated solely to lesson planning and lesson delivery. Since the teachers have had extensive experience with each of the components, they are responsible for pulling it together and writing a SIOP® lesson plan. The lesson writing is done during the twelve hours of instruction. Each teacher will model his or her lesson for one of the TOAs.

As a follow-up to the training, the teachers will teach a practice lesson for peers.

**SEI IV (fifteen hours).** This training is dedicated to using SIOP® in guided reading groups and other literacy settings. (All eight components are adapted to literacy, with a heavy emphasis on contextualizing critical literacy strategies such as prediction, revision, determining importance, etc.).

**A University Partnership Yields Results**

**Lawrence, Kansas.** Tammy Becker, the principal at this midwestern elementary school, made a commitment to have teachers learn the model through SIOP Institutes®. Working with Dr. Socorro Herrera from Kansas State University, as part of a teacher preparation grant, Tammy initially attended a SIOP Institute® for Administrators and then attended three SIOP I Institutes®, each time with a different team of her teachers. First she attended with a team of primary teachers from first and second grade as well as the ESL Newcomer teacher. Later, she attended another SIOP Institute® with a group of teachers from grades 2–5. At a third SIOP Institute®, she brought teachers from a variety of grade levels so that at the school there would be at least two teachers from each grade level trained by SIOP® experts.

After the first group was trained, they formed a study group so that they could support one another and deepen their understanding of the SIOP® Model. Once two groups of teachers had been trained, these nine teachers began implementing the components of the SIOP® Model focusing on certain features at a time.

A trainer from Kansas State, Shabina Kavimandan, (funded through the grant) conducted mini-sessions at the school introducing the SIOP® components to the other teachers who had not attended an institute. The idea behind this training approach was to select one person from each grade level to be trained by SIOP® experts at the Institutes. These teachers became grade level resources to the other teachers who had been trained by Shabina, the university trainer. Later, more teachers from each grade level were trained so that there were two SIOP Institute®-trained teachers per grade level.

Teachers, along with the support of Shabina and Tammy, the principal, spent two full years learning the components in training sessions and then implementing them in their classrooms. At each mini-session, Shabina introduced one component at a time and reinforced what had already been introduced. Those teachers who had been trained at the SIOP® Institutes helped with the trainings at times, and they often used video clips from their classrooms to show the remaining staff. Shabina also went into the classrooms once per week and supported teachers by discussing the focused areas they were working on, such as language objectives or vocabulary.
In the fall of 2006, the teachers who had not previously done so attended a SIOP Institute®, so by 2007, all teachers and specialists in the school had received the same training and were consistently implementing the SIOP® Model in all classrooms.

Start in the Middle Grades and Expand throughout the District

Dearborn, Michigan. In this large urban district of 18,000 K–12 students (7,500 ELLs), the district Bilingual and Compensatory Education staff targeted middle school for the first wave of SIOP® training. A six-member district team, consisting of district and building administrative staff and Bilingual/Title 1 Resource Teachers, attended a SIOP Institute® in Long Beach, California, in June of 2001. The core of the team who have continued providing SIOP® professional development over the years included Dr. Santina Buffone, coordinator, bilingual and compensatory education; Megdieh Jawad, coordinator, bilingual and compensatory education; Maura Sedgeman, resource teacher leader, bilingual and compensatory education; and Saada Charara, classroom teacher. The team returned to the district motivated and energized to recruit more teachers into the training.

Thus, another team of fifteen individuals from the middle schools (administrators, assistant principals, and bilingual teacher and general education teacher teams from each of the middle schools) participated in the August 2001 SIOP Institute®. With a strong school-based SIOP® team and vital support from administration, this group of Institute-trained educators planned for districtwide SIOP® training for teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals.

The districtwide kick-off was a two-part SIOP® training on six Saturdays, with district SIOP® trainers leading each component. Approximately eighty teachers and paraprofessionals participated from various district elementary, middle, and high schools. Attendees were paid at workshop rate. Each Saturday focused on four components of the SIOP® Model. (The district has continued this practice every year to the present—especially important for new teachers to the district).

After the initial districtwide Saturday training, SIOP® expanded to the building level. For example, at one of the middle schools, district trainers attended grade level meetings and presented each component. Over time, all teachers in the building were trained in SIOP®. The building staff focused on embedding SIOP® techniques and strategies into daily teaching, whether the content area was science, math, social studies, or language arts.

Because the principal and assistant principal were also SIOP® trained, teacher evaluations included SIOP® components. Evaluations reflected use of language objectives and content objectives written and explained to the students. Evaluations also affirmed that teachers brought lessons to closure with strong review and assessment.

Another way the district has promoted SIOP® implementation is through “book talks” in some of the schools. A small group of teachers met either before or after school to review the book chapter by chapter to deepen their understanding and keep the ideas fresh in their minds. One of the first people trained at the SIOP Institute® became an assistant principal at one middle school and has used the “book talk format” as a means for effective SIOP® implementation.
To ensure a successful teaching staff for the districtwide Accelerated Summer Academic Program involving more than six hundred Bilingual and Title I students, SIOP® training is included as a part of the summer staff development. One component is presented per day in an interactive session. In the past seven years this training has impacted some eighty teachers and paraprofessionals each year, widening the district pool of SIOP®-trained staff.

SIOP® training has become a mainstay of each year’s professional development plan for the districtwide professional development days. As well, all SIOP® training in the district is tied to State Board Continuing Education Units or college credit. District SIOP® trainers teach SIOP® as one of the endorsement courses as part of a district-sponsored Bilingual/ESL endorsement cohort program. After the initial SIOP® inservice in each component, teachers write lesson plans using the SIOP® format. Teachers are also observed in their classroom implementing SIOP® strategies. The SIOP® book Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP® Model is used for the Dearborn cohort class, as well as by Wayne State University in teacher preparation courses.

The district-developed SIOP® bookmarks (see Chapter 6) synthesizing each component and the overview have aided teachers in remembering strategies and techniques as they work with students and plan lessons appropriately. Many teachers have laminated the color-coded, tagboard bookmarks and put them on a ring for convenience.

Whether through the comprehensive district professional development plan, adding specific techniques to each SIOP® component, or just ensuring that some component of SIOP® is a part of every content area inservice, Dearborn has increased teachers’ capacity to reach English learners and other students. Through these various ways, the district has trained approximately 650 teachers, 30 administrators, and 150 paraprofessionals since 2001. As new teachers join the district, many SIOP® opportunities await them—as one of the district music teachers, Jim Walters, who was trained in the SIOP® Model, put it in an original “SIOP Song”:

Just use the S-I-O-P®!
You need the S-I-O-P®!
Because with sheltered instruction,
Both language and content grow in unity.
Yes, with sheltered instruction,
The children will all SI OPportunity!

Using SIOP® National Faculty for Expert Training

Lawrence, Massachusetts. In this urban district of more than 12,000 students, English was not the first language of more than 80 percent of the students, and special education services were provided to 18 percent of the students (2005–2006). Under an English-only state mandate, the superintendent, Dr. Wilfredo Laboy; assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction, Gail Rosengard; and Dr. Dalis Dominguez, began to tackle the district’s low achievement. They contracted with Pearson Achievement Solutions to bring SIOP® National Faculty to their district and provide a capacity-building model of professional development. In spring 2006, a two-day SIOP I Institute® was conducted in Lawrence for a “Master Cohort” of fifty teachers and fifteen Central Office staff. The group was
referred to as a Master Cohort because they were already recognized as being knowledgeable and skilled in the content and pedagogy of instructing English learners and would receive extensive training to become site SIOP® professional developers.

At the Institute, participants were introduced to each of the eight SIOP® Model components, along with the research base for each. In fall 2006 (August–November), the following professional activities took place:

- One-day overview for all PK–12 teachers in the district. During this overview, four of the eight SIOP® components were emphasized: 1) Lesson Preparation; 2) Building Background; 3) Strategies; and 4) Lesson Delivery.
- Formation of districtwide SIOP® Implementation Team consisting of the superintendent of schools, the assistant superintendent for curriculum & instruction, the coordinator of curriculum and instructional measurement, the supervisor of ELL Programs and ELL districtwide facilitator, and several content area curriculum specialists.
- Coaching and preparation of SIOP® Resident Classrooms, which emphasize a strengths-based model and the concept of making teaching public for collegial professional learning. They provide an avenue for highlighting SIOP® instructional strategies and practices, which support the common goals, philosophy, and objectives established in the district’s Comprehensive Education Plan and Essential Learning Outcomes, aligned with state standards. They maximize opportunities for collegial sharing and collaboration and offer teachers a unique opportunity to observe instructional strategies applied within real classroom settings. A debriefing session follows the classroom visitation.
- The role of the Lawrence Public Schools Instructional Content Coaches is aligned with the Strengths-based Model of Professional Development. Forty-eight specialized content area coaches and facilitators provide ongoing, school-based professional development and training in the areas of Literacy, Mathematics, and Science.
- Selected staff attended a two-day SIOP Institute® in Florida to become trainers approved to train using SIOP® online course materials. The selected staff consisted of four members of the Master Cohort.
- SIOP® Walkthroughs began. SIOP® Walkthroughs are conducted by the SIOP® Implementation Team as well as school administrators, e.g., principals and assistant principals. The purpose of these walkthroughs is to monitor the implementation of the SEI program as well as the SIOP® Model, not to evaluate teachers. The district developed a SIOP® Walkthrough Tool, which is organized around the four SIOP® components being implemented the first year, and around principles of an effective learning environment. Users of this tool have been trained in its use. The data gathered during these visits forms the basis for professional conversations with faculty or individual teachers for the purpose of informing instructional decisions, strengthening teachers’ ability to deliver effective SIOP® lessons, and improving the academic success of English Language Learners. During these visits SIOP® features, as well as best practices observed, are recorded in detail. After Walkthroughs are completed, the administrator from the school schedules a debriefing session with the teacher(s) within a day of the Walkthrough to provide feedback and discuss next steps.
A schedule of Resident Classroom openings was developed and distributed.

Job-alike half-day professional development. During fall 2006, ESL teachers from the Master Cohort attended a workshop titled “From Preparation to Lesson Delivery: Using SIOP® for Coaching.” This workshop focused on how to help mainstream teachers successfully implement the SIOP® Model and how to answer the most frequently asked questions (i.e., How do I develop and choose a strong language objective? What is the difference between the content objective and language objective? How do I present the language objective for students who represent different language development levels?, etc.). New teachers in grades 1–8 attended a workshop titled “From Preparation to Lesson Delivery: Using SIOP® for Instruction: ESL Strategies.” This workshop provided an overview of the four SIOP® components being implemented by the district as well as additional instructional strategies that can be used within the SIOP® Model.

SIOP II Institute®. During winter 2006 and spring 2007 (December–June), the Master Cohort (original cohort of fifty teachers and fifteen Central Office Staff) participated in a SIOP II Institute®, which is an advanced training designed for those who have attended a SIOP I Institute® and have been implementing the SIOP® Model. The teachers and staff received six days of follow-up training with the SIOP® National Faculty.

School-based trainings. Once the Master Cohort had received this extensive training, they conducted school-based trainings that varied in implementation. Some have given a course outside the school day; others have been part of the half-day early release professional development agendas; others have led team discussions. Job-embedded professional development is tailored to the needs of the school. It is a strength of this implementation plan that the Master Cohort members are recognized by colleagues as a resource within their building.

At the time of the interview, the district planned to continue the SIOP® professional development in 2007–2008 in order to sustain the components learned in 2006–2007 and to focus on the remaining four components. The goals of the two-year SIOP® professional development effort included:

- Teachers will increase their knowledge of ELL students’ educational needs.
- Teachers will be able to formulate and deliver clear, educationally sound student-centered SIOP® lessons.
- Teachers will develop an understanding of the connections between the delivery of content in the classroom and the disparate language needs of their students, resulting in increased educational outcomes.
- Teachers will develop SIOP® lessons that will be guided by language and content objectives appropriate for LEP students at different levels of proficiency.
- Teachers will analyze the language needs of their students and develop SIOP® lessons and educational strategies to assist them in gaining the requisite knowledge.
- Teachers will use the SIOP® protocol to plan, implement, and analyze classroom lessons.
- Teachers will use the features of the SIOP® protocol to assess content learning of students who are at different levels of English proficiency.
SIOP® Lesson Study: A Unique Approach

**Fresno, California.** In this large, urban K–12 school district (78,000 ELs or 1/3 of the student population), the idea for SIOP® implementation began after some district EL staff attended a SIOP Institute®. One of the philosophies in the EL department was that instruction only changes if you put the quality of the contact between teachers and students in the forefront of professional development. In order for the quality of instruction to change, this interaction has to be the focus; if teachers’ instructional needs aren’t met, neither are the students’. Their goal was to support teachers, sustaining that support over time.

Before beginning a professional development effort, the staff spent considerable time doing research on which students were struggling and determined that they would begin with secondary students. They also researched what secondary English learners needed. They discovered that social studies was a subject area in which ELs were struggling, so they began by collaborating with the district social studies coordinator. They worked with a committee of about twenty teachers from sixth grade to twelfth grade, spending a year strategizing ways to train most effectively. They wanted to involve the people they would be working with and approached the training of teachers as having “all their ducks in a row.”

During the planning year, the group developed a number of materials and strategies to prepare for training teachers. The group:

- Aligned the standards to materials. Publishers were asked to show how their materials would supplement the adopted textbooks and assist in meeting the standards.
- Adapted standards to various language acquisition levels (see Chapter 7, Figure 7.20).
- Identified key vocabulary from the social studies standards, and adopted text (see Chapter 7, Figures 7.17 and 7.18).
- Identified the academic language of the social studies standards needed to complete tasks and how to differentiate for students (see Chapter 7, Figure 7.19).
- Adapted chapters from the text, demonstrated highlighted text and rewritten text.
- Prioritized standards and identified “focus” standards.
- Demonstrated how to go back to key lessons and extract the key concepts.
- Coordinated with the district content person so teachers didn’t get a different set of demands from him or her.
- Identified necessary professional development and used the SIOP® as a framework for introducing it (see Epilogue, Figure 9.2). For example, technological applications, Japanese lesson study.
- Invited presentations by several EL-friendly publishing companies at selected training sessions where “gift certificates” were offered to teachers to provide a sampling of materials that supported SIOP® implementation.

Once these things were in place, in the second year, teachers were selected to participate in SIOP® training. The social studies coordinator recruited teachers, and fliers were distributed to advertise the training. Enrollment was limited to forty teachers because the goal was to have a focused training with teachers from a variety of schools.
This group spent two years together going through the SIOP® components. The training sessions were held in the evenings from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. and food was provided. The trainings were hands-on to make them meaningful, and teachers were given the SIOP® book *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP® Model*, along with supplementary social studies materials and staff development.

Once the teachers learned the components, they began doing Japanese lesson study with SIOP® lessons. Japanese lesson study (JLS) is a collaborative process through which teachers improve instruction and is based upon the way teachers in Japan learn to teach and develop lessons and curriculum (see Chapter 4, Appendix page 62 for further discussion).

Teachers also engaged in self-observations. They used the SIOP® protocol to self-evaluate their lesson and used the information to prompt discussions about how the feature furthered the teacher’s instructional goal. They used this process as a way of establishing a “comfort zone” so that later the teachers would be able to participate in JLS and allow other teachers and observers in their classrooms.

**All Across the Pacific**

There are districts across the United States that service large geographic regions, which can be a challenge for providing ongoing professional development. Some ideas may be garnered through the experience of professional developers in the Pacific. The largest geographic SIOP® professional development effort to date was conducted by staff from Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL), which serves the Pacific region. They work with teachers on the islands of Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, Chuuk, Pohnpei, Palau, Yap, and the Marshall Islands.

The SIOP Institutes® held in Hawaii in 2005 were attended by PREL staff and teachers from the region. After the PREL trainers learned the SIOP® Model, they began working with individual teachers in their service area. Susan Hanson and Canisius Filibert co-presented a SIOP® training on Chuuk in the spring of 2006, and Susan presented an overview of the SIOP® Model at the Pacific Education Conference in Palau in July 2006. Canisius provided a SIOP® training in Pohnpei in August 2006 and in January 2007, he presented a SIOP® training in Majuro, Marshall Islands. At the SIOP Institute® held in Guam in 2006, educators from around the region attended and received intensive training in the SIOP® Model.

After the institutes, the PREL staff stayed in touch with and provided support to the teachers. In West Hawaii, a Listserv was created through which they communicated, and staff distributed to the teachers additional classroom activities to supplement those they received during the trainings. The PREL staff also used local resources such as the ESL coordinator, Precille Boisvert, in West Hawaii, who helped with training presentations and provided some follow-up. West Hawaii sent two school teams to the SIOP Institute® in Long Beach, California, in June 2006, and Precille Boisvert and two colleagues attended the SIOP II Institute® in Long Beach as well. At the time of the interview, she was preparing a SIOP® professional development course for the staff at one of the high schools for 2007.

With the more isolated islands, it wasn’t possible to offer after-school or one-day professional development sessions. For example, from Hawaii to Chuuk involves four island stops,
so one day isn’t possible. Thus, a five-day training was held. On the afternoon of the fifth day, participants wrote SIOP® lesson plans. The trainers collected their lesson plans, typed them up, and sent each participant a booklet of everyone’s lesson plans as a resource. These teachers were invited to the SIOP Institute® in Guam, and one was able to attend along with four other teachers who had not attended the initial five-day SIOP® training. These five teachers planned to work as a team to conduct SIOP® training in Chuuk. They were enthusiastic about implementing the SIOP® and made plans for future professional development, including requesting that one of the PREL staff assist them with a summer training.

On the island of Pohnpei, Canisus worked with a group of teachers, teaching them the SIOP® Model. The group started a Pohnpei SIOP® Club that met monthly. At the meetings they talked about how they implemented the SIOP® components and ways that they could train others. Three of the club’s participants attended the Guam SIOP Institute® along with two other teachers. One of the new participants was given the task of coordinating implementation efforts in Pohnpei. Some of her responsibilities included giving orientations on the SIOP® Model to the DOE administrators and building principals, coordinating the Pohnpei SIOP® Club and participation on the education Management Council. The education director of Pohnpei was very supportive of the teachers’ efforts and communicated that he wanted to see the SIOP® Model implemented throughout the island.

The professional development program initiated and supported by the staff at PREL offered a number of service options, found in Chapter 2, Figure 2.3. Their experiences illustrated ways that teachers in expansive geographic regions can receive high-quality professional development and ongoing support.

High Schools Start with the Boss

Phoenix, Arizona. In this charter high school district, the ELL director was responsible for seventeen schools. In order to comply with the state’s SEI requirements, she decided to implement the SIOP® Model in the schools. She began by taking a team to a SIOP Institute® to be trained together. The team consisted of her assistant director, two curriculum coaches, one of whom was also the assistant principal, and one classroom teacher.

When they returned from the training, they spent five months developing the training they would use in the schools. Their intent was to understand the model deeply themselves and to “live” the model a little before they began to work with teachers. A significant piece of the planning was to ensure that the team would be able to train the teachers using the SIOP®. Planning began by aligning every session to the State Professional Teachers Standards. The thinking behind this approach was that if teachers are expected to align instruction to what students are supposed to do academically (state standards), the team must do the same for teachers. Ultimately they made certain that the training delivered mimicked exactly what effective instruction looked like. It was crucial that every component be clearly modeled and practiced by every participant. During the five months, the team practiced presenting the components to each other and studied together the SIOP® book, *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP® Model*.

Perhaps most importantly during this time, they educated the superintendent, and he decided that all administrators would be trained on the SIOP® Model. Once the team of core trainers felt comfortable with the training they had developed and with their understanding of the SIOP® Model, they conducted professional development sessions for all administrators.
and the curriculum coaches (there was a curriculum coach at every site). Starting with administrators provided the buy-in they would need for districtwide implementation.

Naturally, not all administrators wanted to move forward with schoolwide training, but the majority did. They had so few resistant administrators because of the superintendent’s support, and as they developed a better understanding of the SIOP® Model, they recognized it as appropriate and necessary for their students.

Initially, the core trainers provided a three-day professional development session for thirty individuals with the idea that these site trainers would take the SIOP® Model back to their own schools (Training of Trainers). Those thirty trainers were the curriculum coaches and one ELL facilitator from each school. During the three days, the core trainers presented the entire SIOP® Model and worked on lesson planning. In addition to the SIOP® training, the core trainers provided site trainers’ support in developing and delivering their own three-day training.

Site trainings that were conducted during three allocated professional development days involved every teacher on staff. At each of the site trainings, one of the core trainers presented with the site trainer, who actually did the majority of the training since he or she had a much deeper understanding of the model. For instance, the site trainer would present one component of the model to establish credibility with her teachers, and the core trainer would do the rest. They both worked with the teachers on SIOP® lesson planning.

After the teachers attended SIOP® training, the site trainers mentored them in a number of ways. They assisted them with lesson planning, conducted observations, and worked with them at grade level meetings. Some schools did this once a week, others once a month, and the rest once a quarter, all depending on schedules and administrative support. At schools that met once a week, teachers at each grade level had common prep time. Schools who met once a month did so in lieu of a weekly staff meeting, and those who met quarterly did so on early release days.

Frequency of observations depended on the school. Some schools only had part-time ELL facilitators (depending on the number of ELs), and some curriculum coaches had responsibilities for content-specific initiatives in addition to SIOP® so that frequency varied from one observation per quarter to one per year.

In addition to the observations, teachers were coached and mentored. The curriculum coaches were trained in cognitive coaching, which is the approach they used as they worked with teachers.

Ongoing support from the district level was also provided for curriculum coaches and ELL facilitators. Mini-trainings reinforcing individual components from the SIOP® were done by the ELL director at designated facilitator and curriculum coach meetings. There were also designated districtwide professional staff development days where all teachers, administrators, and support staff received training. Lesson Planning, Language Objectives, Vocabulary Development, and Lesson Delivery were a few of the sessions provided during these days.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter we presented many different ways that the SIOP® Model is implemented around the United States. Since the effectiveness of these programs has not been researched, we are not endorsing them as effective models of professional development. However, in the descriptions you will see reflected some elements of what we know to be effective professional development.
Questions for Reflection and Discussion

1. Which one of the various professional development programs in this chapter most closely reflects your current situation?

2. As you consider the professional development needs of your school or district, which features of the programs described will you begin to implement? Why did you select those features? What are some potential difficulties you may encounter? (See Barriers to Effective Professional Development in Chapter 2.)

3. Create an ideal professional development program using the ideas described in the chapter. Where would you begin if you were to actually implement the program you’ve created?

Appendix: Japanese Lesson Study

The Japanese lesson study (JLS) process used in Fresno, California, is based on the work by James Stigler and James Hiebert (1999). These researchers used the results of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study to show that although American teachers are often competent at implementing American teaching methods, these teaching methods themselves are severely limited. They propose a new plan for improving classroom teaching in America. Their proposal is based on six principles: (1) expect improvement to be continual, gradual, and incremental; (2) maintain a constant focus on student learning goals; (3) focus on teaching, not teachers; (4) make improvements in context; (5) make improvement in the work of teachers; (6) build a system that can learn from its own experience.

The Fresno staff used a resource by Professor Catherine C. Lewis titled, Lesson Study: A Handbook of Teacher Led Instructional Change (2002) for thinking about and helping teachers use analysis of their lessons as a means of improving instruction for English learners. One aspect of the process is to think of a research question or general theme around which lessons are designed. (See Figure 4.2 for a sample of possible Lesson Study questions.)

The social studies teachers worked together to plan SIOP® lessons where they set up a research goal. For instance, one group’s goal was to preteach vocabulary in an explicit way and then implicitly teach during the lesson to see if it furthered both language acquisition and content acquisition. So the research question that they planned their lesson around became: Does vocabulary instruction improve language and content acquisition? The teachers sometimes held five or six meetings to plan just one lesson. They met together and planned the lesson out using the SIOP® protocol and Japanese lesson-setting protocol.

Each group taught the one SIOP® lesson they had designed twice—first a selected teacher from the group taught, then the group revised it based on feedback, and another teacher retaught the lesson. When they taught the lessons, they invited outside experts to observe, such as EL specialists, social studies teachers, the social studies coordinator, or site and district administrators, and each observer was assigned a cooperative group of students to watch. The focus was on watching the students, not the teachers. Then the
FIGURE 4.2  *Samples of Lesson Study Research Questions and Themes*

Please choose a specific research question or a general theme around which to design your lesson. Examine the specific features of the SIOP® Model, features of a specific approach (Thinking Maps), or curriculum (TCI, WRITE, adopted text, etc.). Your group may also decide to spotlight a particular level or levels of ELs in the classroom. The focus is on English Learners and what instructional approaches facilitate their learning, their integration into society, and their general growth and well-being. The questions below are just samples. Please feel free to modify or create your own.

- What is the effect of integrating *explicit vocabulary instruction* into a social science lesson?
- Does developing *language objectives* for a history lesson promote content acquisition? Language acquisition?
- Will a *primary language preview* and follow-up review increase comprehension of a lesson in English?
- Does *adapted text* (highlighted, margin notes, simplified text, etc.) increase the use of content area text for comprehending content?
- What types of *speech modifications* by a teacher provide the most comprehensible input for ELs?
- Do *simulations* (act-it-outs, drama, readers’ theatre, etc.) promote deeper EL engagement in and comprehension of content lessons?
- (How many, what kind of) lessons for *academic background building* in the area of cause/effect words are required to promote actual student use in writing?
- Which *SDAIE techniques* (modeling, visuals, hands-on activities, demonstrations, gestures, questioning, etc.) are most useful to us in making content comprehensible?
- What kinds of language objectives are useful for content area teachers?
- What teacher activities promote the *independent use of graphic organizers* by EL students (such as Thinking Maps)?
- Does establishing *personal and cultural connections* to the content being taught expedite content acquisition?
- What amount of *primary language support* promotes mastery of content standards for pre- and early-production ELs?
- What *grouping configurations* and protocols best support language learners?
- What type of *outlines and study guides* facilitate textbook use for English Learners?
- Does the use of *wait time and question preparation* increase the participation of English Learners in classroom discussions?

*Created by Elizabeth Fralicks, Title III, Fresno Unified School District*

teachers were provided feedback and had the time to revamp the lesson and review. Feedback is presented by all observers directly after the lesson is taught—it is recorded on video and in written form. The feedback focused directly on what was observed: what the students were doing and saying. Observers record precisely what they observe and collect student work as evidence. The revision process is based on the research question and whether or not the students learned what the teachers intended; the revision attempts to address any issues in the lesson that did not further the goals of the lesson. It was through this process that teachers developed a deeper understanding of the SIOP® Model and used it to meet the specific needs of their students.