PROMOTING ADVOCACY IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN THE US

David R. Byrd and Melina Alexander
Weber State University, USA

Abstract: The population of English learners (ELs) is increasing dramatically and teachers need to learn how advocate for these often marginalized students. This study investigates various syllabi from English as a second language pre-service teacher course work that are aimed at preparing future teachers to advocate for ELs. The researchers employed constant comparison methodology to examine 14 syllabi to ascertain in which courses and how pre-service teachers are prepared to advocate for their future students. Findings indicate that prospective teachers are being exposed to advocacy in many types of courses and with a variety of readings and assignments.

Key words: English learners, teacher education, teacher preparation, advocacy for ELs

Introduction

Between 1997 and 2009 the number of English learners (ELs) in the K-12 public school system in the United States (US) grew by 53.25% while the total enrollment at these schools increased by 8.4% (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011). According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (2013), this increase means that approximately one in ten students in the US is an EL. These students are often overwhelmed by a school system that they may not understand. Further, instructional philosophies often marginalize ELs by placing students with under-developed language and culture skills in classrooms with native speaking peers (de Jong, 2011; Kauchak & Eggen, 2014). As Freeman and Freeman (2011) suggest, teachers, particularly English as second language (ESL) teachers, can help ELs transition by becoming their advocates.

Unfortunately, most teachers in today's schools do not share their ELs' experiences. Goldring, Gray, and Bitterman (2013) report that 82.7% of teachers in the US, including many ESL teachers, are White, while only 7.5% are Hispanic, 6.4% are Black and less than 1% are either Asian or Pacific Islander (p. 6). In the US, teacher preparation programs offer courses that prepare teacher candidates to teach non-native English speakers. The types and number of courses related to this preparation vary from institution to institution, but the course content is expected to be based on the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/Commission for the Accreditation of Education Preparation (TESOL/CAEP) Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs (TESOL International Association, 2010). These preparatory teaching standards consist of five overarching areas: (a) language; (b) culture; (c) planning, implementing and managing instruction; (d) assessment; and (e) professionalism. The standards contain an underlying theory intended to equip teachers in all aspects of language teaching. Standard 5b seeks to address the unique demands of advocating for ESL students and their families. Ideally, pre-service ESL courses present teacher candidates with theories and ideas designed to help them examine what it means to advocate for ESL students and how to implement such practices effectively. As Darling-Hammond (2000) suggests, such courses give pre-service teachers the "ability to see beyond one's own perspective" and "to put

oneself into the shoes of the learner" (p. 170). The various courses required for an ESL endorsement should contain opportunities to introduce teacher candidates to a variety of methods beyond what they experienced as students. These courses can potentially expose teacher candidates to ideas and theories that inform best practices in advocating for ELs.

Review of Related Literature

Advocacy

Domain five of the TESOL *Standards* focuses on the development of prospective teachers' professionalism (TESOL International Association, 2010). Among its goals, this standard expects that "Candidates work collaboratively with school staff and the community to improve the learning environment, provide support, and *advocate* for ELs and their families (p. 68, emphasis added). Benchmarks 5.b.6 and 5.b.7 further the idea of advocacy by having teacher candidates learn to "Support EL families" and "Serve as professional resource personnel in their education communities" respectively (pp. 74-75). This two-pronged approach helps ELs both linguistically (generally with educators) and culturally or in the community (with families).

Although TESOL seeks to prepare ELs for advocacy, the responsibility for advocating is a call for all educators (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007; Valdés, 2004). Cohen, de la Vega, and Watson (2001) suggest that advocacy consists of organized efforts to highlight critical issues and to make change for a decent society for all. Standard 5 also recognizes this need and aims to help future ESL teachers learn to spearhead this collaborative effort. In the area of curriculum, Varghese and Stritikus (2005) suggest that ESL teachers need to realize that teacher knowledge extends beyond just language and methods to include language policy development and curriculum and

assessment critiques. Valdés (2004) suggests that although content-area teachers and ESL teachers often function in separate school worlds, they should work collaboratively for ELs. Beyond the classroom, de Oliveira and Athanases (2007) report that ESL teachers advocate for students by having teachers critique institutional practices and by proposing or creating alternatives.

Syllabus Analysis Research

For the purposes of this study, the term syllabus will refer to an outline of lectures and other presentations in a course at the college or university level. The course syllabus is an important document in post-secondary level teaching. As Thompson (2007) states, the syllabus expresses the course instructor's beliefs related to the course and intended educational purposes. Habanek (2005) suggests that syllabi must be created in ways that provide optimum transparency for the student in an age of accountability.

Madson, Melchert, and Whipp (2004) examined 88 syllabi from both required and general education pre-service courses in a college of education. The researchers developed a Syllabus Analysis Inventory (SAI) to examine how prospective teachers were exposed to and expected to use technology in these courses. Madson and colleagues found that pre-service teachers were exposed to areas of technology both in and out of the college of education in a significant manner.

In the area of academic librarianship, Williams, Cody, and Parnell (2004) looked at 253 course syllabi from their campus at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. They created an analysis model which allowed them to identify different types of library usage often demanded in academic syllabi. Of the 253 syllabi from 34 discipline areas, they found that 41% use the library for research

purposes, such as reports and projects. The researchers posit that the 'mining' of syllabi is a worthy pursuit that allows them to identify current usage patterns that ultimately allow them to make adjustments to the services that they offer faculty at the university.

In second language (L2) research, Wilbur (2007) conducted a study of 32 L2 methods course syllabi, looking at the content of methods courses in preparing future secondary teachers; how instructors address pedagogical content knowledge; and how instructors help these future teachers make connections between theory and practice. Researcher findings indicated a large variance in content of the methods course syllabi, despite the stable set of standards to guide such instruction in the L2 teaching profession. Because of this difference, Wilbur concluded that prospective teachers were not being prepared optimally in the area of pedagogical content knowledge. She further concludes that L2 methods course students were poorly equipped to meet the demands of the diverse learners that they will encounter. More recently, Byrd (2014) examined ten methods course syllabi to learn how L2 teacher candidates are prepared to teach culture. His findings indicated that the teaching of culture is still viewed as "the other" aspect of teaching language, as many instructors devote less than ten percent of course time to the topic (p. 84). He also concluded that the content of methods courses is not at the same level as professional standards for preparing teacher candidates.

The Study

This study explores how future ESL teachers are prepared to advocate for their students in and out of the school setting. We define advocacy as "supporting or promoting the interests of another" (Advocating, 2015). Because the TESOL preparation standards address the need to prepare future teachers to advocate for their

students, an examination of courses within teacher education programs is warranted. We scrutinized 14 syllabi from a number of courses from random programs. As stated in Thompson (2007) syllabi represent the course instructors' beliefs related to advocacy. The research questions that guided our study are: (a) Where is EL advocacy promotion located in ESL teacher preparation programs? and (b) How does ESL pre-service course work prepare prospective teachers to advocate for their future students (and the students' families) as shown in course syllabi?

Data Collection

We triangulated among the following online data sources: course syllabi from various course types, course calendars, online course program sites, and online sites related to the courses. We used several search engine inquiries, combining terms, such as 'advocacy,' 'English as Second Language,' 'ESL,' 'syllabus,' and 'programs' to locate initial data sources. After syllabi were located, we searched online university course catalogues to verify that these courses were part of an ESL teacher preparation program. For manageability purposes, we randomly selected fourteen institutions from eleven states, including: Alabama (2), Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Texas (3), and Washington, D.C.

Research Design

Qualitative research methods fit the descriptive nature of the present study. We used grounded theory to guide our research and develop a framework upon which to structure the themes found within the documents (Merriam, 1998). Merriam states that grounded theory assumes an inductive stance for researchers, as well as derives meaning from the data. The final result is a theory that emerges from or is 'grounded in' the data (p. 17). This study

examines the developing knowledge base of prospective teachers and is grounded in the description of one of the tools that leads to their learning. The data were analyzed recursively and inductively, using constant comparative methodology (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Initially, to promote interrater reliability, each author analyzed two randomly selected syllabi from the fourteen, using a syllabus analysis protocol (see Appendix A). Afterwards, we met together to refine our approach in using the protocol. We then independently read each of the fourteen data sources, meeting frequently to discuss our results. The first reading allowed us to identify potential occurrences of advocacy and where they were located. The second reading focused on course readings. A third reading focused on assignments. After obtaining these data points, we organized them into categories, where two main themes emerged: advocacy was dealt with explicitly or implicitly. Explicit occurrences of advocacy meant that the course instructor made direct efforts to work with the topic, while implicit handling of the topic suggests a tangential approach. We re-analyzed the data sources one final time after categories were identified and looked for common and discrepant themes.

Results

Types of Courses

The first research question asks: Where is EL advocacy promotion located in ESL teacher preparation programs? For research purposes, identified ESL courses were labeled P1-P14. Five of the courses (P3, P8, P9, P10, and P12) were identified as ESL methods courses. Foundations of ESL courses were represented with four syllabi (P2, P5, P6, and P7). Two of the syllabi (P1 and P11) were part of an ESL literacy course. Finally, P13 came from an ESL policy course and P14 from a seminar.

Coursework

The second research question looked at how ESL pre-service course work prepared teacher candidates to advocate for their future students and students' families. The themes of explicit and implicit handling of materials emerged here. In the present article, we focus on two specific areas: readings and assignments/assessments.

Direct readings. Six of the course syllabi listed readings that directly promoted advocacy. In the present data set, all of these readings were contained in a full-length textbook where at least part of the text dealt with advocacy in some manner (See Table 1).

Table 1
Direct Readings

Course	Reading
P3	Herrera, S., & Murry, K. (2005). *Mastering ESL and bilingual methods: Differentiated for culturally and linguistically diverse (cld) students.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
P4	Ovando, C. J., & Combs, M. C. (2012). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts* (5th ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
P7	Ovando, C. J., Combs, M. C., & Collier, V. P. (2006) *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts* (4th ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
P9	Faltis, C. (2006). *Teaching English language learners in elementary school communities: A joinfostering approach,* (4th ed). New York: Pearson.
P12	Beykont, Z. (2000). *Lifting every voice: Pedagogy and politics of bilingualism.* Cambridge: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
P13	Echevarría, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. J. (2007). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model,* (3rd ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

In all cases the students were required to read about advocacy, but the amount of advocacy content varied. Chapter five of the Herrera and Murry book (2005) dedicates part of a chapter on how teachers can become advocates for their students. Faltis (2006), Echevarría et al. (2007), and both editions of Ovando and Combs (2006; 2012) discuss advocacy at several points throughout the text. The Beykont (2000) text has an entire section of essays devoted to advocating for ELs.

Indirect readings. One syllabus contained an indirect reading about advocacy for ELs. P6 requires students to read Freire's (1998) *Teachers as Cultural Workers: Letters to Those who Dare to Teach*. The text generally advocates for the teaching of all subgroups of inclusion classrooms. Prospective teachers may be able to extrapolate the information from the text to include ELs.

Assignments/assessments. Our data found eight of the syllabi (P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P10, P11, and P12) included assignments/assessments that directly deal with advocacy, and one syllabus (P1) that includes an indirect assignment/ assessment. Each assignment/assessment is unique with no overlap across syllabi.

Direct assignments/assessments. The instructor of P4 requires students to complete and present an advocacy plan. The instructor writes in the course overview, "[S]tudents will create an advocacy plan that will focus on the issues that surround educating bilingual and second language learners. Providing for opportunities for inquiry, research, and collaboration through various assignments and field based experiences in low socio-economic communities."

P5's instructor requires students to create an advocacy module with no further explanation of the assignment in the syllabus except to direct students to a set of learner outcomes, including:

(a) Students develop knowledge and skills to become cultural brokers within the school community, and (b) Students advocate for English language learners and their families.

P6's instructor provides a written discussion about advocacy in the classroom and school. It reads:

4b. According to most proponents of multicultural education, profound changes have to take place in schools in order for it to be effective. These include not only changing the *content*, but the *processes* of education (i.e. pedagogy, organization, climate, and so on) (italics in original).

An inquiry/action project makes up 30% of the grade for the students of P7. The assignment description begins:

Students will conduct a semester-long inquiry and action project in your school, district, or community. The first week of class, peruse the "Activities for your Classroom" and "Community Based Activities and Advocacy" in Nieto (2010), and choose from among these activity ideas for your project.

The instructor provides guidance by identifying people and materials that can aid students in completing the project.

A partnership project is assigned to P8 students, which allows them to examine their experiences working with ELs and their families:

The partnership project can be a project with other teachers OR with families. You will need to demonstrate collaboration between ESL, content area teachers, and/or administrators— or with families.

P10's students are to learn to build partnerships with professional colleagues

and parents. The instructor provides these guidelines:

> Early in the semester seek permission, where required, and establish rapport with a classroom teacher and students. You may use your own classroom for this project, but, you will be expected to confer with other stakeholders e.g, colleagues, parents, other resource teachers to: plan, teach, and reflect upon the project.

On the course website, the P11 instructor includes an in-depth eight step project to help students learn about and advocate for ELs. All of the activities require students to explore detailed web materials linked to the activity. The first activity requires students to "learn the terminology associated with ESL students." Activity two is a quiz on the terms. Activity three introduces general issues associated with ESL education. Activity four requires students to interact with a website that outlines a potential day for an ESL student in an inclusion situation. Activity five involves listening to ELs from the inclusion classrooms from activity four. The sixth activity requires students to explore their own definition of limited English proficient, while exploring official definitions. Seven provides students with required resources they explore both on- and offline. Finally, the eighth activity asks students to meld what they have previously learned and to "investigate the research database and see what is known about ESL students." The instructor indicates that this project will affect other assignments.

P12 is an online course. The final assignment listed asks students to create a professional development meeting or parent guide, given the following directions:

> You will create a parent resource/brochure to address one of these top priorities to parents. Design a brochure to give to the parents of your students to help them address one of the issues. The brochure should

include the following sections (at a minimum): (a) Introduction; (b) What is the issue? (c) Why is it important? (d) What are the myths or misunderstandings about this issue? (e) How can this be addressed? (f) A list of resources to address this topic; and (g) potential issues.

Indirect assignment/assessment. The only indirect assignment/assessment is an open-ended writing task that can include advocacy, but does not require it. P1 has graduate students create a project that may include a number of possible topics. The instructor describes the assignment as follows:

> Graduate students will choose from among several options, all of which will require uploading PowerPoint slides and a written report to the online course as well as doing a presentation using the slides in class.

It is feasible that the graduate student could choose advocacy as their topic, as it is listed as one of the course learning outcomes.

Discussion

The first research question examined where advocacy promotion occurred in ESL teacher preparation programs. In the present data set, a wide variety of courses from methods to seminars address the need for advocacy. The findings suggest that ESL teacher educators are focusing on the issue of advocacy as it relates to a number of differing teacher preparation sub-areas. Because we did not look at any one teacher education program, we cannot claim that programs are using particular courses to help prepare their pre-service teachers. This finding suggests that teacher educators are trying to make advocacy a cross-curricular issue, at least within the limits of the courses for the endorsement. This latter assumption supports Dannels and Housley Gaffney's (2009) findings that cross-curricular teaching helps prepare professionals more effectively. Likewise,

our findings support McDonald's (2005) research which suggests that it is not sufficient for issues like advocacy to be located in a single teacher education course; rather, effective programs seek the opportunity to integrate such information in several different courses for their prospective teachers. Researchers recommend that a program-wide effort to teach advocacy skills improves teachers' ability to advocate effectively for ELs (Athanases & Martin, 2006; de Oliveira and Athanases 2007). This may occur due to the complex nature of advocacy for both ELs and their families, which cannot be addressed in one course. Likewise, since advocacy issues need to be addressed both in terms of culture and language, dispersing the teaching of advocacy through a number of different courses may more effectively accomplish this goal.

The second research question addresses which course work helps to prepare teacher candidates to advocate for ELs. Course readings indicate what instructors feel is important for students to know about the content of the course (Sappington, Kinsey, & Munsayac, 2002). The present data found that only half of the courses included some type of reading connected with advocacy. This finding indicates that half of the identified course instructors are neglecting a potentially powerful resource in helping prospective teachers learn advocacy skills, which supports Byrd's (2010) work indicating that course instructors need to be aware of and use readings to optimize learning for pre-service teachers. Dow (1991) and Richards (2001) likewise describe how instructional materials such as textbooks can shape student learning. Similarly, readings form a major portion of a course's knowledge base (Grosse, 1993). Instructors cannot afford to ignore such a valuable tool.

Similarly, examining assignments/ assessments provides information about how students are engaged with course materials (Kauchak & Eggen, 2014). Nine unique assignments/ assessments were identified in nine of fourteen (64%) syllabi. With a limited amount of time in a course, instructors must carefully plan meaningful methods for students to show what they are learning (Fink, 2003). Although assignments/assessments represented in this data set vary greatly, they do tend to directly guide students towards advocacy. As Cooper (2004) posits, teacher candidates often find hands-on assignments most helpful. Direct assignments in this data set tend to promote hands-on learning and practical application that teacher candidates can use when they enter the profession.

Limitations

This study is a qualitative description of what is happening in a specific set of data across fourteen courses and at a specific point in time. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to all situations (Merriam, 1998). Firstly, syllabi do not necessarily provide clarifications on certain areas within the data. Instructors can change the syllabus to fit course needs in a given semester or for a specific set of students. In the present study, we were also limited by the search for a definite topic. Our data will tend to lean towards finding syllabi that contain advocacy as an issue within the course. However, it must be noted that several false finds occurred, where advocacy was mentioned in a general way, but not addressed in the syllabus itself.

Conclusions

Data from the present study, buoyed by the inclusion of domain five of the TESOL *Standards* (TESOL International Association, 2010), seem to suggest that ESL teacher candidates are being shown that advocacy is necessary and are being encouraged to pursue specific methods to accomplish advocacy goals. This finding supports the idea that teacher education

programs, regardless where they are found in the world, can successfully implement the standards or guidelines established for preparation course work. Future research can examine if such implementations are occurring in various countries.

This study focused on describing how prospective teachers are being taught to advocate for their future students and possibly for families of these students. Theoharis (2007) contends that students and their families must be positioned as integral players of the school community. Although this study focused on non-native English speakers in the US, educational institutions around the world work with marginalized groups. Advocacy can be implemented into teacher candidate preparation programs in ways that prepare teachers to meet the varying needs of individuals (and groups) within their courses.

In the present study, many of the readings and assignments move beyond ESL classrooms to help teacher candidates work towards including colleagues and the community. Coady, et al. (2008) and Suttmiller and González (2006) have found that the most effective programs for ELs stem from school wide efforts. P8's partnership project, P10's content literacy project, and P12's professional development presentation are examples of effective methods to prepare pre-service teachers to become leaders in this effort (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007). Lucas, Henze, and Donato (2004) and Stritikus (2006) suggest that interaction with non-ESL teaching staff improves that quality of

instruction for teachers and, ultimately, students. If, as Theoharis and O'Toole (2011) posit, inclusion in mainstream classrooms provides "each student the right to an authentic sense of belonging to a school classroom community where difference is expected and valued," then preparing future teachers to help bring this situation about is crucial (p. 649). Current mainstream teachers and mainstream teacher candidates need to be taught that advocating for ELs can be effectively accomplished on two levels: linguistic and cultural. Linguistically, mainstream teachers can recognize the difference between social and academic language. Many ELs may seem fluent while conversing with friends, but may struggle with academic subject-matter demands in their classroom, including both content and vocabulary. They also would benefit by adapting the pacing of their classroom to allow ELs more time to process information being presented, if needed. Finally in this area, mainstream teachers need to become familiar with resources that can scaffold EL learning. Culturally, teachers can realize that some cultural references, in books or part of lectures, may not be familiar to ELs. Further, these students and their families may need help in accessing and navigating the US school system in general, and their classes in particular. For instance, as more schools are providing online resources (grade reports or blogs), ESL families may require help to access them. Lastly, all teachers can encourage ELs and their families to become active in leadership positions throughout the school, in parent-teacher organizations, and on school boards.

References

Advocating. (2015). In *Merriam-Webster's online dictionary.* Retrieved from
http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/advocating

Athanases, S. Z., & Martin, K. J. (2006). Learning to advocate for educational equity in a
teacher credential program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*(6), 627–646. doi:
10.1016/j.tate.2006.03.008

Byrd, D. R. (2010). The influence of the second language methods course in learning to
teach culture: Towards the development of a teaching philosophy. In J. L. Watzke, P.
Chamness Miller, & M. Mantero (Eds.), *Readings in language studies volume 2:
Language and power* (pp. 425–445). Lakewood Ranch, FL, USA: International Society
for Language Studies, Inc.

Byrd, D. R. (2014). Learning to teach culture in the L2 methods course. *e-FLT: Electronic
Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 11*(1), 76–89.

Coady, M., Hamann, E.T., Harrington, M., Pacheco, M., Pho, S., & Yedlin, J. (2008).
Successful schooling for ELLs: Principles for building responsive learning
environments. In L.S. Verplaetse & N. Migliacci (Eds.), *Inclusive pedagogy for English
language learners: A handbook of research-informed practices* (pp. 245–255). Mahwah,
NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cohen, D., de la Vega, R., & Watson, G. (2001). *Advocacy for social justice: A global action
and reflection guide.* West Hartford, CT, USA: Kumarian Press.

Cooper, T. (2004). How foreign language teachers in Georgia evaluate their professional
preparation: A call for action. *Foreign Language Annals, 37*(1), 37–48.

Dannels, D. P., & Housley Gaffney, A. L. (2009). Communication across the curriculum and
in the disciplines: A call for scholarly cross-curricular advocacy. *Communication
Education, 58*(1), 124–153. doi: 10.1080/03634520802527288

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education,
51*(3), 166–173. doi: 10.1177/0022487100051003002

de Jong, E. J. (2011). *Foundations for multilingualism in education: From principles to
practice.* Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.

de Oliveira, L. C., & Athanases, S. Z. (2007). Graduates' reports of advocating for English
language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(3), 202–215.
doi: 10.1177/0022487107299978

Dow, P. (1991). *Schoolhouse politics: Lessons from the Sputnik era.* Cambridge, MA, USA:
Harvard University Press.

Fink, L. D. (2003). *Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to
designing college courses.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare to teach,* Boulder, CO, USA: Westview Press.

Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2011). *Between worlds: Access to second language acquisition.* (3rd ed.). Portsmouth, NH, USA: Heinemann.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New York: Aldine.

Goldring, R., Gray, L., & Bitterman, A. (2013). Characteristics of public and private elementary and secondary school teachers in the U.S.: Results from the 2011-12 school and staffing survey (NCES 2013-314). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

Grosse, C. U. (1993). The foreign language methods course. *Modern Language Journal, 77*(3), 303–312.

Habanek, D. V. (2005). An examination of the integrity of the syllabus. *College Teaching, 53*(2), 62–64. doi: 10.3200/CTCH.53.2.62-64

Kauchak, D., & Eggen, P. (2014). *Introduction to teaching: Becoming a professional* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Pearson.

Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (2004). The best multicultural schools. In O. Santa Ana (Ed.), *Tongue-tied: The lives of multilingual children in public education* (pp. 201–213). New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Madson, M. B., Melchert, T. P., & Whipp, J. L. (2004). Assessing student exposure to and use of computer technologies through an examination of course syllabi. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 29*(5), 549–561.

McDonald, M. A. (2005). The integration of social justice in teacher education: Dimensions of prospective teachers' opportunities to learn. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(5), 418–435. doi: 10.1177/0022487105279569

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from 'case study research in education'* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

National Center for Educational Statistics (2013). Digest of education statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_047.asp

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2011). What language instruction educational programs do states use to serve English learners? NCELA Factsheet. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from www.ncela.gwu.educ/files/uploads/NCELAFactsheets/refugees_2011.pdf.

Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives.* New York: Routledge.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Sappington, J., Kinsey, K., & Munsayac, K. (2002). Two studies of reading compliance among college students. *Teaching of Psychology, 29*(4), 272–274. doi: 10.1207/S15328023TOP2904_02

Stritikus, T. T. (2006). Making meaning matter: A look at instructional practices in additive and subtractive contexts. *Bilingual Research Journal, 30(1)*, 219–227. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2006.10162873

Suttmiller, E. F., & González, M. L. (2006). Successful school leadership for English language learners. In K. Téllez & H.C. Waxman (Eds.), *Preparing quality educators for English language learners: Research, policies, and practice* (pp. 167–188). Mahwah, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum.

TESOL International Association. (2010). *TESOL/NCATE standards for the recognition of initial tesol programs in p-12 esl teacher education.* Alexandria, VA, USA: Author.

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Towards a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*, 221–258. doi: 10.1177/0013161X06293717

Theoharis, G., & O'Toole, J. (2011). Leading inclusive ELL: Social justice leadership for English language learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47*, 646–688. doi: 10.1177/0013161X11401616

Thompson, B. (2007). The syllabus as a communication document: Constructing and presenting the syllabus. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 54–71.

Valdés, G. (2004). Between support and marginalization: The development of academic language in linguistic minority children. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 7*(2-3), 102–132. doi: 10.1080/13670050408667804

Varghese, M. M., & Stritikus, T. (2005). "Nadie me dijó (nobody told me)": Language policy negotiation and implementation for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(1), 73–87. doi: 10.1177/0022487104272709

Wilbur, M. L. (2007). How foreign language teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the methods course. *Foreign Language Annals, 40*(1), 79–101.

Williams, L. M., Cody, S. A., Parnell, J. (2004). Prospecting for new collaborations: mining syllabi for library service opportunities. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 30*(4). 270–275. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2004.04.009

Appendix A
Advocacy for ELs: Syllabus Analysis Protocol

1. State:
   University:
   Year of course:

2. Course title/type:
3. Required readings:
4. Recommended readings:
5. Course description:
6. Course objectives/goals:
7. Assessments/assignments:
8. Examination of course calendar:
9. Other:

Authors

David R. Byrd, Ph.D., Associate Professor in the Moyes College of Education at Weber State University. His teaching and research interests include ESL, teacher, and culture education.

Melina Alexander, Ph.D. Associate Professor in the Moyes College of Education at Weber State University. Her research interests are teacher preparation and instructional methods for students with and without special needs.