

Improving Discourse Among Multilingual Learners Using Project-Based Tasks Analysis

Dr. Marie Conceptia Girault, Greenville County Schools, Multilingual Learner Professional.
mcmgirault@gmail.com

Abstract

This article discusses an intervention implemented in the case of thirteen Multilingual Students (MLs) who consistently fail the Speaking domain of the ACCESS for ELs test, which is administered annually. This article, similar to my first article, Developing Pedagogical Discourse Analysis Through Project-based tasks, which discusses why pedagogical discourse analysis (PDA) can be an effective strategy for teaching through discourse and how multilingual learner professionals can efficiently use it to bring discourse analysis into the language classroom (Girault & Rivera Corridor, 2019). I continue to argue that to succeed with language acquisition and to achieve fluency, it is important to implement effective PDA. I also continue to argue that to make PDA feasible in language teaching, it is essential to coordinate language pedagogy and actual discourse-based approaches (Girault & Rivera Corridor, 2019). This article explores the implementation of PDA in terms of Problem Based Task Analysis in a Speech class through a combination of two strategies: task-based language teaching (TBLT) and project-based learning (PBL). TBLT and PBL are the basis for a project-based task analysis (PBTA), in which discourse is the ultimate teaching and learning strategy for assisting MLs who have difficulty passing the Speaking domain of the ACCESS test (Girault & Rivera Corridor, 2020). It begins with an explanation of the PBTA (Girault & Rivera Corridor, 2019) for the development of the Speech class. It introduces the University of Wisconsin-Madison's WIDA Framework, (Standards, Key Language Use, Language Expectations, and Proficiency Level Descriptors) that underline the curriculum and supports the structure for an effective lesson plan to be used in the classroom. It presents the studies of various researchers who support the implementation and outcome of the Speech class, present the Speech curriculum and lesson plans for the Speech class, then finally shares my conclusion of the students' learning outcome following their retake of the ACCESS for ELs test to discover any developmental growth amongst them. Through the implementation of a Speech class, I present how multilingual learners can mentally prepare for the ACCESS for ELs annual exam without the added pressures of having to perform within a given timeframe. Moreover, participating in the Speech class will allow them to receive immediate feedback on their performance while exemplifying a predictable outcome.

Introduction

Two years after publishing my article titled “Developing Pedagogical Discourse Analysis through Project-Based Tasks” (Girault & Rivera Corridor, 2019), I return with another in-depth approach for implementing effective strategies for improving multilingual learners’ speaking skills as one of four domains of the WIDA ACCESS test (WIDA, 2020). The idea of creating a Speech class came about because it takes 4-8 years for the multilingual students, once identified as such, to exit the Multilingual Program (Personal Interview, 2023); sometimes, they graduate K-12 without ever exiting. Many are retained because of their composite scores even if they pass the four domains of the ACCESS for ELs. Year after year, it was determined that the one language domain that holds students back from successfully exiting the Multilingual Learners Program (MLP) is the Speaking assessment. The process entailed a close analysis of students’ assessment results and searching for patterns that reveal student growth and/or deficiencies following a period of instruction - typically following one year after the previous test (Greenville County Schools, 2023). Once the analysis was complete, 13 multilingual learners of low socioeconomic background (Greenville County Schools, 2023) were identified as having successfully passed three of the four WIDA language domains (Listening, Reading, and Writing). However, these students failed to pass the Speaking domain of the test. Consequently, these 13 multilingual learners were one domain away from exiting the MLP in comparison to 133/136 students, in total, who failed two or more of the domains (Table 1. As a result, the best strategy was to focus on students who demonstrated growth in a particular domain, rather than the actual failure of a domain, as a means to assist them with reaching the passing score of a particular domain. In other words, we are focusing on one domain at a time.

Table 1

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Student	Listening (Target Year)	Listening (Prior Year)	Listening Change	Reading (Target Year)	Reading (Prior Year)	Reading Change	Speaking (Target Year)	Speaking (Prior Year)	Speaking Change	Writing (Target Year)	Writing (Prior Year)	Writing Change	Literacy (Target Year)
140301	6	6	0.00%	6	6	0.00%	3.9	3.8	2.60%	4.5	4	12.50%	5.9
480010088999	4.8	4.3	0.10%	6	6	0.00%	3.9	3.2	21.90%	4.8	4.1	17.10%	5.6
21940	5.4	6	-0.10%	6	6	0.00%	4	3.7	8.10%	4.6	3.5	31.40%	5.3
10652	6	6	0.00%	5.9	6	-1.70%	2.4	2.5	-4.00%	4	3.6	11.10%	4.4
33266	6	6	0.00%	6	6	0.00%	3.7	3.9	-5.10%	4.6	3.5	31.40%	5.5
81671	5.3	5.5	0.00%	5.4	5.6	-3.60%	3.5	3	16.70%	4	4.4	-9.10%	4.2
119096	6	6	0.00%	6	6	0.00%	3.5	3.7	-5.40%	3.8	3.3	15.20%	4.6
30529	5.8	6	0.00%	6	6	0.00%	3.9	4.8	-18.80%	4.2	3.7	13.50%	5
480010089123	5.9	5.7	0.00%	5.6	5.4	3.70%	3.4	3.5	-2.90%	4.5	4.2	7.10%	4.8
85086	6	6	0.00%	4.5	3	50.00%	4	3.4	17.60%	3.7	3.5	5.70%	3.8
480010089543	5.6	6	-0.10%	6	6	0.00%	4.1	3.8	7.90%	3.6	4.2	-14.30%	4.2
60981	6	6	0.00%	6	6	0.00%	4.1	3.6	13.00%	4.3	3.8	13.20%	5.1
67925	5.6	6	-0.10%	5.4	6	-10.00%	3.2	3.4	-5.90%	3.3	3.8	-13.20%	3.7

To address the 13 Multilingual Learners’ Speaking abilities, a Speech course was designed. Because of their prior year ACCESS test results, students were not given a choice, but were placed in the course for one semester or 16 weeks. Throughout the 16-week course, and although the Speaking domain was its core focus, the other three domains, Listening, Reading, and Writing were revisited and the application of PBTA activities were strategically implemented. The activities that were assigned gave students the opportunity to experience language in real-life situations considering its formal and functional aspects, causes of communication breakdowns as well as its socio-cultural features (Girault & Rivera Corridor, 2019). Using a PBTA instructional strategy, learners got to use language in context while genuinely managing discourse to communicate, hence, pedagogically closing the gap between language teaching strategies and real analysis of discourse.

To successfully bridge the gap between language teaching and discourse analysis, discourse should evidence authentic and complete sentences in explicit situations that demonstrate fluency when speaking,

(McCarthy, 1991; Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2014) Second, discourse analysis encompasses structural characteristics such as grammar rules, formal properties of language, and functional characteristics that refer to the different ways language is used while serving distinct communicative purposes, the relation between language and context, and how the context itself interprets the produced language, (Erton, 2000) That is to say, functional aspects are concerned with how people utilize the language in order to Recount, Explain, Argue, and Discuss (WIDA, 2020) otherwise known as *Key Language Use*. Moreover, to attain a level of “discourse”, when using oral language, one must be able to produce the “amount, structure, and density of text, as well as the organization and cohesion of ideas within the text”. This paper presents the Speech course as it was taught in the classroom using authentic strategies and materials for increasing students’ speaking skills while addressing the four key language uses. Moreover, it will discuss strategies for teaching through discourse using project-based task analysis (PBTA), a strategy that combines Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) with Project-Based Learning (PBL).

Definition of terms

Because the terminology in the field of education is so dynamic, I present these eleven terms as current literature clarifies their use and their original introduction to education.

ACCESS for ELs - ACCESS for ELLs (ACCESS) is the collective name for WIDA's suite of summative English language proficiency assessments (WIDA, 2020).

Cognitive presence - “Cognitive presence is the extent to which learners are able to construct and confirm meaning through reflection and discourse and is defined as a four-stage process of practical inquiry (Boston et al., 2010, p. 69).

English learner (EL) - This was the preferred term of the South Carolina Department of Education. Over the past five years, SCDOE moved from English Speakers Other Languages (ESOL) to English Learner (EL) and, most recently, from EL to Multilingual Learner (ML).

English Language Proficiency (ELP). The student's ability to use the English language; listening, reading, writing, and speaking which are assessed through the required ELP screener and annual assessment that tracks the English proficiency progress of a Multilingual Learner (ML).

Generation 1.5 - This term, originally used in higher education, often refers to students who have been long-term residents in the United States but who were born abroad (although the term is sometimes also used to refer to US-born children of recent immigrants).

Multilingual Learner (ML). MLs receive MLP services to assist in developing English proficiency in listening, reading, writing, and speaking. Previously known as: Limited English Proficient (LEP), English Learner (EL), or English Language Learners (ELL).

Multilingual Learner Program (MLP). The language instruction educational program (LIEP) for eligible MLs in South Carolina.

Newcomer - A program in which students learn not just “survival” English, but also how school works in the United States. As the position statement discusses, it’s sometimes argued that newcomer programs benefit “low-level literacy immigrant students” and/or students with interrupted formal education who may have limited literacy in their first language (L1). Other newcomers may

be fully literate in L1, especially by high school, and may or may not benefit from being isolated from the mainstream curriculum. For older students, the challenge is to move away from “low-level” ideas of literacy assessment that may discount the literacies of these students.

WIDA Screener - An English language proficiency assessment given to new students in grades K–12 to help educators identify whether they are English learners (ELs). It is a flexible, on-demand assessment that can be administered at any time during the school year. WIDA Screener is available in two formats – online (U.S. only) and paper (U.S. and International).

Teaching presence -Teaching presence consists of instructional design and organization, facilitation of discourse, and direct instruction. It has often been described as “the glue that makes a community of inquiry function” (Garrison, 2021). Teacher presence is able to create an intellectual climate that works as a catalyst in improving grades, retention, self-efficacy, and sense of community (Ke, 2010).

US Entry Date - The actual date on which a student entered the United States and enrolled in the public school system. This date is their designated arrival date as well as the date they supposedly entered the MLP.

Review of Literature

Identifying Multilingual Learners

When a student is enrolling in a public school district in the United States, an Enrollment Survey (ES) is to be completed by the parent/guardian. In the event that the student is not accompanied by neither a parent/guardian, the child, presumed old enough, must complete the enrollment survey. This survey is to be completed for all students, from ages preschool to twelfth grade, enrolling for the first time, or who had never enrolled in the district prior, (SCDOE, 2023). Once the form is complete, it remains with the students throughout their entire educational career with the district and in the K-12 school system as their ML records follow the student. Moreover, all sections of the form must be completed even if the question(s) do not pertain to the students in particular (SCDOE, 2023).

As part of the Title III, Part A: Multilingual Learner Program (MLP) and Immigrant Children and Youth section of the Enrollment Survey (SCDOE, 2023), a completion of a Home Language Survey (HLS) is also required by parents and students. Upon enrollment at the school district, Multilingual Learners are identified as candidates for a Multilingual Learner Program (MLP). This process entails parents being required to complete the Home Language Survey (HLS). There are three questions that the parents must answer: 1) What is the language that the student first acquired? 2). What language(s) is most often spoken by the student?, and 3) What is the primary language spoken in the home regardless of the language spoken by the student? (SCDOE, 2023). (See Exhibit B). The HLS is issued upon the initial registration of all students during their first enrollment into a South Carolina public school (3K – Grade 12) and becomes part of the students’ permanent records.

Generation 1.5

The term Generation 1.5 was first used to describe children born outside the United States who fell between the categories of first-generation and second-generation immigrants (Rumbaut & Ima, 2002). Today, the term refers to young people who were born and/or immigrated to the United States at a young age, but use their native language as their primary language at home (Huster, 2012). Generation 1.5

includes individuals who (1) immigrated to the United States as children, (2) are U.S.- born children of immigrants, or (3) were raised in environments where English is not the primary language of the home and community (Huster, 2012). Given these definitions, it is not uncommon for many Generation 1.5 students to not only disassociate themselves from multilingual learners and newly arrived immigrants, but also to not identify as multilingual learners because they are either native-born or have spent the majority of their lives attending school in the United States (Bergey et al., 2018; Haras et al., 2008). Generation 1.5 are culturally between first- and second-generation immigrants who may be fluent in spoken English, but may still require work on the command aspects of academic writing as long-term residents (Huster, 2012). Consequently, they require a very engaging learning environment.

Social and Emotional Learning (SEL)

To achieve such a synergetic, collaborative classroom community, one must take into consideration the members' social and emotional learning (SEL) experience. Although this study does not contribute much to the literature on the instruction of SEL within the general classroom, it considers SEL essential to a successful learning community; hence, the socioeconomic multilingual learner communities that tend to perform low on the ACCESS test also benefits from receiving SEL instruction (López, 2020). SEL instruction prepares the students to have more empathy, positive peer and student-teacher relationships, and self-regulations for better classroom management and discipline ((López, 2020), all the elements needed for a successful discourse community as students work collaboratively.

WIDA consortium

WIDA, an acronym which originally stood for Wisconsin, Delaware, and Arkansas - the first three states to collaborate on setting the standards for English Language Learning - eventually became known as the WIDA Consortium consisting of 41 territories and federal agencies dedicated to the research, design and implementation of a high-quality, culturally and linguistically appropriate system to support multilingual learners (WIDA,2020). This initiative began with a grant funded by the U.S. Department of Education and awarded to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction for the purpose of creating English language proficiency standards and assessments for K-12 education (WIDA, 2020). Despite the large population of Multilingual Learners, Arkansas, California, New York, and Texas have opted out of the consortium. The consortium is housed at the Wisconsin Center for Education Research School of Education, Madison, WI and oversees the development of the assessment for evaluating the English proficiency levels of multilingual learners. There are two tests that WIDA requires of multilingual learners; the first is the Screener and the second is ACCESS for ELs.

Standards. The standards are designed to ensure that effective pedagogy is being addressed in the core content subject areas of English Language Art, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and Language for Social and Instructional purposes, and that educators are making the appropriate alignment between language development and academic content area learning (WIDA, 2020). There are five standards to the WIDA language instructional platform (WIDA, 2020).

- Standard 1: Language for Social and Instructional Purposes
English language learners communicate for social and instructional purposes within the school setting.
- Standard 2: Language for Language Arts
English language learners communicate information, ideas and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of language arts.
- Standard 3: Language for Mathematics
English language learners communicate information, ideas and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of mathematics.

- Standard 4: Language for Science
English language learners communicate information, ideas and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of science.
- Standard 5: Language for Social Studies
English language learners communicate information, ideas and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of social studies.

Key Language Use. Language is a necessary tool for survival as we use it in our daily lives. Whether the language is spoken or written, its primary purpose is to make communication effectively possible. Multilingual learners having language barriers can find themselves in a confusing state when there is communication breakdown. The misuse of language functions and structure only adds to the difficulty of communicating. Consider the conversation:

Student:Teacher, Adrien did not come to school today.

Teacher:Why not?

Student:She said you don't need to come to school today!

Teacher:'I' don't have to come to school today? she responded while pointing back to herself.

Student:No, Adrien....

Teacher:Oh, you mean Adrien, 'he' does not have to come to school today.

In this example, where the speaker is using the subject pronoun "she" to define a boy whose name is Adrien, can be confusing. Hence, the name Adrien is male because of its spelling. In addition, the speaker's intent is to generalize the fact that no one is required to come to school today. However, the speaker uses the second person pronoun 'you' which many multilingual learners tend to use when speaking because processing the transition of subject pronouns within complex sentences can be challenging (Girault & Rivera Corridor, 2019). Because language functions take time to master, they do not have to be addressed immediately. To address these types of errors, an understanding of the general purpose of the discourse is the best approach.

What is the purpose of a conversation or discourse? WIDA presents four key language uses of academic language to uphold the purpose of a discourse. These key language uses reflect the most high-leverage genre families across academic content standards: Narrate, Explain, Argue, and Inform (WIDA, 2023). Within each key language use, there are present various forms of multimodals such as written language, visual imagery, audio sound, spatial arrangements, and gestures, to name a few. These multimodals are intended for specific purposes in specific discourse organization and language features such as speeches (WIDA, 2020). Because there are underlying characteristics within similar speeches (i.e., demonstrative, descriptive, definitive) they can be grouped into one genre of key language use such as to *Inform* an audience. In the above conversation, the student not being very clear forces the teacher to clarify her understanding by using the hand gesture to point back to herself as she emphasizes who does not have to come to school. In doing so, the purpose of the conversation is not lost, but simultaneously teaches the student how to use the correct personal pronoun within the context of the discourse. Hence, a method that speaks to pedagogical discourse analysis and is supported by PBTA. In the example above, the purpose of the discourse is for the student to 'inform' the teacher.

Understanding the Key Language Use, whether in a conversation or in writing, can result in an effective discourse. The following is a closer look at the key language use and genre examples of how they are used in curriculum contexts (See Table 2).

Table 2. Examples of Genre of Key Language Use in Context

Key Language Use (Genre Family)	Genre Examples (Curriculum Contexts/Program) (adopted from de Oliveira, 2010 Derewianka & Jones, 2018)
Narrate Represent experience through stories and histories, real or imagined	Stories: short stories, novels Histories: biographies, historical accounts
Inform Convey factual information about phenomena or topics	Reports: descriptive, classifying, comparative, compositional
Explain Give account for how or why things work	Explanations: sequential, causal, cyclical, systems, factorial, consequential
Argue Justify one’s claims using evidence and reasoning	Arguments: book reviews, critical responses in mathematics and science

As educators, we must conduct research to identify possible communication breakdowns of the discourse we encounter. As in the aforementioned example, communication can fail because of incorrect grammar choices, which are structural language features (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2014). Moreover, communication can also break down due to functional aspects, as illustrated above in the misunderstanding of who is not going to come to school based on the student’s use of the pronoun “you”. As described, Pedagogical Discourse Analysis (PDA) serves as a worthwhile instrument to detect, understand and prevent future students ‘communication breakdowns (Girault & Rivera Corridor, 2019). The teaching of grammar will and continues to be relevant but the approach of language development through discourse is a new approach in which teachers must be open to in the classroom.

When addressing communication breakdown, PDA allows for the analysis of the discourse at hand, whether it be oral or written, as educators can prevent communication breakdowns by employing top-down and bottom-up (Bailey & Curtis, 2015) resources for improving students’ discourse. According to Bailey and Curtis (2015), Top-down helps learners to process the social context where communication happens, and, Bottom-up teaches learners about the individual components of the language such as: grammar patterns, vocabulary, pronunciation. Moreover, assigning tasks encompassing discourse that reflect real-life communication and contextualized use of the target language is essential to achieve fluency. To accomplish this, educators must have established a discourse community in which multilingual learners can thrive.

Discourse community

Harper (2001) traced the etymology of the word *community* to the Latin *communitas*, indicating “common, public, general, shared by all or many,” and closely related to *communitatum*, referring to “fellowship, community of relations or feelings.” The English word *community* refers to both location and a sense of belonging or quality of relationship (Meredith, 2012). Therefore, a discourse community can be defined as one that engages members from a common location, sharing similar community relations or feelings in a collaborative group setting for meaningful and effective discourse. Similar to a virtual learning environment, the discourse community needs to be equipped with social presence, teaching presence (Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W., 2000), and cognitive presence (Boston et al., 2010, p.69), in order for educators to conduct effective discourse among multilingual learners. Members of its community can easily collaborate and interact with one another. For example, students can

scrutinize each other's discourse so that they can be aware of their own contributions to communication breakdown among the discourse community and provide effective feedback to one another.

For educators, the collaboration elevates the PDA to a Problem Base Task Analysis (BPTA) giving them the opportunity to incorporate different features of language while employing the four key language use within meaningful contextual discourse. (Olshtain & Celce-Murcia, 2001). Moreover, students can conduct peer analysis and self-recording to increase discourse awareness (Loaiza et al., 2016).

Methods

Design - Project Based-Task Analysis (PBTA) of Speech for Multilingual Learners

Having employed a Problem Based Task Analysis (PBTA) strategy for teaching discourse to assist with improving multilingual learners' performance outcome on the ACCESS for EL test, A Speech class was created. The Speech class borrowed the standards form WIDA and followed through with the Key Language Use to ensure that each aspect of the course was well aligned with its curriculum and lesson plans. If successful, at the end of the course, students will demonstrate growth on the Speaking domain of the ACCESS test. Although students are expected to grow at varying degrees, the growth target will not be measured according to the categorical tiers of high performers, average performers, and low performers (SCDOE, 2015). Rather, on the Speaking domain, students will be given a rating score from 1-6 on each of the four domains. Each score corresponds to 1) Entering 2) Emerging 3) Developing 4) Expanding 5) Bridging and 6) Reaching (WIDA, 2020). These ratings will reflect their performance at a 1) Word/Phrase Level, 2) Sentence Level and 3) Discourse Level while focusing on vocabulary usage, language forms, and linguistic complexity respectively.

Setting and Sampling

Participants. The participants ranged from 14 to 17 years of age in grades 9-12. They derived from several different central and south American countries. 16 students were selected for the course, but only 13 were assessed because three of them had already passed the ACCESS for ELs and had exited the program. They are not discussed in detail but are represented in the chart below (See Appendix A). Nonetheless, for this study, I included them in the survey, which will be discussed later, to understand their perspective of the course. The reason for why these three were chosen to participate in the course is unknown. Two of them were seniors and graduated at the top of their class. One was a junior and was also an honor student though his class rank is unknown and since he had already exited the MLP; his rank does not impact this study. Aside from these three, the remaining students all demonstrated deficiencies in the Speaking domain of the test (See Table 1).

To understand the impact that the Speech class had on the students' ACCESS test, one must consider each student's individual experience. Student (140301) Grew up in the US, and her family speaks mostly English at home. Student (480010088999) had always been very timid and never really spoke prior to this academic year. He speaks like an American with a southern accent. He was born and raised in Greenville, SC and began the ELP in K-4 with Greenville County Schools. His home language is Spanish. Student (21940) was born and raised in the US, and she is fluent in English and her parents are also fluent in English. Student (10652) indicated her home language as "other" since she is native Hawaiian-Pacific Islander. She began the ELP in K5 though she was born and raised in Greenville County. Student (81671) is from Mexico. He began elementary school in 6th grade. He began the MLP upon entry to the US and identified his home language as Spanish. His US Entry date was 8/16/2016. The first time he took the test, he earned a 6.0 in listening which would have placed him in at least level-A of the ELP curriculum. His highest score was three years ago in 2020 before Covid-19. Consequently, this raises

Forum on Public Policy

some doubt as to the accuracy of the ACCESS test. Student (33266) has an entry date from Mexico of 8/21/2013 and began the ELP in K-4 in Greenville County. His home language is Spanish, though his birthplace was South Carolina (SC). Student (119096) was born in Colombia and began the ELP in 2020, which was also the US Entry year. His home language is Spanish. His first year in the ELP he earned a score of 2.8 for the reading domain in 2020 and in 2022, it went up to a 6.0 in reading demonstrating significant growth. Student (30529) was born and raised in the US. Her family is of Puerto Rican descent. She has a speech impediment and has difficulty projecting her voice. Her speaking ability went down from 4.8 to 3.9 from one year ago. She had two perfect qualifying scores in Listening and Reading. She passed three of four domains last year except for the Writing in which she earned a 3.7. Since the Listening and Speaking domains are administered together, and since she was identified as a student who could benefit from the Speech course and could possibly yield significant growth in development, she was placed in the course (GCS, 2022). This year, her composite scores were excellent at 4.9 being a qualifying score to exit the program despite not having passed the Speaking domain. She entered the MLP on 3/23/15, in K-5, when she was probably identified as Gifted & Talented as well. She was also identified as Gifted & Talented until entering high school but was not served as such. Nonetheless, her writing score increased from 3.7 To 4.2. Student (85086) entered the MLP in 2016 when he was in third grade. He was born in El Salvador, but has been in the US for at least several years. His Speaking score went up 17 %. Student (480010089123) went up in all four domains except for the Speaking. He went down 1/10 of a point in Speaking. His home language is Spanish though he was born in Greenville County. He began receiving service in 2009, through the MLP in K-4, in Greenville County. The earliest record of test results dates back to 2015. Student (49001008) began in K-4 in Greenville County. She was born in Greenville County. She has the lowest GPA of 1.5. Student (480010089543) was born in California, US. She entered the MLP in 2014 when she was in 4th grade. Her Home language is Spanish, and successfully exited the program in her senior year of high school. Student (67925) was born in Ecuador. Her first record of MLP dates back to 2017 in 4th grade. There is no record of where she was born, but her home language is definitely Spanish. For a summary of the students’ profile, see Appendix A.

Speech Class. The Speech class itself did not have an actual curriculum and had to be designed, developed and implemented in accordance with WIDA Key language use and WIDA Standards. Table 3 below outlines how the Key language Use should be realized across content areas of Language Arts, Science, Social Studies, and Mathematics.

Table 3. Sample Speech Class Lesson Plan

Key Language Use	Hook	Standards	Activities
NARRATE	Unique Speech Topics: Student 60 sec. speech	Students will be able to..... -narrate a story within the context of Science, Language Arts, Social Studies, and Math -recognize different genres of speeches: short stories, anecdotes, news stories, autobiographies, biographies, historical recounts	“What does narration look like in core content courses?” Arts?” https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1CLFct_Vye1BkarMbyg9dQP0CK8-s019CsvNUYdD8FQ/edit#slide=id.g1465d3f8595_0_11 Understanding the WIDA rubric https://drive.google.com/file/d/1cknfUmiqFJcE2-8GX9ADbpSK1r0gCA2v/view?usp=drive_web&authuser=0

Forum on Public Policy

		<p>-analyze speeches for understanding, purpose, intent, and audience</p> <p>Speaking and Listening</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in collaborative conversations with diverse partners about grade level topics and texts with peers and adults. Describe people, places, things, and events with relevant details, expressing ideas and feelings clearly 	<p>Cooperative listening: “I Had a Dream”, MLK</p> <p>Research and analyze four different genres of speeches</p> <p>Independent Work - Google Classroom https://classroom.google.com/u/0/w/NTI2Mzk0MDc1ODQ2/tc/NTM5MjU0MzE1MTE1</p> <p>Recording of students’ Responses using Screencastify, Mote, R&W, etc.</p> <p>Cooperative Grouping: Students will be given several recordings of speeches and will practice analyzing and grading per WIDA rubric. https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/126zwkESROpMTs2en53eTxzUFmkgwPGLX?usp=sharing</p>
NARRATE	<p>Hook: Ted Talk https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q1A4Vs_h5Qas</p>		<p>Independent Work - Google Classroom https://classroom.google.com/u/0/w/NTI2Mzk0MDc1ODQ2/tc/NTM5MjU0MzE1MTE1</p> <p>-TedTalk: Reflect and respond “Are Latinos Hispanics? What countries make up Latinos? -Name several countries in the Caribbean that are Not Latinos? In Africa that ARE Latinos? -Tell us your story: How did you arrive to the United States -Seasaw.com - Select 3-4 recordings of your classmates and Assess their speech using the “Scoring Scale for Speaking Assessment” TedTalk: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q1A4Vsh5Qas -Paired Activity: TeachThis-30 Second Jail Talk Completion of Ted Talk Worksheet -Independent Practice: Work on Ted Talk (5 mins. Speeches)</p>
ARGUE	<p>Hook: “One language Three Accents: One</p>	<p>Justify one’s claims using evidence and reasoning. Language for Language Arts Expectation: Interpret</p>	<p>-Understanding the key language “Argue” across core content. -Independent Practice - Completion: Graphic Organizer</p>

Forum on Public Policy

	Language Three Accents ”	and express language arguments Language Function and its associated Language Features ELD-LA-4-5.Argue.Expressive Construct language arts arguments that:	-Independent Practice Completion of worksheet: Debate worksheet -Debate: Parent vs. Kid -Cooperative Group: Debate -Completion of worksheet: Debate worksheet
BENCHMARK 1 WIDA SCREENER			Speaking prompt - “Bill Nye has a plan to solve climate change!” “What do you think of Climate Change? Do you agree with the speaker? Record Benchmark- Speaking Domain Include a narration, and present a concrete argument.
INFORM	Unique Speech Topic: “But he told me...”		-Selection of TED TALK date -Introducing: Language Use - Informative PPT -Language Teach/Model: Essay Cohesion, Coherence and Unity
	Unique Speech Topic: 60 second speech: I wish I didn’t speak Spanish		Introducing: Review Language Use - Informative - Speaking up without freaking out! -Peer Evaluation - Presentation of TedTalk Language -Look for : Essay Cohesion, - Coherence and Unity Peer Evaluation Sheet - Debate: Should there be a limit to school dress code? - How I Overcame My Fear of Public Speaking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● But he told me ● Double Trouble
EXPLAIN	Hook “Can you solve the problem?”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze and evaluate data in explanations • Identify multilayered causal or consequential relationships in social or scientific phenomena • Apply reasoning or theory to link evidence 	Students will explain a math problem.

Forum on Public Policy

		<p>to the claims in explanations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct and revise explanations based on evidence from multiple sources <p>When students EXPLAIN, they do more than describe, recount or state facts. They give accounts for how things work. They not only ask about the “what” but the “how”!</p>	
Benchmark 2			<p>“Ted Talk”</p> <p>Prepare a 5 minute presentation (speech) on a topic in which you are passionate about. Presentations will be held in the auditorium.</p>

Table 4. Scoring Guide for WIDA SCREENER - Speaking Rubric

Score Point	Response Characteristics
Exemplary use of oral language to provide an elaborated response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language use comparable to or going beyond the model in sophistication • Clear, automatic, and fluent delivery • Precise and appropriate word choice
Strong use of oral language to provide a detailed response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language use approaching that of model in sophistication, though not as rich • Clear delivery • Appropriate word choice
Adequate use of oral language to provide a satisfactory response.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language use not as sophisticated as that of model • Generally comprehensible use of oral language • Adequate word choice
Attempted use of oral language to provide a response in English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language use does not support an adequate response • Comprehensibility maybe compromised • Word choice may not be fully adequate
No response (in English)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not respond in (English)

Data Collection

ACCESS for ELs. The ACCESS test is administered annually. WIDA recruits educators with culturally, and linguistically, diverse backgrounds to review ACCESS for ELLs and verify that the test contains neither bias nor sensitivity issues and that its contents are grade-level appropriate. The process is designed to ensure that test items are factually accurate and are free of material that (1) might favor any subgroup of students over another on the basis on gender, race/ethnicity, home language, religion, culture, region, or socio-economic status, and (2) might be upsetting to students (WIDA, 2020).

The ACCESS review session is a three-day process where educators from various member states collaborate on reviewing the test questions and responses. All participants must sign a non-disclosure agreement (NDA) to ensure the validity of the test. This process includes:

- Bias and Sensitivity Review - Ensure test items do not favor any group of students over another or have the potential to upset test-takers.
- Content Review - Ensure each test item is factual and grade-level appropriate.
- Forms Review - Review the entire test immediately before it is operational to do a final check for errors.
- Field Testing - Let your students practice for the scored test and ensure new test items meet our high quality standards

The test is administered across several days, focusing on the Listening and Speaking then Reading and Writing domains together on a separate occasion (WIDA, 2020). Once students take the test, they must earn a score of at least a 4.0 on each of the four domains (i.e., Speaking, Reading, Writing, Listening) and a 4.4 on the composite score to exit the Multilingual Learner Program. The Listening and Reading domains are graded by the computer, and the Speaking and Writing domains are graded by humans. Rating points are awarded for the percentage of multilingual students who score a composite of 4.4 or who achieve the interim target based on their initial identification and number of years in South Carolina’s MLP (WIDA, 2020). Annually, points are earned for the percentage of MLs meeting expected growth targets on the ACCESS for ELs using the values shown in Table 5. This allows both teachers and students to aim for an annually targeted growth of proficiency (WIDA, 2020).

Table 5. Annual On-Track English Proficiency Targets for MLs based on Initial Screener Level

Screener Level	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5+
1	1.9	2.9	3.8	4.1	4.4
2	2.6	3.2	3.8	4.1	4.4
3	3.3	3.6	3.8	4.1	4.4
4	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.4
Access-ALT	A1	A2	A3	P1	P1

Screener. The Screener is similar to the ACCESS test. However, the screener is administered within the first week of the arrival of a Multilingual learner at their assigned school in the United State (Greenville County Schools, 2023). The screener test consists of the same four domains as the ACCESS test and is administered in the same order. The Screener is used to determine students’ level of proficiency prior to

receiving Greenville County School English Language instruction. Based on the Screener scores, students are placed in one of six English Language Learner courses: Newcomers, Fundamental 1, Fundamental 2, Level A, Level B, or Level C.

Student Survey. The intervention of a Speech class was implemented to assist multilingual learners with increasing their performance on the ACCESS for ELs Speaking domain. This intervention required a high consideration for the participants’ social and emotional wellbeing within the learning environment in order for it to be successful. To further understand the participants’ experience during the intervention and the influence that the course may have had on the students’ progress on the English language proficiency assessment, a combined quantitative and qualitative survey was administered following the course (See Table 6). The survey consisted of 15 closed and open-ended questions.

Analysis

As noted in the Survey table below, the majority of the students agreed that the Speech influenced their ability to speak both, in front of others (93.7%), and outside of the class (87.5%) such as in their other core content classes, which provides additional opportunity to practice their speaking skills. In terms of engagement, 70.6% found the class to be very engaging, but 29.4% agreed that it was somewhat engaging. Moreover, 69.75% of the participants found that they gave a speech at least 2-3 times per week while in the class. Among the participants, 87.5% found the topics of discussion to be influential. Following the class, 76.4% felt that their confidence level had increased and 62.5% felt more confident when they took the Listening and Speaking domains of the ACCESS test. When asked “If you could change any aspect of the class, what would it be?” 81.25% said they would not change a thing. Finally, 100% of the participants said they would recommend the course to other multilingual learners.

Table 6

Students’ survey responses

Respondents	n	percent
How engaging was the Speech class?		
Very engaging	12	70.6%
Somewhat engaging	5	29.4%
Did the class discussions influence your ability to speak in front of your peers?		
Yes	14	87.5%
No	2	12.5%
How frequently were you asked to speak in front of the Speech class?		
At least 2-3 times per Week	11	68.75%
Daily	5	31.25%
Would you recommend this course to other Multilingual Learners?		
Yes	16	94.1%
Maybe	1	5.9%
No	0	0.0%
To which level of English Language Learners would you recommend this course?		
Beginners(Newcomers)	3	17.6%
Intermediate	13	76.5%
Advanced	1	5.9%

Forum on Public Policy

When you took the ACCESS for Els test, did you find that your confidence level had increased after taking the Speech class?		
Very much so	13	76.4%
Somewhat	4	23.5%
No, not at all	0	0%
How confident were you when you took the speaking and listening part of the ACCESS test after the Speech class?		
More confident	10	62.5%
A bit more confident	6	37.5%
No more confident than Before	0	0%
Would you recommend the Speech class to other Multilingual Learners?		
Yes	16	100%
No	0	0%
What advice would you give to others who are having difficulty passing the speaking part of the ACCESS Test?		
Talk loud	7	43.7%
Pay attention & participate in class	2	12.6%
Have confidence & Practice	7	43.7%
How would you rate the knowledge of your teacher teaching the Speech class?		
Knowledgeable	16	100.0%
Somewhat knowledgeable	0	0%
Not knowledgeable	0	0%
How would you compare the difficulty of this course?		
Like a College Prep (CP) Course	12	75%
Like an Advanced Placement (AP) course	1	6.2%
Unable to compare	3	18.8%
If you could change any aspect of the class, what would it be?		
Nothing	13	81.25%
Force everyone out of their comfort zone	1	6.25%
More class discussions	1	6.25%
More daily speeches	1	6.25%
Which Key Language Use was easiest to address in terms of public speaking?		
Argue	4	64.7%
Narrative	3	23.5%
Informative	2	23.5%
Explanation	5	29.4%

Descriptive Statistics

Instrument	n	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation
Target Year Speaking Test Results	7	5.7	5.9	6	0.37228
Previous Year Speaking Test Results	7	5.8	6	6	0.45987

Result Details

W-value:8
Mean Difference: 2.64
Sum of pos. ranks: 8
Sum of neg. ranks: 20
Z-value: -1.0142
Sample Size (N): 7

Result 1 -Z-value

Note: N(7) is not large enough for the distribution of the Wilcoxon W statistic to form a normal distribution. Therefore, it is not possible to calculate an accurate p-value. However, the N(13); being less than 20, allows for a W-value to be used to evaluate the hypothesis.

Result 2 -W-value

The value of W is 8. The critical value for W at N=7(p<.05) is 2.
 The result is *not significant* at p < .05.

Note: Because some of the students had the same score in both treatment conditions, the test removed the individuals from the analysis causing the sample size to be reduced from N(13) to N(7). Moreover, because there were a lot of ties, this procedure lessens the reliability of the test and suggests that the requirement that the data is continuous has not been met.

Results

This study was based on a quantitative analysis of students’ performance outcome on the ACCESS test following an intervention of a 16-week Speech course. A comparison of their ACCESS ELs 2022, prior year’s results, to their current score on the ACCESS ELs 2023, following the course, was conducted. A calculation of percentage increase or decrease determined their outcome as a result of the course. Greenville County Schools (GCS) does not look at the pass or fail status of the students’ performance on the test, but rather their demonstrated “growth” in terms of percentage increase or decrease.

Student Learning Outcome. Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) (Appendix A) are a tool for actionable reflection used in the Performance Assessment for Teachers (PAS-T) as a student growth measure (GCS, 2023). SLOs are generally monitored over the duration of time the students are with the teacher for instruction; this could be for either one semester or a full school year, depending on the duration of the course. Teachers are required to develop an objective that is student/class specific based on a standards-based area of focus (GCS, 2023). Throughout the interval of instruction, the teacher must plan and

monitor the students' progress, and prepare evidence of such at his/her mid-interval and final conference sessions with the Administrator or Supervisor.

The below Student Learning Objective (SLO) form summarizes the students' performance before, during, and following the Speech class. The first column indicates the students' identification number. Their actual names have been omitted to protect their identity. The second column briefly describes each students' profile based on a teacher-student interview. Each student's grade, linguistic abilities, and or characteristics have been indicated as known by the researcher. The third column indicates the students' scores on either the Screener or the Prior and Target year's ACCESS test. There are three years of scores for each student: 2021, 2022, and 2023. Where there is not an ACCESS score, a Screener score has been indicated. The Screener score is the onboarding assessment result for placing the student into an MLP class level. The fourth column is the mid-year or the mid-term exam result that was administered in the form of a Speaking test. The mid-year assessment mirrored that of the Screener Speaking test to ensure the validity of the overall assessment.

It should be noted that three of sixteen students who participated in the Speech class had already exited the MLP and did not have to take the ACCESS in 2023 leaving the population for this article at 13 students. Also, six of the thirteen students who served the targeted population for this study had a percentage decrease in their scores from 2023 compared to 2022. The remaining seven had a percentage increase.

Discussion

As a result of continuous low performing scores on the Speaking domain of the ACCESS for ELs and the low percentage of students who fail to exit the Multilingual Programs, a Speech course was designed, developed, and implemented to contribute to our understanding of the outcome of students' performance on the Speaking domain of the ACCESS for ELs. This study focused on the overarching theme of PBTA as it explored the influence of PBTA in a Speech class and if it created a difference in the outcomes of students' performance on the Speaking domain of the ACCESS for ELs and yielding the scores needed to exit the MLP, (Lamport & Hill, 2012; Yang et al., 2013) . I posed two questions in this analysis.

Research Questions

Research question 1. "What were the skill levels of multilingual learners in a Speech class supported by Project Base Task Analysis?"

Research question 1 answered. The mean for target year 2023 Speaking domain was higher than that of the previous year. The previous year's Speaking domain scores ranged from 2.5 to 4.8 with a mean of 5.8 and the target year's scores ranged from 2.4 to 4.1 with a mean of 5.7. The percentage change between the target year and the previous year ranged from -2.90 to 21.90. The average of the percentage change of the Speaking domain results from year to year is 3.58%. The value of W is 8, which is the critical value for W at $N=7(p<.05)$ is 2. The result is not significant at $p < .05$.

Research question 2: What changes are observed in the Speaking skills of Multilingual Learners following a Speech class supported by Project Base Task Analysis (PBTA)?

Research question 2 answered. As per the student survey, following the Speech class, 93% of the students were influenced by their ability to speak in front of their peers; 87.5% of the students were influenced by their ability to speak in a public setting outside of the class; 76.4% of the students were

more confident when they took the ACCESS test, and 62.5% were more confident when they took the speaking and listening part of the ACCESS test.

Generation 1.5. To understand the impact that the Speech class had on the students' ACCESS test, one must consider each student/subject independently. The results of the ACCESS for ELs test is influenced by several factors outside of the Speech class; factors that perhaps are unknown to the readers and graders of the test. For example, student #140301 grew up in the US, and her family speaks mostly English at home; student #480010088999 had always been very timid and never really spoke prior to his participation in the Speech class. Moreover, he was born and raised in Greenville, SC and began the ELP in K-4 with Greenville County Schools, and he is now a senior. These students are the Generation 1.5s. Upon entering postsecondary education, many Generation 1.5 students do not identify as Multilingual Learners because they are either native-born or have spent a great deal of their lives in the host country where they have received much of their K-12 education (Berger et al., 2018; Haras et al., 2008).

Based on the definition of Generation 1.5, these Multilingual learners are fluent in spoken English language, but may still need assistance with commanding aspects of the written English language. However, the Writing domain scores of these individuals on ACCESS for ELs demonstrate their mastery of written academic English with the exception of four students (#67925, #480010089543, #85086, #119096). If one takes a closer look at these four students, one will find varying plausible causes for their deficiencies. Student #480010089543 is a senior. She appears to be a college preparatory (CP) student averaging D-F in her core content classes. Her historical grades in her core content classes demonstrate that she performs at very low levels. Her home language is predominantly English, although her parents may speak Spanish from time to time. Nonetheless, she was born in Greenville County. She began receiving service in 2009, through the MLP in K-4, in Greenville County. She has been in the US for 14 years long enough for her to be fluent in all four domains. One could suspect that her low score in Writing could be the result of her cognitive or intellectual abilities.

Student #67925 is also a senior and has been an honor student with a 3.866 GPA. She has been very strong in math and science but somewhat average in her English courses. She has been in the MLP since 4th grade, for the past 8 years. Again, whether or not 8 years are sufficient to master the English language, she excelled in her academics graduating with honors. Moreover, her home language is both English and Spanish. Student #85086 is a Freshman. He is a very soft-spoken individual. He averages C in his core content classes. His home language is Spanish. He entered the MLP in 2016 when he was in third grade. He was born in El Salvador, but has been in the US for 6 years. His Speaking score went up 17% although his Writing decreased. This student is the eldest of several children at home, and has great responsibilities that interfere with his school life such as working 20 hours per week in construction (Interview, 2023). Student #119096 is a junior. He missed passing the Access by 1 point. Overall, he is a B student. He has a very strong accent and a slight speech impediment, which was probably not detected by the Reviewer. He first took the ACCESS for ELs in 2020, which was also his US Entry date. His home language is Spanish. In his first year in the ELP, he earned a score of 2.8 for the reading domain in 2020 and in 2022, it went up to a 6.0 in reading within three years.

Implications and Recommendations

As a result of this study, I recommend educators look into students' intellectual deficiencies by assessing their cognitive abilities and consider issuing an Individual Education Plan (IEP), (IDEA, 2018) in addition to or rather than an Individualized Language Acquisition Plan (ILAP) (GCS, 2020). Additionally, educators should look into bilingual households to see how much exposure a bilingual environment influences students' performance in their academic courses. In terms of exposure, I am

referring to the interaction with family members in their native language and considering the additional home responsibilities and obstacles that multilingual learners encounter on a daily basis. Educators should also consider that the alignment of the WIDA standards to Key Language Use within a PBTA instructional curriculum is critical for successful discourse among multilingual learners. Particularly when in a classroom setting, which presents a learning community where situations arise and where there can be communication breakdowns due to conflicting points of view and opinions. These discourse communities afford Multilingual Learners the opportunity to learn how to appreciate and be aware of the discourse patterns associated within a particular context. In doing so, educators can better plan and incorporate interactive activities or tasks that lead students to produce actual discourse (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2014) .

This year, I had the privilege of serving on the review committee for Bias, Sensitivity, and Content, to help ensure that test items are free of material that (1) might favor any subgroup of students over another on the basis on gender, race/ethnicity, home language, religion, culture, region, or socio-economic status, and (2) might be upsetting to students. The panel consisted of 30 classroom-based educators with a variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds who have experience teaching English learners and content area teaching expertise (in English Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, or Science) in one of five grade clusters: Grade 1, Grades 2–3, Grades 4–5, Grades 6–8, and Grades 9–12 (WIDA, 2020). WIDA has historically grounded its work in language development standards as a driver of equity for multilingual learners in curriculum, instruction, and assessment (WIDA 2020). These practices reflect a continued commitment to their goals. But where is the equity when students are not being allowed to exit the Multilingual Program on the basis of varying learning and developmental experiences? Should students be forced into the Multilingual Learner Program simply because they indicated that another or second language is spoken at home without taking into consideration the number of years in the US or exposure to the English language? Consider the case of Student (#21940) who was born in the US. Because her mom selected Spanish on the form, she is monitored every year as an ML student. One could argue that if Student (#21940) spoke English very well, then she should have been able to test out of the ML program just as quickly as she was placed. However, let us not forget that forcing individuals to participate in any event against their will, can have an adverse effect on their performance outcome, hence making that event counterproductive.

The Home Language Survey stipulates that as a result of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, school districts and charter schools should “determine the language that is spoken in each student’s home in order to identify their specific language needs” (HLS, 2020). There seems to be some ambiguity in the chosen words “their specific language needs”. Identification of one’s home language does not necessarily mean that the student is lacking in the English Language. It also does not address the student’s linguistic aptitude in the English language. Perhaps the HLS should be modified to also identify whether or not the student was born in the United States and whether or not the student feels he/she has difficulty with the English language? While the latter cannot be addressed upon completion of the Home Language Survey, it can certainly be considered before committing the student to a lifelong ML program. Consequently, I recommend posing two additional questions on the HLS: 1) Was the student born and raised in the United States? and 2) How many years did the student attend schooling in another English speaking cultural environment prior to enrolling at the prospective school? This does not mean that the student will not have to be placed in the ML program, on the contrary, it will contribute to the prediction of the number of years the student will most likely need to spend in the program.

Perhaps Educators should consider what parents are thinking and feeling when they are completing the HLS? Being bilingual or polyglot is something to be very proud of as it offers many cognitive benefits and academic advantages. It also expands one’s awareness of other cultures and makes it much easier for one to learn subsequent languages. Therefore, it is not surprising that people who are bilingual are proud to share this information with others. After all, they are coming to the United States for better

opportunities. What better way to demonstrate their capabilities, than to share that they can communicate in more than one language as a valuable skill in the US also referred to as the melting pot? Moreover, as designated 1.5 generation families, expressing their disapproval of participating in the ML program is not uncommon especially when they are fluent in the English language - even though they are still working on their command of the written English and academic writing skills.

Despite the implementation of a semester-long Speech course. Students still did not pass the Speaking domain of the ACCESS test. This mystery is one that cannot be ascertained. To pass the ACCESS for ELs, one must obtain at least a 4.0 in all four domains and the composite score has to be at least a 4.4. But consider Student X, who was not used in this study, but had all the qualifying scores except her composite score was 4.3 making her ineligible to exit the program. One important factor to keep in mind is that the Listening and Reading domains are graded by a computer, and the Speaking and Writing domains are graded by humans and can be biased based on human perception. Another factor to consider is if students born and raised in the US, fluent in the English language, yet do not pass the Speaking domain of the test, then how can we expect multilingual English learners to pass the test? After a few attempts of the ACCESS for ELs, I recommend testing students only on the domain(s) that they do not pass. Upon arriving in the United States, students have only two opportunities to avoid being admitted to the Multilingual program: 1) by not initially disclosing their primary language on the HLS and 2) by passing the Screener exam. Students who meet these criteria are identified as ML students, but they are not one needing any kind of classroom services.

As this relates to the outcome of the survey, it is evident that students enjoyed the discourse pedagogy and highly recommend it for future Multilingual Learners. Although they may not have passed the ACCESS test, they demonstrated continued learning and practice of the English language, which is necessary for them to become fluent. To effectively achieve students' communication in the target language, language educators must incorporate discourse and discourse analysis into their pedagogy. As a result, learners will be able to express themselves contextually and manage genuine communication. Moreover, I encourage language teachers to adopt PBTs and PDA so that learners can fully understand how to manipulate the language in different ways that take place outside of the classroom.

Limitations

There is one limitation to this study and that is the sample was quite small and limits its power. However, the survey helps to emphasize the opinions of the participants in the study and support the results. Moreover, if the population used in this study are limited in their classroom experience, this too might have influenced the outcome of the study, which is why I recommend PBTs and PDA to be used in the instructional practices.

References

- Bergey, R., Movit, M., Baird, A. S., & Faria, A. (2018). Serving English language learners in higher education: Unlocking the potential. *American Institutes for Research*. Retrieved from <https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Serving-EnglishLanguage-Learners-in-HigherEducation-2018.pdf>
- Boston, Diaz, Gibson, Ice, Richardson, Swan (2010). An Exploration of the Relationship Between Indicators of the Community of Inquiry Framework and Retention in Online Programs. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 14(1), 67-83.
- Education Commission of the United States. (May, 2020) 50-State Comparison: English Learner Policies State Resource Page for English Learners. Retrieved from <https://www.ecs.org/50-state-comparison-english-learner-policies/>
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language Teaching Research and Language Pedagogy*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Enright, K. A. (2011). Language and literacy for a new mainstream. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(1), 80–118. doi:10.3102/0002831210368989
- Flowerdew, J. (2013). *Discourse in english language education*. New York: Routledge.
- García, O. (2009). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name? *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(2), 322–26. doi:10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00172.x
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 2(2-3), 87-105. <http://www.thecommunityofinquiry.org/editorial29>
- Harper, D. (2001). Online etymology dictionary. Retrieved from <http://etymonline.com/index.php?term=community>
- Hong, J. C. (2007). The comparison of problem-based learning (PmBL) model and project-based learning (PtBL) model. International Conference on Engineering Education (ICEE) 2007, Coimbra, Portugal.
- Huster, K. (2012). The grammar and vocabulary challenges of Generation 1.5: Hmong college women in academia. *Hmong Studies Journal*, 13(1), 1-30.
- I.D.E.A. (2018).
- Ke, F. (2010). Examining online teaching, cognitive, and social presence for adult students. *Computers and Education*, 55(808-820).

- Loaiza, M., Madrigal, V., & Vargas, V. (2016). Bringing critical discourse analysis into the foreign language classroom: A case study of a Taiwanese learner of Spanish in Costa Rica. *Revista de lenguas modernas*, 24, 215-226.
- López, Maria (2020). Creating a caring and inclusive community: Analyzing Effectiveness of a social emotional learning program at the classroom level. California State University, Long Beach Proquest Dissertations Publishing.
- Meredith, John Randy (2012). The impact of podcasting on perceived learning, classroom community, and preferred context for podcast consumption. Regent University. Proquest Dissertation publishing, 2013. 3535968.
- Olshtain, E., & Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Discourse analysis and language teaching. In D. Schiffrin, D.
- Olsen, L. (2010). *Reparable harm: Fulfilling the unkept promise of educational opportunity for California's long term English learners*. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together.
- Pettela, R., Kandra, C., & Palepu, S. (2017). Discourse analysis and language teaching. *Research journal of English language and literature*, (5), 658-652. Retrieved from <http://www.rjelal.com/5.2.17c/648-652%20CHANDRIKA%20KANDRA.pdf>
- Rumbaut, R. G., & Ima, K. (1988). *The adaptation of Southeast Asian refugee youth: A comparative study*. *Final report to the Office of Refugee Resettlement*. San Diego State University. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED299372>
- SCDOE, (2022-2023). Title III. Multilingual Learner and Immigrant Children and Youth Program Guiding Principles. Retrieved from <https://ed.sc.gov/policy/federal-education-programs/office-of-federal-and-state-accountability-trainings/2021-essa-academy-day-1/title-iii-multilingual-learner-and-immigrant-student-program-guiding-principles/>
- Tannen, & Hamilton, H.E., (2020). *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 707-724). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- WIDA. (2020). *WIDA English language development standards framework*. (2020 edition): Kindergarten–grade 12. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System.

Appendix A

2022-2023 Student Learning Objective (SLO)

I. Student Population and Baseline: *What do I already know about the students in my class? What do I know about the support my students will need to be successful in this class/content area?*

(Input data about the class in which you are completing this SLO- number of students, # of students with IEPs, 504s, iLAPS, attd'l info as needed as well as the baseline data from the pre-assessment)

My Speech class consists of students who have taken the WIDA ACCESS test in 2022. These students did well in three of the four domains. The domain in which many of them fell short was in Speaking. Hence, the Speech class was suggested to address the needs of these students in this particular domain. This SLO is being written after one month of having been in contact with the students in a learning environment. Hence, I have determined the areas of weakness to “pronunciation”, ‘voice projection”, and “lack of extensive vocabulary”. Moreover, because writing tends to enhance once Speech, students have demonstrated a lack of organization when addressing writing prompts prior to recording their scripts during assignments and assessments.

Name	Student Profile Per Teacher and student interviews.	ACCESS or SCREENER Speaking Test	Mid Year Assessment Speaking Graded by Ms. Sever	ACCESS and Learning Outcome Percentage Increase
140301	A Freshman and a straight A student. She is well versed in all subject areas. She is a soft spoken individual but a very articulate one. She moved to SC from NJ and a blue ribbon school. It is surprising that she is not taking honors courses. HL: English/Spanish	Screener Speaking 5.0 Access 2022 - 3.8 2023 - 3.9	6.0	2.6
480010088999	A senior. He receives very good grades in all of his classes with the exception of science where he tends to average low Ds. This is important considering the standard of “Language proficiency in academic Science”. HL: Spanish	Access 2021 - 3.1 2022 - 3.2 2023 - 3.9	N/A	21.9
480010095563	He has already passed the ACCESS in all four domains. He was given the opportunity to withdraw from the class and select a course at his preference, but he chose to remain in Speech with the hopes of building his confidence. Graduated #60 with 4.628/5.0 GPA HL: English	Access 2021 - 3.5 2022 - 4.5 2023 - n/a	5.5	N/A
21940	She was born in the US and came to HHS from a middle school ESOL program. She speaks English very well. When asked why she did not do so well on the Speaking domain of the ACCESS, she did not quite have an answer. She averages C-D overall content courses. HL: English	Access 2021 -3.8 2022- 3.7 2023 - 4.0	N/A	8.10
10652	She is a Junior. She is of Polenesian background. She averages F in both language and English courses. Moreover,	Access 2021 - 2.4 2022- 2.5	6.0	-4.10

Forum on Public Policy

	all of her courses were floored (HHS, 2021) in 20-21 and low performance indicators in 21-22 academic school year records. HL: English	2023 - 2.4		
33266	He is a Freshman. He is an honor student in Math and History and receives As in all his other courses. He is a very shy individual. He does not interact with his peers, which is sad because the class operates off UDL standards and approach. Not only does he speak with a low voice; he opens his mouth then struggles to get the words out. HL: Spanish	Access 2021 - 3.9 2022 - 3.9 2023 - 3.7	N/A	-5.10
81671	He is a junior. He averages D in English class. HL: English/Spanish	Access 2021- 2.8 2022- 3.0 2023 - 3.5	5.5	16.7
119096	He is a junior. He missed passing the Access by 1 point. His performance in English is quite good; hence, he was dismissed from an actual ESOL class with the prediction that he can do better in a mainstream course. Overall, Thomas is a B student. He has a very strong accent and a slight speech impediment. HL: Spanish	Access 2021 - 3.2 2022 - 3.7 2023 - 3.5	4.5	-5.4
30529	She is a Freshman and a straight A student. She is in Honors English. She is fluent in English and Spanish. She is quite shy and has voluntarily accepted to remain in the Speech class after having been given the choice to select another course. Lariel believes that the Speech class will help build her self esteem.	Access 2021- 3.5 2022 - 4.8 2023 - 3.9	6.0	-18.80
480010089123	He is a senior with a very low passing rate across all subject areas. The majority of his courses have been floored for failure to make an effort. He is the eldest child in his family and often is required to take care of his siblings sacrificing his own school work. HL: English	Access 2021 - 3.3 2022 - 3.5 2023 - 3.4	N/A	-2.9
46532	He is a junior and has successfully passed the ACCESS in all domains. He was given the opportunity to withdraw from the class and select a course at his preference, but he chose to remain in Speech with the hopes of building his confidence. HL: Spanish	Access 2021 - 4.0 2022 - 4.0 2023 - n/a	6.0	N/A
104499	She is a junior and has successfully passed	Access	6.0	N/A

Forum on Public Policy

	all domains of the ACCESS test. He was given the opportunity to withdraw from the class and select a course at her preference, but she chose to remain in Speech. Arantza has a lot of confidence. Graduated #24 with 4.9/5.0 GPA in her class of 564 seniors. HL: Spanish	2021- 3.7 2022- 4.8 2023 - n/a		
85086	He is a Freshman. He is a very soft spoken individual. He averages C in his core content classes. HL: Spanish	Access 2021 - 3.6 2022 - 3.4 2023 - 4.0	5.0	17.6
480010089584	She is a senior and an Honor student across all of her classes. Graduated #118 with 4.3/5.0 GPA HL: Spanish	Access 2021- 3.1 2022- 3.6 2023 - 4.1	5.5	13.9
480010089543	She is a senior. She appears to be a CP student averaging D-F in her core content classes. Her historical grades have not been floored, demonstrating that she performs at very low levels. HL: English/Spanish	Access 2021 - 3.8 2022 - 3.8 2023 - 4.1	5.5	7.9
67925	She is a senior and has been an honor student. She has been very strong in math and science but somewhat average in her English courses. HL: Spanish	Access 2021 - 2.4 2022 - 3.4 2023 - 3.2	5.5	-0.10

- II. SLO Objective Statement:** *What should students be able to do at the end of the interval of instruction?*
- Students should be able to...(if you say show measurable growth, what does that mean)
 Students should be able to increase their linguistic Speaking skills as per WIDA Proficiency Standards in Academic Language of Science, Math, English, and Language Arts. Students' proficiency will be measured using the WIDA Screener Prompts. Student learning outcomes should demonstrate a proficiency growth by at least 10% from their baseline scores (I.e., 80% increase to 88%)
 (See Chart Above)
- III. Standards and Learning Objective:** *Identify one or two content standards and indicators that will provide the basis of the SLO learning objective. What evidence will tell me that a student has met the learning objective?*
- (What standards or course objectives did you use to create your statement above and what will the meeting look like?)**
 English Language Learners (ELL) will communicate for Social and Instructional purposes within the school setting. ELLs will communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content areas of Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. The curriculum Inside addresses all four of these content areas, comprehensively, as they are presented in the English language curriculum.
- IV. SLO Interval of Instruction:** *When will instruction begin and end specific to this SLO?*
 Beginning Instruction Date: August 29, 2022 Mid-Year Conference October 14, 2022.
 Ending Instruction Date: December 19, 2022
- V. Instructional Strategies:** *Describe the instructional practices and/or grouping strategies that will be used to teach this content to your students.*
- Explain and describe the specific strategies you will use (2-3 specific ones that would help you meet your objective)**

Forum on Public Policy

This year because the district focus is Universal Design for Learning (UDL), I will incorporate the following strategies:

- Cooperative Group (Students work in small groups to conduct peer review of sample work)
- Close Reading (Cooperatively, students will read aloud unit stories. They will also role play and follow along with audio)
- Conferencing (
- I will conference with students to analyze their assessments and discuss strategies for improvement.)
- Effective questioning and Extended Thinking (Present students with essential questions prior to lesson delivery and assignments. Following formative assessment, data will be used to develop extended thinking strategies.)
- Student Self-assessment: Students will write and record their scripts. They will then listen to their recordings while grading their work using a rubric.
- Cues, questions, activating prior knowledge (Class begins with a “Best Topics for 60 second Speeches) Activating strategy to review prior lessons and engage students into oral speech.
- Formative Assessment process (Students will receive quizzes(oral/written), projects)
- Direct instruction and Flexible/strategic grouping (Daily lecture and instruction with options as per UDL strategies.

Example Strategies

VI. Responsive and Inclusive Practices: *Student success is deeply connected to the learning environment. Which responsive and inclusive learning practice is most connected to your planning for a positive learning environment?*

(Click one) **Creating a Safe Space for Learning**

X Building Relationships

- **Knowing & Communicating with Students**

To model student behaviors, rules and classroom expectations will be shared, exhibited, reinforced, consistently.

Students will be held accountable for their learning, collaboration, and giving each other respectful feedback - all of which will be evaluated and most of which will be entered in my Grade Book.

Following assessments, consultation with students will take place to express belief in and compassion for them and their work, while posing genuine questions, being an active listener, expressing enthusiasm about students' engagement with content, and/or expressing respect and acceptance in my classroom.

- **Designing with High Expectations for Cognitive Rigor**

When you think about this group of students and this content, how will this inclusive practice help you intentionally create a positive classroom community that helps all students take risks and grow as independent learners? (Answer this)

First, the American educational system presents a foreign experience to my student population. The best way to reach them is to first build and establish a relationship with them and their parents. This tends to go a long way when understanding how much access they have to being successful in and outside of school. Second, communicating with parents helps to convey the message that Hillcrest has standards which students are expected to uphold. This also draws the parents closer to the school community, a viable resource for student success.

Appendix B



Home Language Survey (HLS)

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI, Language Minority Compliance Procedures, requires school districts and charter schools to determine the language(s) spoken in each student's home in order to identify their specific language needs. This information is essential in order for schools to provide meaningful instruction for all students as outlined in Plyer v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202 (1982).

The purpose of this survey is to determine the primary or home language of the student. This survey is given to all students enrolled in the school district/charter school. The HLS is administered once, upon initial enrollment in South Carolina, and should remain in the student's permanent record.

If a language other than English is recorded for ANY of the survey questions below, the appropriate identification screening assessment will be administered to determine whether or not the student qualifies for additional English language development support.

Please answer the following questions:

- 1. What is the language that the student first acquired?
2. What language(s) is spoken most often by the student?
3. What is the primary language used in the home, regardless of the language spoken by the student?
*4. In what language do you wish to have communication from the school?

Student Name: Grade:
Parent/Guardian Name:
Parent/Guardian Signature: Date:

Your signature above certifies that you understand if a language other than English has been identified, your student will be tested to determine if they qualify for English language development services, to help them become fluent in English. If entered into the English language development program, your student will be entitled to services as an English learner and will be tested annually to determine their English language proficiency.

For School Use Only:
School personnel who administered and explained the HLS and the placement of a student into an English language development program if a language other than English was indicated

Name: Date:

Updated August 28, 2019