Supporting Multilingual Learners/Long-Term English Language Learners in New York State

About this Document

This document contains three different sections which provide resources for administrators and educators working with Multilingual Learners/English Language Learners (MLLs/ELLs).

- The first section is a topic brief that addresses questions such as: Who are multilingual learners/ long-term English Language Learners? What are the Educational Services available to this group of students? It also provides examples of promising practices to support long term MLLs/ ELLs in schools.
- The second section presents profiles of long term MLLs/ ELLs to encourage educators in New York to think about how unique each of their students are, regardless of the labels that they have received.
- The third and last section offers an annotated bibliography.

These sections complement each other, but can also be read and used as separate documents.

Who are Multilingual Learners/Long-Term English Language Learners?

New York State Education Department (2017) defines Multilingual Learners/Long-Term English Language Learners (MLLs/ELLs) as those English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners (MLLs/ELLs[1]) who have received English-language supports through Bilingual Education or English as a New Language (ENL) for six or more years without scoring at the Commanding level on the NYSESLAT. This subpopulation of MLLs/ELLs are typically in middle and high school.

Typically, the majority of LTELLs speak English fairly fluently. Their oral language is strong when it is used for social purposes. In their daily lives outside of school, LTELLs use their full linguistic repertoires, including words from English and their home languages—with family members, friends, and in their communities (Ascenzi-Moreno, Kleyn, & Menken, 2013).

Despite their linguistic creativity and intelligence, these students often score below grade level in school-based literacy tasks or assessments that are administered in English as well as in their home language (Olsen, 2010). There are many factors contributing to that outcome.

- **Language development among learners is highly variable and based on many contextual factors.** Studies over time have shown that it can take students who are

---

[1] English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners (MLLs/ELLs) are defined as children who "by reason of foreign birth or ancestry, speak or understand a language other than English…and require support in order to become proficient in English" (NYSED, 2014, p. 17).

learning a new language from 4 to 12 years to develop academic content area knowledge and school-based literacy on par with students who have been exposed to that language from birth (Collier, 1995). NYSED (2018) has found that **"Most ELLs/ MLLs in New York State become proficient in English in three to five years, on average"** (p. 27). While these students develop what Cummins (2008) describes as conversational language quickly, the academic language takes longer to develop. This academic language is what MLL/ELL students need to understand and use in order to be successful with grade level curriculum (Freeman & Freeman, 2009; Gibbons, 2009).

- **Many LTELLs have not lived in the United States continuously.** Even though a significant proportion of LTELLs were born in the United States, and all are primarily U.S.-educated (Menken & Kleyn, 2010), their mobility often makes the U.S.-born label misleading, and may lead to interruptions in their schooling.

- **Inconsistent U.S. schooling.** Over the course of their academic careers, some LTELLs are shifted by their school systems between bilingual education programs, English as a new language (ENL) programs, and mainstream classrooms that provide no "ELL services." In addition to having different, unaligned goals for students, some or all of those educational programs may have been of low quality. For example, many LTELLs attend under-resourced schools where teachers may be less experienced. Schools that LTELLs attend are often schools that abruptly shift or unevenly implement their language policies (Menken & Kleyn, 2010).

- **The prior schooling of these students was often subtractive.** This means, in an effort to replace students' home language practices with English, schools that , LTELLs attended did not typically build on their prior knowledge, dynamic language practices, experiences, or cultural backgrounds. Given that, LTELLs struggle to make connections to school-based literacy (Menken & Kleyn, 2010). These students tend to be labeled low performing in the content areas as well (Soto, Freeman, & Freeman, 2013), even though there is much they can do (Brooks, 2015, 2016).

- **LTELLs with Disabilities.** The [Blueprint for English Language Learners' Success](#) (NYSED, 2019) states that all districts and schools will provide special education supports, services, accommodations, and specially-designed instruction to meet the specific instructional needs of MLLs/ELLs with disabilities. However, providing an accurate diagnosis for MLL/ELL students with disabilities can be a challenge. It is widely documented that MLLs/ELLs are both over- and under-identified for special education services (Brown & Campbell-Ault, 2015). Correctly identifying and providing LTELLs with disabilities the appropriate supports is essential.

- **Social-emotional factors**. Positive emotional well-being correlates with higher rates of academic engagement, a sense of belonging and connectedness in school (Fredrickson, Cohn, Coffey, Pek, & Finkel, 2008). On the other hand, when students do not have positive experiences in schools, their learning can be adversely affected (McLeod &

Fettes, 2007). The social-emotional wellbeing of LTELL students plays an important role in their academic success.

For all of these reasons and others, this population of students is at high risk for dropping out of high school before graduation and not going on to college.

Strengths of Multilingual Learners/Long-Term English Language Learners

LTLs may have not received the high-quality English language development services they need to learn academic English, and may not have access to English language materials and supports outside of school, such as assistance with homework in English. For that reason, current educational research has sought to highlight the unique language practices, experiences, strengths, and resilience these students possess (Brooks, 2015, 2016; Flores & Rosa, 2015).

LTELLs make up the largest group of secondary school-aged MLLs/ELLs in the United States. In New York State, 11.7% of the total number of identified MLLs/ELLs are LTELL (EngageNY, 2014), and in New York City, one third of students in secondary schools are labeled LTELLs (Menken & Kleyn, 2010).

Focus on Transnational Students

Some LTELLs have moved between countries, states, and/or schools. Transnational students have moved back and forth between the United States and their families' countries of origin during their school-aged years. These students are often transient meaning they frequently move within the United States because of their family and economic circumstances (Soto, Freeman, & Freeman, 2013) and for this, may or may not have gaps in their schooling history (Menken & Kleyn, 2010). For example, some students who return to their home countries have had to work rather than attend school during their time away. In these cases, LTELLs may have some commonalities with the sub-group of multilingual learners labeled as 'Students with Interrupted Formal Education" or SIFE[2] .

Unpacking LTMLL/LTELLs' Language Abilities

Teachers often wonder why LTMLL/LTELL students typically do poorly in school. They have been in school(s) for several years, they speak English, and they appear to understand what is going on in class. Often, educators have the impression that these students are not trying or that they have additional learning difficulties when they do not do well academically. They may assume that because students' oral English is proficient, they should be doing well academically as well.

---

[2] New York State Education Department defines Students with Interrupted/Inconsistent Formal Education (SIFE) as English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners (MLLs/ELLs) who have attended school in the U.S. for fewer than 12 months, and are two or more years below grade level in home language literacy and/or math due to inconsistent or interrupted schooling prior to their arrival (New York State Education Department, 2014, CR Section 154-2.2).

To help explain these observations, Cummins (1984) theorized there are two types of language proficiency: conversational and academic. The first type, conversational language, develops rather quickly when a student begins to learn a new language. It is reflected in the ability to hold a conversation about every day, concrete topics. On the other hand, being able to talk, read, and write about subject areas using the kinds of vocabulary and syntax that is expected in school takes longer to develop. Since then, other researchers have expanded what we know about the school-based literacy practices of LTMLLs/LTELLs, demonstrating the ways they are, in fact, richer and more dynamic than many educators assume. Brooks (2016) identified four meaning-making practices that LTELLs students engaged in as they read biology and English Language Arts texts and "thought aloud." These think aloud protocols revealed deep thought about these students' thought processes while reading; students summarized and identified important information, made connections to background knowledge, went beyond facts stated explicitly in the text, and recognized the limitations of particular texts. This meaning-making, however, is typically not captured by most standardized tests. Alternate kinds of assessment can help teachers gather the data they need about the real growth and abilities of LTMLLs/LTELLs, which vary greatly from student to student (Brooks, 2016).

What educational services do they receive?

LTELLs receive English-language supports through Bilingual Education or English as a New Language (ENL) from their schools until they score at the Commanding level on the NYSESLAT.

Bilingual Education Programs
Bilingual Education programs include Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) programs and Dual Language (DL) programs. TBE programs offer students of the same home language the opportunity to learn to speak, understand, read, and write in English while continuing to learn academic content in their home language. The students' home language is used to help them progress academically in all content areas while they acquire English. "The goal of a TBE Program is to provide students with the opportunity to transition to a monolingual English classroom setting without additional supports once they reach proficiency" (NYSED 2019, n.p.).

DL programs do not transition students to a monolingual English setting. DL programs "…seek to offer students the opportunity to become bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural while improving their academic ability" (NYSED 2019, n.p.). In the majority of dual language programs, the students receive half of their instruction in their home language, and the remainder of their instruction in the target language they are learning.

English as a New Language Programs
In an ENL program, language arts and content-areas are taught in English using specific ENL instructional strategies. Students receive core content area and English language development instruction with appropriate supports, including the use of student's home languages. There are stand-alone and integrated ENL classes.

Integrated ENL classes are taught by a teacher dually certified in the content area they are teaching and ENL or they are co-taught by a certified content area teacher and a certified ENL teacher.

In a *Stand-alone ENL class*, students receive English language development instruction taught by a NYS-certified teacher of English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) in order to acquire the English language needed for success in core content areas. (NYSED, 2019).

A student's score on the NYSESLAT exam determines their level of English language proficiency. At present, the five levels of English proficiency are as follows: Entering, Emerging, Expanding, Transitioning, and Commanding. Depending on their levels, students are entitled to a specific number of minutes per week of English as a New Language (ENL) instruction.

What are some best practices for supporting Multilingual Learners/Long-Term English Language Learners?

Effective programs for LTELLs help students build on and extend their strong communicative oral language base to support their development of the language and literacy necessary for academic purposes. In all cases, it is critical that the ways that LTELLs use English and their home languages are not marginalized in schools (Cheatham & Hart Barnett, 2016). As explained in the CUNY-NYSIEB Framework for the Education of LTMLLs/LTELLs:

> "LTELLs [Long-Term English learners] are often misperceived as 'language-less' in schools because they are still in the process of acquiring academic language and literacy skills in English as well as in their home language. Yet the reality is that these students are characterized by highly complex and dynamic bilingual language practices. These must be recognized, positively regarded, and built upon strategically in instruction" (Ascenzi-Moreno, Kleyn, & Menken, 2013, pp. 1–2).

School-based practices

Below we describe programmatic and curricular structures that schools implement to support LTMLLs/LTELLs. It is critical that administrators support school-wide efforts by providing teachers with time for student-level data analysis, collaborative curriculum mapping, ongoing planning and reflection, and professional development on best practices for LTELLs. Schools with these supports in place have seen significant progress among their LTELLs.

Research suggests that coursework for LTELLs should be aligned and focused on the development of students' language and literacy for academic purposes in students' home languages and English (Ascenzi-Moreno, Kleyn, & Menken, 2013; Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2002; Menken & Kleyn, 2010; Soto, Freeman, & Freeman, 2013). The CUNY-NYSIEB Framework for the Education of LTELLs (Ascenzi-Moreno, Kleyn, & Menken, 2013) describes the following key structures for success:

Rigorous Home Language Arts instruction geared towards LTMLLs/LTELLs. It is very important that LTELLs receive explicit instruction in their home language. Home (or Native) Language Arts (HLA) classes build on and extend the strong oral communicative skills that LTELLs bring to school. These classes are different from world language classes which are typically designed for students at the beginning stages of learning a new language that they do not already speak and understand.

A focused bilingual language and literacy block. This language and literacy block would include ENL class, English Language Arts (ELA) class, and an HLA class. The teachers of these classes plan collaboratively in order to align broad topics of study and the literacy skills that are taught.

All teachers are language and literacy teachers. LTELLs make great progress when math, science, and social studies teachers, in addition to ENL and ELA teachers, develop language and literacy objectives that support their content objectives (Ascenzi-Moreno, Kleyn & Menken, 2013). Translanguaging pedagogies—where students' home languages are used strategically (García, Johnson, & Seltzer, 2017)—are employed in these classes to help students access content and develop their language and literacy skills. Translanguaging strategies such as home language grouping, setting up multilingual reading and writing partners, and using multilingual texts are described in detail, along with many additional strategies in Celic and Seltzer's (2013) Translanguaging Guide.

A school team that meets regularly to describe and review the education of LTELLs in the school and individual students' progress. This team ideally includes school staff involved in the education of LTMLLs/LTELLs, including the ENL, ELA, and HLA teachers, a content teacher in social studies, science or math, a school counselor, and an administrator. This group reviews curriculum structures and shares teaching strategies that support LTMLLs/LTELLs. This team also uses multiple sources of data as they level, group, and provide appropriate programming for LTELLs. The work of these students is carefully described and studied. Administration supports these meetings by providing guidance and time.

A multilingual family support center and a family support team. Strong schools create spaces where multilingual families feel welcome and parents of LTELLs are encouraged to be closely involved in their children's education. Family members are encouraged to serve as, what are called in some schools, Family Instructional Assistants. These family members help with conflict resolution, home language resources and the overall; development of the school's multilingual culture.

Integration into the larger school culture and community. While some LTELLs may face particular challenges and have specific needs, schools must ensure these students are truly members of the broader school community. This can be accomplished through school-wide clubs, advisories, and events that encourage students to share their work across classes, such as publishing parties and gallery walks.

Co-Teaching Models Promoting Success in Math Literacy

A math teacher at a Brooklyn middle school noticed that over time, as more and more reading and writing were required of students in her math classes, some of her LTELLs were struggling to keep up. She met with her school's principal to express her concerns and together they decided it would be helpful for her to work with an ENL teacher to analyze the language required of students for each math lesson.

The principal provided time for the two teachers to work together. They looked carefully at content for each week and together they planned both content and language objectives for each lesson. In addition to providing planning time, the principal also organized the ENL teacher's schedule so that she could push into math class three times a week to provide students with extra language support.

The teachers found that this new planning time and co-teaching model helped them provide greater support for their LTELLs as they developed both math content and language.

Forming an MLL/ELL Leadership Team

At a high school in the Bronx, the principal formed an MLL/ELL Leadership Team to better serve their population of LTMLLs/LTELLs. The team is led by the principal and includes one ENL teacher, a Spanish Home Language Arts teacher, the bilingual science and math teacher, and the social studies teacher. This leadership group frequently meets to discuss curriculum, strategies that work for particular students, and school-wide initiatives. Once ideas are agreed upon, they are shared with the rest of the school's faculty.

In addition to this curriculum and strategy work, the team aims to design a database of profiles that compile information about all of the emergent bilingual students in the school. Teachers drew on pre-existing databases which include information such as attendance records, test results, and transcript to start their data collection. The goal is for every teacher to have access to the profiles of the students with whom they work so they might become more aware of and better understand students' specific needs.

The team also wanted to include the personal stories of their students. They created a list of interview questions for students about the countries where they were born, their home language proficiency, where they have lived, and their living situations. The group also decided to include biographies written by the students that describe their personal journeys as MLLs/ELLs. The teachers brainstormed ways in which they could further engage the students in their classes to participate in creating materials for the profiles which would be available to all of the faculty.

Classroom-based practices

In addition to the school-wide practices described above, there are a number of strategies and instructional structures teachers can use in the classroom to help support LTELLs as they learn content and academic English. Students benefit when teachers use a gradual release of

responsibility model of instruction (**Figure 1**), which begins with teacher modeling and visual and verbal scaffolds and continues toward student independence with cooperative learning and partner work (Freeman & Freeman, 2011; Frey & Fisher, 2009; Gottlieb, 2006; Kagan, 1986; Pearson & Gallagher, 1983). Even when teachers work within a gradual release of responsibility model of support, Soto, Freeman, and Freeman (2013) stress the importance of only moving on to the next stage when students are fully prepared. "Even then, LTELs may need more time and more support than other MLLs/ELLs or native English speakers to develop the content knowledge and the academic English they need in order to succeed" (p. 27).

| Teacher Modeling | → | Visual and Verbal Scaffolds | → | Cooperative learning & partner work |

Figure 1. Gradual release of responsibility model of instruction.

Research has considered the pedagogical structures for teaching academic concepts and vocabulary. It has also examined which structures are perceived by LTELLs as most helpful. Based on those reviews, Soto, et al. (2013, p. 27) suggest the following:

- Teacher modeling is effective when it is interactive, allowing for student feedback, and when students understand both what to do and how to do it;
- Guided discussions help students get ideas from classmates and review key concepts;
- Group work is only effective when there is positive group interdependence, that is, when students work together effectively with each one making contributions;
- Partner-work and independent work is only effective when students are prepared and understand a task. Teachers can ensure this level of understanding by, for example, asking students to paraphrase the task before they begin.

Below we highlight additional key classroom-based practices for supporting students labeled as LTELLs (Ascenzi-Moreno, Kleyn, & Menken, 2013).

Build spaces for students to create and reflect upon goals. Students labeled as LTELLs understand that they need to "work hard," but often are not clear on exactly what that entails. Teachers in content-area classes and advisors can help students select and set goals for reading, writing, language, speaking, and behavior, and then reflect on them at set intervals. In addition, teachers can help LTELLs take specific first steps towards their goals by explicitly modeling study skills, like how to take notes and plan for long and short-term assignments.

Group students flexibly considering language and content proficiency. LTELLs bring a variety of backgrounds and languages to the classroom, and for this, can serve as resources for each other. Flexible grouping allows teachers to group students strategically for specific purposes, and then change the groups once the task of the group has been accomplished. For example, teachers may form homogeneous groups with similar needs for intervention work, and later in the day create heterogeneous groups for sharing and responding to work.

Embed opportunities for structured oral language development (public speaking, presentations, role play, sentence frames). While LTELLs have strong communicative oral language, they need opportunities to develop academic oral language. Because of the interconnectedness of language, this can help serve as a foundation for developing academic written language as well. Teachers can plan strategically for oral language development through presentations, debates, theater activities, and discussions. In planning such assignments, teachers should develop both content and language objectives for their lessons.

Provide curricular materials that are connected to students' backgrounds and interests. Classroom materials that build on LTMLLs/LTELLs' backgrounds and interests engage students, promote deeper levels of understanding, and increased comprehension of content (Ebe, 2015). To encourage this for LTMLLs/LTELLs, teachers can find resources that help students meet the required standards but with topics and materials, including technology resources, that are relevant to their students.

Use translanguaging strategies. All instruction, whether in the home language or in English, should leverage students' full linguistic repertoires to help them learn. Translanguaging strategies can help teachers plan for the use of all of the students' languages for learning. For more on these strategies, see the [CUNY-NYSIEB Translanguaging Guide](#) (Celic & Seltzer, 2013).

Provide a text-rich environment with mentor text models. LTELLs need to have immediate access to examples of content-area-specific language in English and their home languages. Charts and posters around the classroom, in moderation, are helpful. Students, with the help of their families, can help create multilingual word walls displaying content specific vocabulary written in students' home languages. Having mentor texts, or texts that teachers have chosen and analyzed with students, visible in the classroom, can provide students with clear examples of what they should aim for in their own work.

Pay attention to vocabulary and language structures. Although LTELLs use language in creative and dynamic ways to express themselves, they are still working to develop the kind of language that schools expect them to use in the content areas: "Students must be able to think, read and write like literary scholars, historians, mathematicians, and scientists" (Soto, Freeman, & Freeman, 2013, p.25). For example, in social studies, in order for students to successfully talk and write about causes of World War II, students not only need to learn specific vocabulary words, they also need to be able to create clauses using causal expressions such as: *as a result*, *consequently*, *for these reasons*, and *therefore*. Teachers can plan for the development of this language, which both builds on and extends their students' languaging, by writing content and language objectives for their lessons. Freeman & Freeman (2009) provide guidelines and examples for writing language objectives that relate to specific content objectives.

Oral Debates as a Launchpad for Persuasive Essay Writing

At a middle school in the Bronx, LTELLs are assigned the class novel "The Boy who Dared" by Susan Campbell Bartoletti (2008) in English Language Arts. This is an historical fiction novel based on the life of Helmuth Hübener, a German teenager who fought against the Nazi regime using words and anti-war propaganda.

Their teacher wanted students to understand how the main character developed his own voice despite the propaganda in Germany. The main character in the story tried to convince others that the government was wrong. Building on the examples from the book, she set about working with students to master the content objective: Students will defend their position on an issue by writing an argumentative essay.

She began by leveraging students' oral language strengths. She presented the students with a debatable statement "Administrators should be allowed to search student's personal belongings if they consider it necessary." This was something students could relate to and which captured their interest. She displayed the statement on the board and then in the four corners of the classroom, she hung signs that read strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Students were asked to stand in the corner that best represented their view on the statement. As a team, students were asked to come up with persuasive arguments to convince classmates of their position.

After presenting their oral arguments, she provided the students a cloze worksheet where they were to state their position and three supporting reasons. This served as a scaffold for further writing.

Following the cloze activity, she modeled how to write an argumentative essay, pointing out the key features of this type of academic writing. Next, in pairs, students wrote argumentative essays on the topic from the debate.

After this supported practice, students composed their own argumentative essays individually about other topics that interested them. In addition to her content objective, she planned specific language objectives for the students to focus on as they wrote their essays:

- Students will begin their essays with a thesis statement asserting their opinion followed by reasons.
- Students will transition between paragraphs using appropriate signal words (First, Second, Third)
- Students will write paragraphs with a main idea and supporting details.

Building Understanding of New Texts

The students in an 8th grade English Language Arts class in Brooklyn are reading a class novel called "Inside Out and Back Again" (Lai, 2011). It's a story, written in verse, about a young girl who leaves Vietnam after the fall of Saigon and immigrates to the US. While the book is written with language that students in late elementary school would be able to comprehend, it is at many of the students' independent or shared reading level, and is a high-interest text about issues that students in this classroom—some of them refugees themselves—can identify with. Their teacher uses this text in rigorous activities that help students practice close reading and critical thinking about author's purpose.

First, their teacher organized table groups so that students speaking the same languages—Spanish, French, and Arabic—sit together. The students in the class are LTELLs with a variety of language backgrounds. On their tables they find a Do Now translated into the three languages which reads:

The author uses a lot of vocabulary words in Vietnamese in this book. Explain your thoughts as to why she didn't use all English words. How are you able to infer the meaning of the Vietnamese words?

This activity draws on students' strengths and backgrounds by encouraging them to translanguage—or use their full linguistic repertoires including words from their home languages and English—as they work to understand how the author intentionally uses language to achieve desired effects in her readers.

While the teacher doesn't speak or read most of her students' home languages, she used Google Translate to provide each group at least a rough translation to start their discussions. Because there are often mistakes in the translations, she provides students the opportunity to correct the errors. She finds that through this editing and discussion in home language groups, the students have a better understanding of the questions they are discussing. She also finds that their responses are more thoughtful than if they were to do this work all in English.

Goal Setting and Reinforcing Good Study Habits

"*I wrote: Turn in all my homework*"
"*Mine is: Be neat and organized this week*"
"*My goal is to keep track of the notes in my folder*"

It's Monday morning and the students in a 9th grade math class have their binders out and are sharing the weekly goals they have written as their teacher circulates around the room listening in. The teacher stopped at one student who had just shared his goal about being organized, picked up his folder and shook it. Nothing flew out this time. "Nice job!"

The LTELLs in this class are starting to get the hang of writing goals and focusing on them throughout the week. Their teacher had taught an Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) class at his previous high school and wanted to incorporate some of the goal setting and study skills from that program into his math class. He found this to be especially helpful for his LTELLs.

The teacher made sure each student in his class bought a binder at the beginning of the year. He gave them all a calendar for the binder which included space for writing weekly goals at the top as well as space to write something for each one of their classes. For each class, he encourages students to write what their homework is or if there is no homework, to write a few words about what they did in class that day.

Another high school teacher approaches goal-setting with all her students, including LTMLLs/LTELLs, in a visual manner. She has students review their student work data (test and project grades), create a Line Graph where they chart their progress throughout a semester, then write a reflection based on what their Line Graph shows. This provides students with a tactile/kinesthetic activity that results in a visual representation of the direction their learning (daily/weekly work) is going. Then, students use their languages freely to explain what they see, why it's going in that direction, and/or what they will do to make it go in the direction they want. This teacher has found that creating opportunities for students' metacognition significantly increases their content vocabulary, understanding through critical thinking, and literacy skills, and makes their learning more meaningful to them.

Using Poetry to Discuss Language and Identity

Students in an 11th grade ELA classroom were engaged in thematic a unit called "Language and Identity." During one lesson, students read a poem entitled "Two Names, Two Worlds" by student poet, Jonathan Rodríguez. The poem was primarily written in English, but the poet incorporated words and phrases in Spanish. After doing a close reading of the poem, during which students were invited to annotate and discuss the poem in any language, the teacher facilitated a conversation about how a writer's linguistic choices can lend insight into the larger themes or messages at work in a text. After this conversation, students worked in small groups to highlight moments in the poem in which the writer's linguistic choices (i.e., the use of a word in Spanish rather than English) connected to a larger idea within the poem.

After deciding on one stanza of the poem that exemplified the connection between the poet's linguistic choices and the poem's theme(s), students were tasked with collaboratively constructing a short paragraph that explained their ideas. They collaborated using both English and Spanish, though the paragraph was ultimately written in English. When it came time to share, a representative from each group read that group's paragraph aloud to the class.

One group that had a few LTELLs noted that the poet's repetition of his name, which he rendered in distinct fonts, signaled the different ways he pronounced his name with different groups of speakers.

The students added that the way the poet pronounced his name revealed the shifts in his identity that occurred when he was in different contexts. Another group pointed out that the poet translated words and phrases in Spanish more at the beginning of the poem than at the end. These students, including LTMLLs/LTELLs, connected this choice to the poet's growing sense of comfort with his bilingual, bicultural identity.

After each group shared, students incorporated what they heard into their writing. Each student independently expanded upon their group's paragraph by adding a second excerpt from the poem that illustrated a connection between the poet's linguistic choices and his message.

Profiles of Students Identified as Long Term Multilingual Learners/ English Language Learners Who Attend School in New York State

The New York State Education Department (NYSED) defines Long-Term Multilingual Learners/English Language Learners (MLLs/ELLs) as those MLLs/ELLs[3] who have received English as a New Language of instruction as a component of their Bilingual Education or English as a New Language program for seven or more continuously enrolled school years in the United States and who have not yet exited the MLL/ ELL status (EngageNY, 2014, p. 6). This subpopulation of MLLs/ELLs is in middle and high school. This document will use the acronym LTMLLs/LTELLs.

Typically, LTMLLs/LTELLs speak English fairly fluently. Their oral language is strong when it is used for social purposes. In their daily lives outside of school, LTMLLs/LTELLs may use their full linguistic repertoires, including words from English and their home languages—with family members, friends, and in their communities (Ascenzi-Moreno, Kleyn, & Menken, 2013). Despite their linguistic creativity and intelligence, these students often score below grade level in school-based literacy tasks or assessments that are administered in English as well as in their home language (Olsen, 2010).

Researchers have often focused on the need for this group to build their literacy skills and to learn how to use language for academic purposes in order to meet the demands of schooling (Freeman & Freeman, 2002). They have also emphasized that LTMLLs/ LTELLs benefit when they are in programs that help them to develop their home language literacy skills (Forrest, 2006; Menken & Kleyn, 2010). There is a need to make a direct connection between students' fluid language practices and the instructional practices that are meant to further develop their languages, beginning from the development of dynamic bilingual assessments that allow students to use their entire linguistic repertoires to demonstrate their knowledge (Flores, Kleyn & Menken, 2015).

Below you will find the profiles of three students who have been identified as LTELLs/LTMLLs. One of the students is also identified as an MLL/ELL with an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) and receiving special education services due to his learning disability. These profiles were gathered from information provided by their teachers. These profiles were gathered from information provided by their teachers. In order to protect the students' confidentiality, they

---

[3] Multilingual Learners/English Language Learners (MLLs/ELLs) are defined as children who "by reason of foreign birth or ancestry, speak or understand a language other than English…and require support in order to become proficient in English" (NYSED, 2014, p. 17).

have been given a pseudonym and no identifying information about their schools or teachers is provided.

You will meet Josh (8th grader from Bangladesh), **Raul** (11th grader from the U.S. who has an IEP), and **Ricardo** (11th grader from the Dominican Republic). Their stories show how unique these students are. They have received different services from their school and teachers, and have different learning needs, preferences, and personalities. These profiles serve as an example of the vast diversity of LTELLs/LTMLLs. It is very important that educators in New York learn about how unique each of their students really are.

Josh, 14, 8th Grade Student from Bangladesh

Josh is a 14-year old originally from Bangladesh who emigrated to the U.S. in 2nd grade. He is identified as a **LTELL/LTMLL** because he has been receiving **ENL services for seven consecutive years**. He is in 8th grade and receives **ENL services**.

Josh demonstrates aural/oral competencies in both English and Bengali. He speaks English using short, simple sentences, and he is fluent in Bengali. While he is the only Bengali speaker in his ELA classroom, he often speaks Bengali during lunchtime and transitions with his peers. He is playful and talkative with his peers. He is always the first in line to hold the door for the class during transitions.

With reading, he struggles to decode words in English and Bengali. The keys to capturing Josh's interest in learning are the two C's—computers and cricket. His teachers modify texts with pictures and have given him articles on cricket translated into Bengali. He was engaged but still demonstrated little comprehension of the texts. His teacher is working with Josh to strengthen his ability in sound- letter-correspondence. While he has produced little writing in English, he has written some sentences in Bengali; however, his teacher does not speak Bengali, and there are no educators at the school who are able to decode his writing.

Josh loves science and enjoys conducting experiments. In ELA, he works best when he reads using technology. During independent reading, he completes selections on myON, an online digital library, and I-Ready, a leveled reading and math program. Unlike some other students who prefer one-on-one support, Josh prefers to work either independently using technology or in small groups. Overall, he responds well to small group intervention, computer technology, and audio books.

Raul, 17, 11th Grade Student from the U.S.

Raul is a 17-year old student born in the U.S. of Panamanian descent. He was identified as a **LTELL/LTMLL** because he has been receiving **ENL services for over seven years**. He is also identified as an MLL/ELL with IEP and classified with a **specific learning disability**. He is in 11th grade at a high school in a large urban area and receives **ENL services and special education services through integrated co-teaching with two or more teachers (general education, special education, and/or ENL teachers) in different subjects.**

Raul loves cooking and is a budding chef, video game designer and fiction writer. He also loves to draw. He is social, polite, and gets along well with his peers. Raul speaks both English and Spanish at home. He has strong Spanish literacy skills and passed both the Spanish Second Language Proficiency Regents Exam and the Spanish Comprehensive Regents. Still, Raul prefers to speak and write in English. He demonstrates strong comprehension of written texts and the ability to retell or paraphrase what he has read. In addition, he is a talented creative writer who enjoys crafting imaginative narratives and poetry. Overall, Raul struggles with organization and applying appropriate mechanics in his writing. Specifically, he is inconsistent with distinguishing claims from counterclaims and using transitions to connect body paragraphs with claims. He often has challenges remaining on task, as well.

Successful strategies that his teachers have tried include giving him question prompts, using graphic organizers, applying annotation routines, and providing redirection. When given prompting with questions, he can usually recognize and implement corrections on his own. For organization, his teacher has used T charts to help organize ideas for an essay and provided a pre-filled organizer for Raul to insert relevant information. His teacher modeled how to annotate English texts thought an integration of his home language practices, as well as underlining, starring, circling, and other text based signals. Raul is now able to apply these strategies without prompting, which has helped his reading comprehension and writing.

Ricardo, 16, 11th Grade Student from the Dominican Republic

Ricardo is a 16-year old who arrived from the Dominican Republic in 4th grade. He was identified as a **LTELL/LTMLL** because he has been receiving **ENL services for eight consecutive years**. He is in 11th grade in a school in a large city in New York and his **ENL services are provided by his general education teacher who is also ENL-certified.** Since the school also offers a **bilingual program,** he took some **bilingual Spanish/ English classes.**

Ricardo speaks Spanish at home. However, when he first started high school, he did not want to be placed in bilingual classes. His oral and written skills in Spanish were at about grade level, but he did not want to do school work in Spanish. However, in 11th grade, he started to value his bilingualism and is now a tutor, helping younger students with Spanish. He is working with a small group of boys and tries to be a role model for them. Ricardo is an artist. He produces music and writes the lyrics for his songs in Spanish. He now loves to write and participating in his Spanish, English literature and History classes.

By the time he started high school, he was also very comfortable speaking in English but he needed to work on his writing skills, in particular English grammar. He started very motivated during his freshman year, but 10th grade was very hard for him. He was going through a crisis, challenging authority figures, and refusing to do his work. However, in 11th grade he realized that being disrespectful to the teachers would affect his future and changed his attitude. His writing has developed during the year. He responds very well to specific feedback in order to revise his work and he takes the time to edit and make changes to improve his writing. At the end of 11th grade, he is very motivated to go to college and has done very well in the NY State ELA Regents Exams. While he has also struggled in math, particularly on word problems, he has also improved and has passed the algebra Regents exam.

Through the stories of these three students, educators are provided examples of the diversity of experiences and characteristics of students identified as Long Term MLLs/ELLs in New York

State. In addition, a number of strategies teachers use to support these Long Term MLLs/ELLs students are presented. The NYSED Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages hopes that you have found the stories of Josh, Raul, and Ricardo helpful and informative for successful instructional planning.

Research Studies on Supporting Long-Term English Language Learners /Multilingual Learners (LTELLs/LTMLLs)

Annotated Bibliography

New York State Education Department defines Long-Term English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners (LTELLs/LTMLLs) as those ELLs/MLLs[4] who receive English-language supports through Bilingual Education, or English as a New Language (ENL) for seven or more years and who have not yet passed the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) (EngageNY, 2014). This subpopulation of ELLs/MLLs are in middle and high school. This Annotated Bibliography will use the acronym *LTELLs/LTMLLs*.

This annotated bibliography serves as comprehensive overview of current research on Long-Term English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners (LTELLs/LTMLLs) around two areas: what are the characteristics of LTELLs/LTMLLs and the challenges they experience, and what school- and/or classroom-based supports are the best for working with these students. It is intended to be a resource for educators who serve this population of students; it is not an exhaustive list of resources, but, rather, serves to highlight representative research in the field around these areas.

Methodology for Selecting the Articles Featured

This annotated bibliography includes current research found through structured internet and database searches on the two areas of research presented above and from suggestions of scholars knowledgeable in the literature on LTELLs/LTMLLs. We used the following search terms: long-term ELLs, LTELL, LTEL, reclassification, English language learners, and ELLs. The works included in this annotated bibliography were selected based on the following criteria:

- They come from a credible publication source, such as a peer-reviewed journal, educational institution, or agency (we are not including books);

- They are current, being published in past ten years (between 2007 and 2017); and,

- The methods of analysis were clearly identified in the publication in order to evaluate the rigor of the study.

The authors of this annotated bibliography then selected nine sources that they consider the most useful for educators working with LTELLs/LTMLLs.

We first present an overview of what current research says about the two areas of analysis: a) what are the characteristics of LTELLs/LTMLLs and the challenges they experience, and, b) what school- and/or classroom-based supports are best for working with these students. We then present a summarizing table indicating the authors and year of the works included, the type of article they are (journal or report) and on which area(s) of analysis they have information. Finally, we present each article, organized alphabetically, and a summary of their findings by analysis area.

---

[4] English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners (ELLs/MLLs) are defined as children who "by reason of foreign birth or ancestry, speak or understand a language other than English…and require support in order to become proficient in English" (NYSED, 2014, p. 17).

NYSED

What does the research say about the characteristics of Long-Term English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners (LTELLs/LTMLLs) and school- and classroom-based supports?

Although students labeled as LTELL/LTMLL are often not distinguished from others with very different backgrounds and abilities, they are not a homogenous group. They may or may not be U.S.-born, but have often experienced interruptions in their schooling, programmatic and/or transnational adaptations, and stigma associated with their home language and culture. The label of LTELL/LTMLL is also often associated with a deficit perspective, such that these students may be perceived as failing to sufficiently progress, which further stigmatizes their academic status. Despite these challenges and perceptions, these students are characterized by strong oral language skills and complex and dynamic language practices, and bring with them a rich repertoire of experience that can be used to scaffold their literacy and academic development.

Within the classroom, successful practices to serve LTELLs/LTMLLs center on incorporating students' home languages, cultures, and experiences into instruction, maintaining academic rigor in both content and literacy development. Translanguaging, integration of explicit literacy instruction, and the creation of "democratic" classroom spaces, help students to experience success in an academic setting, and see the connection between their robust language skills and development of academic literacy.

From a broader perspective, alternative measures of language proficiency and knowledge may help determine more appropriate instructional approaches for students broadly labeled as LTELLs/LTMLLs. For existing programs, maintaining consistency in the type of services offered provides a stable foundation for these students to progress and thrive academically.

Author and Year	Type of Article	Characteristics and challenges of LTELLs/LTMLLs	School- and/or classroom-based supports for LTELLs/LTMLLs
Ascenzi-Moreno, Kleyn, & Menken (2013)	Report	✓	✓
Brooks (2015)	Journal		✓
Brooks (2016)	Journal	✓	✓
Flores, Kleyn, & Menken (2015)	Journal	✓	✓
Flores & Rosas (2015)	Journal	✓	✓
Kim & Garcia (2014)	Journal	✓	✓
Menken, Kleyn, & Chae (2012)	Journal	✓	✓
Menken & Kleyn (2010)	Journal	✓	✓
Olsen (2010)	Report	✓	✓

Ascenzi-Moreno, L., Kleyn, T., & Menken, K. (2013). *A CUNY-NYSIEB framework for the education of long-term English learners: 6–12 grades.* **New York, NY: The Graduate Center, CUNY, CUNY-NYSIEB. Full text access:** http://www.nysieb.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2013/06/CUNY-NYSIEB-Framework-for-LTELs-Spring-2013-FINAL.pdf

In this Framework, the authors provide information on who LTELLs/LTMLLs are, as well as information on programmatic structures, curricular structures, classroom structures and resources,

pedagogical strategies, and assessment strategies that should be adapted with flexibility to meet the specific needs and strengths of LTELLs/LTMLLs.

Characteristics of LTELLs/LTMLLs and the challenges they experience:
- LTELLs/LTMLLs are students who may have struggled with inconsistent/interrupted schooling, may have had transnational life experiences through immigration/relocation, and/or are students who have gone through subtractive schooling processes that devalue the development/support of their home language. These students have strong oral language abilities and are characterized by highly complex and dynamic bilingual language practices.

School and/or classroom-based recommendations for supporting LTELLs/LTMLLs:
- Employ a framework which includes programming specifically tailored for LTELLs /LTMLLs, such as the CUNY-NYSIEB framework.
- Use pedagogical strategies that incorporate students' home languages (even if they are instructed in English) with emphasis on academic rigor as well as the support of academic language/literacy development.
- Adopt a framework which prioritizes the creation and implementation of (from pp. 6–15):
  - Programmatic Structures, which meet the students at their levels of academic language/literacy in both English and their home language, and continue this development through translanguaging.
  - Curricular Structures, which establish a rigorous curriculum that makes connections students' home/life experience-based cultural practices, supports student choices, and integrates academic content and language development.
  - Classroom Structures and Resources, which provide a rich academic, cultural, and linguistic environment while prioritizing students' background and different ways of learning through awareness building, technology, and project-based learning.
  - Pedagogical Strategies, which employ a variety of "best practices" based on the principles of translanguaging and students' prior knowledge and language practices.
  - Assessment Strategies, which evaluate student progress via various intersecting means including both formative and summative approaches as well as home language-based assessment and teacher development around the successful implementation of these assessments.

Brooks, M.D. (2015). "It's like a script": Long-term English learners' experiences with and ideas about academic reading. *Research in the Teaching of English, 49*(4), 383–406.

This article presents observations on academic reading practices in the high-school classroom, and ideas about academic reading held by five students classified as LTELLs/LTMLLs. These observations revealed that the majority of academic reading in the classroom required students to listen to oral recitations of texts by other students and/or the teacher, which were then supplemented by the teacher's oral interpretations of meaning. Students' descriptions of successful reading reflected this context, and focused on oral reading fluency, passive, comprehension of texts, and behaving appropriately during classroom reading.

In this context, academic reading is a socially situated cultural practice–primarily an oral group activity in which the teacher was the arbiter of meaning. In contrast, to meet the requirements of standardized testing, students are expected to silently and independently make meaning with written text. The educational environment for students would ideally include opportunities for them

to engage in multiple types of reading practices, including those that are ultimately measured as 'English proficiency'.

School- and/or classroom-based recommendations for supporting LTELLs/LTMLLs:
- Create students who are able to successfully engage in multiple kinds of reading practices with diverse texts.
- Look beyond English proficiency to provide alternative understandings of bilingual students' performances on standardized measures of reading.
- However, more research is needed for:
  - Identifying the natures of these students' literacy development needs and which instructional methods contribute to their academic success.
  - Exploring what English-speaking bilinguals who are labeled LTELs can accomplish with oral language, reading, and writing, both in and out of school.
  - Comparing literacy difficulties with other English-speaking adolescent populations who are encountering literacy difficulties to determine whether LTELs' literacy difficulties are unique to individuals who are still in the process of acquiring English.

Brooks, M.D. (2016). "Tell me what you are thinking": An investigation of five Latina LTELs constructing meaning with academic texts. *Linguistics and Education, 35*, 1–4.

Using the guiding perspective of holistic bilingualism and a literacy-as-social-practice framework, this article documents the meaning-making practices vocalized by students during think-alouds with biology and English language arts texts, examining what these practices suggest about their text comprehension. The author specifically investigates how participants construct meaning with the texts, and what these reading practices suggest about their comprehension.

Primary reading practices that were observed included: summarizing and identifying important information, making connections to background knowledge, going beyond the text (opinion, inference), recognizing limitations (verbalizing difficulty, asking questions). All of these demonstrate that the students were actively making meaning with the texts.

Educators are encouraged to provide varied experiences with texts to develop 'reading stamina' and afford students and teachers with more opportunities to explore multiple literacies.

Characteristics of LTELLs/LTMLLs and the challenges they experience:
- The LTELL/LMLL label potentially obscures students' successful literacy practices, and may frame students in a deficit perspective of not being fully competent in any language.
- Low standardized reading scores are used as part of the criteria to classify ELs, which assumes that these literacy scores reflect their English language proficiency, and are attributable to their bilingual backgrounds.
- Many studies do not differentiate students based on language use, classification, or educational background, making broad assumptions across potentially very distinct populations.

School- and/or classroom-based recommendations for supporting LTELLs/LTMLLs:
- Encourage development of reading stamina—the ability to persevere when literacy engagement becomes difficult.
- Create democratic classroom spaces that promote learning through structured and varied opportunities with texts facilitate the development of reading stamina. Guiding principles include:
  - The creation of literacy learning opportunities that allow students to experience

success.

- The existence of multiple opportunities for students to select purposeful and interesting reading material that connects to their background knowledge.
- The development of strong interpersonal relationships in the classroom, school, and broader community.

Flores, N., Kleyn, T., & Menken, K. (2015). Looking holistically in a climate of partiality: Identities of students labeled long-term English language learners. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *14*(2), 113–132.

The authors seek to explore the lived experiences of students labeled LTELLs/LTMLLs as a contrast to the deficit view that has historically been employed in policy-making and programming for these students. The authors assert that such a view, which characterizes this subgroup of students as "linguistically deficient" (p. 115), comprises a racialized agenda that perpetuates the marginalization of students and communities of color. The perspective of these students tends to be less well-known and underexplored in research, and the researchers attempt to challenge the ideology that underpins the label "LTELL" (or LTELLs/LTMLLs as used in this Annotated Bibliography) by placing front and center the stories and experiences of students who have been labeled this way and their desires to be seen as individuals and participants in many groups. Such dynamic and fluid identities, the authors assert, must be valued just as their fluid and dynamic language practices should be valued in educational programming and classroom practices.

Characteristics of LTELLs/LTMLLs and the challenges they experience:
- Researchers must reconsider the dynamic and complex lived experiences of students labeled as "LTELLs/LTMLLs" and understand that the label confers a deficit view that positions these students as "failing."

School- and/or classroom-based recommendations for supporting LTELLs/LTMLLs:
- Assessments should be reconceived to encapsulate the dynamic linguistic practices and repertoires of this heterogeneous subgroup of students by supporting a dynamic bilingual framework which challenges the monolingual paradigm.
- Explore and prioritize pedagogies and programming based on translanguaging while valuing the diverse and shifting linguistic repertoires of all students.

Flores, N. & Rosa, J. (2015) Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149-171.

In this article, the authors critique appropriateness-based approaches to language diversity in education. Those who subscribe to these approaches conceptualize standardized linguistic practices as an objective set of linguistic forms that are appropriate for an academic setting. In contrast, the authors highlight the raciolinguistic ideologies through which racialized bodies come to be constructed as engaging in appropriately academic linguistic practices. [*Raciolinguistic ideology* refers how language is used to construct race and how the ideas of race influence language. In education, raciolinguists have theorized that these constructs of appropriateness create different meaning and experiences for racialized students.] Drawing on theories of language ideologies and racialization, the authors offer a perspective from which students classified as LTELLs/LTMLLs, heritage language learners, and standard English learners can be understood to inhabit a shared racial positioning that frames their linguistic practices as deficient regardless of how closely they follow supposed rules of appropriateness. The authors illustrate how appropriateness-based

approaches to language education are implicated in the reproduction of racial normativity by expecting language-minoritized students to model their linguistic practices after the white speaking subject despite the fact that the white listening subject continues to perceive their language use in racialized ways. They conclude with a call for reframing language diversity in education away from a discourse of appropriateness toward one that seeks to denaturalize standardized linguistic categories.

Characteristics of LTELLs/LTMLLs and the challenges they experience:
- LTELLs/LTMLLs are language minoritized students who experience low academic achievement.
- The authors argue that LTELLs/LTMLLs is a deficit-based label that highlights that their educational experiences haven't provided with enough academic literacy for their succees in school. However, the authors argue that researchers and educators are expecting that these students mimic the linguisti practices of white speaking subjects withough acknowledging that they will be seen as racialized individuals with innapropriate linguistic practices regardless of the language practices that they produce.
- The linguistic practices of language-minoritized populations are seen often as deviant based on their racial positioning in society while the same practices could have been interpreted as gifted if they were said by a white speaker.

School- and/or classroom-based recommendations for supporting LTELLs/LTMLLs:
- Educators should engage in a critical heteroglosic approach that both legitimizes the dynamic linguistic practices of language minoritized students while simultaneously raising awareness about issues of language and power.
- The solution the marginalization of language-minoritized students cannot be to add objective linguistic practices to their linguistic repertoires—as additive approaches to language education suggest—but instead to engage with, confront, and ultimately dismantle the racialized hierarchy of U.S. society.

Kim, W.G., & García, S.B. (2014). Long-term English language learners' perceptions of their language and academic learning experiences. *Remedial and Special Education*, *35*(5), 300–312.
Full text access:

In order to respond to the relatively small amount of current research on LTELLs/LTMLLs, the authors conducted interviews with 13 LTELLs/LTMLLs regarding their experiences in schooling and programming to understand their perceptions of school and self-perceptions as learners, as well as document analysis to examine academic outcomes. The researchers found a gap between the students' aspirations for work and schooling and their academic outcomes, suggesting that educational program design and implementation, identification of ELLs/MLLs with disabilities, academic advising for both students and parents, and embedded, continuing biases against these students via a deficit perspective receive new attention.

Characteristics of LTELLs/LTMLLs and the challenges they experience:
- Assumption that LTELLs /LTMLLs—in contrast to literature that depicts these students as "unmotivated," "underperforming" or "struggling,"—wish to succeed in schooling and perceive this success in direct connection to future opportunities.

School- and/or classroom-based recommendations for supporting LTELLs/LTMLLs:
- Programming for LTELLs/LTMLLs should prioritize "systematic and high quality language

development" as well as "rigorous academic instruction that accelerates their language growth and effectively supports learning." (p. 309)

● Prioritize review/revision of inconsistent or underprepared implementation of programming.
● Identify "barriers to LTELLs/LTMLLs' progress in language development and academic learning" (p. 310) in order to develop more appropriate programming.
● Student expectations around academic achievement and future possibilities should be valued and incorporated into academic counseling.

Menken, K., Kleyn, T., & Chae, N. (2012). Spotlight on "long-term English language learners": Characteristics and prior schooling experiences of an invisible population. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 6*(2), 121–142.
Full text access: https://katemenken.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/menken-kleyn-chae-2012-spotlight-on-e2809clong-term-english-language-learnerse2809d-imrj1.pdf

Insufficient empirical research and information exists about LTELLs/LTMLLs, especially at the secondary level. Educational programming is consequently lacking for this heterogeneous group; LTELLs/LTMLLs received the same supports as other ELLs/MLLs and are often put in classes with students with different needs (e.g., newcomers). The authors collected data from interviews with LTELLs/LTMLLs, interviews with educators (administrators and teachers), and analyses of academic performance data. They then clarify the different types of LTELLs/LTMLLs and articulate the types of educational programming they need as members of different categories (or of more than one), identifying divergent educational and social-geographical experiences within this subgroup of students. Finally, the authors make a set of recommendations about how to support this subgroup of students, and identify which type of student might be arriving at a school using an intake template. This template gathers information about each year of prior schooling, languages of instruction, and how many years a student attended a given school, and helps to identify educational inconsistencies.

Characteristics of LTELLs/LTMLLs and the challenges they experience:
● Educators tend to see these students monolithically, i.e., without distinguishing between students based on educational experience, transnational life experience, or other factors which may influence the way they approach schooling.
● LTELLs/LTMLLs typically demonstrate a distinction in their receptive and productive language use; they tend to be "orally bilingual for social purposes, yet have limited academic oral or literacy skills in English and their native language." (p. 122–123)
● LTELLs/LTMLLs may be U.S.-born; in fact, the researchers identified two main groups: (a) students whose schooling has included combinations of bilingual education, ESL, and mainstreaming; and (b) transnational students who have moved between their country of origin and the U.S.

School- and/or classroom-based recommendations for supporting LTELLs/LTMLLs:
● Develop educational programming that draws upon native literacies, and values the bilingualism and biliteracy practices of these diverse students.
● Make every attempt to maintain ELLs/MLLs in programming which is of a consistent type.
● Explicitly teach literacy skills and academic literacy instruction for LTELLs/LTMLLs and infuse all content areas with this priority.
● Employ the template created by the authors to distinguish different incoming students who may be labeled as LTELLs (see Appendix C of the article).

Menken, K., & Kleyn, T. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English language learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 13,* **399–417.**
Full text access: https://katemenken.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/menken-kleyn-ijbeb-134-july-2010-subtractive-schooling-ltell1.pdf

The authors explore the language practices and educational experiences of LTELLs/LTMLLs, who are one third of all secondary school students in New York City, yet are often overlooked in educational research. Through interviews and document analysis over the course of a three-year project, they explore 29 high school-aged LTELLs/LTMLLs' schooling experiences over time. The authors found relationships between the experience of these students with schooling, their language use, and their struggles toward academic achievement, which has been due in part due to subtractive schooling, which denies their ability to employ their home languages in the learning process and in fact can contribute to home language attrition while limiting their chances for academic achievement. While these students demonstrate oral skills in English, their academic language skills are limited. The authors recommend ways in which programmatic changes can be enacted to benefit LTELLs/LTMLLs and support their academic success and development as biliterate individuals.

<u>Note:</u> This paper conflates the label "LTELL" with the students it describes, which may have the unintended effect of essentializing these students. These authors shift this posture in subsequent publications and refer to these students as "students who are given this label."

Characteristics of LTELLs/LTMLLs and the challenges they experience:
- LTELLs generally fall into one or both of the following categories: (1) they have had transnational life experiences, moving back and forth between the U.S. and other countries; and/or (2) they have had interruptions in their formal schooling, moving from one school (and whatever programming it has deemed fit for English learners) to another. Most LTELLs/LTMLLs in the study belonged to (2).
- LTELLs appear not to be well understood (perhaps through inappropriate assessment and/or programming) in terms of their educational needs, and they do not receive appropriate services as a result. Of particular concern was the group's limited literacy in both English and in their home languages.
- LTELLs appear to perform at several grade levels below their non-ELL/MLL peers, which can lead to their being held back and a concomitant loss of confidence.

School- and/or classroom-based recommendations for supporting LTELLs/LTMLLs:
- Provide consistent opportunities for LTELLs/LTMLLs to use and develop their home languages via language policies aimed at the development of biliteracy and bilingualism.
- Explicitly teach LTELLs/LTMLLs academic literacy skills.
- Develop pedagogy that is specifically tailored to, and supportive of, LTELLs/LTMLLs and their learning needs.

Olsen, L. (2010). *Reparable harm: Fulfilling the unkept promise of educational opportunity for California's long term English learners.* **Long Beach, CA: Californians Together.**
Full text access: http://www.laurieolsen.com/uploads/2/5/4/9/25499564/reparableharm2ndedition.pdf

This report presents survey data collected from 40 school districts throughout all regions of California in 2009–2010 and almost one-third of all secondary school ELLs/MLLs in the state. The major findings suggest that programming and pedagogy specifically designed for LTELLs/LTMLLs is rare. These students experience schooling which can be characterized by a lack of prepared teachers, misinformation about who LTELLS/LTMLLs are, inappropriate curriculum, poor/inadequate

tracking systems, policy which is confusing and contradictory, overrepresentation in special education programming, inappropriate assessments, and a systemic lack of awareness of how to understand the process of English Language Development and, indeed, the best ways to support and educate these learners. Of note is the fact that these same issues are encountered both in elementary school and in the upper grades.

Note: The authors employ terminology which at times signals a deficit view of LTELLs/LTMLLs ("gap," "lack," weak," etc.).

Characteristics of LTELLs/LTMLLs and the challenges they experience:
● LTELLs/LTMLLs have needs that are distinct and different from newcomer and normatively developing ELLs/MLLs that have to be addressed. Additionally, there is a diversity of need within the LTELLs/LTMLLs which requires assessments to accurately diagnose.
● Language development is more than literacy development; LTELLs/LTMLLs need both. Courses, strategies, and instruction focused on literacy skills are important, but not sufficient. LTELLs/LTMLLs need development in all four domains of language (speaking, listening, reading, and writing), and for multiple functions and contexts.

School- and/or classroom-based recommendations for supporting LTELLs/LTMLLs:
● Prioritize LTELLs/LTMLLs' full participation and engagement in school, healthy identity development, and positive intergroup relationships through inclusive and affirming school climate. Some examples are literature and curricular materials that speak to the histories and cultures of the students, intentional outreach for extracurricular and club activities that seek to diversify participation, provision of awards or multilingual designations on the diplomas of students for attainment of biliteracy and mastery of two or more languages, and elective courses that focus on the histories and contributions of the diverse cultures represented among the student body.
● Create a specialized English Language Development course (or courses) designed specifically for LTELLs/LTMLLs that focuses on powerful oral language development, explicit literacy development, instruction in the academic uses of English, high quality writing, extensive reading of relevant texts, and an emphasis on academic language and complex vocabulary.
● LTELLs/LTMLLs should be concurrently enrolled in a grade-level English class mixed heterogeneously with strong native English speakers and taught by the same teacher and taught with differentiated instructional strategies.
● LTELLs/LTMLLs should be placed into rigorous, college preparation courses and specialized English language development courses. A formal monitoring system can review mid-semester assessments and grades for each LTELL/LTMLL in order to determine whether placement needs to be adjusted and what kind of supports might be needed to improve student success.
● Teachers should draw upon students' life experiences and wisdom, to focus upon helping students develop their own "voice," to provide opportunities for students to make choices, to emphasize critical and deep thinking and reflection, and to find and include relevant texts that matter to students and captivate their attention.

Works Cited

Ascenzi-Moreno, L., Kleyn, T., & Menken, K. (2013). A CUNY-NYSIEB Framework for the Education of 'Long-Term English Learners': 6–12 Grades. New York, NY: CUNY-NYSIEB, The Graduate Center, The City University of New York. Retrieved on February 1, 2017 from http://www.cuny-nysieb.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/CUNY-NYSIEB-Framework-for-LTELs-Spring-2013-FINAL.pdf.

Bartoletti, S.C. (2008). *The boy who dared*. New York: Scholastic Press.

Brooks, M.D. (2015). "It's like a script": Long-term English learners' experiences with and ideas about academic reading. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *49*(4), 383–406.

Brooks, M.D. (2016). "Tell me what you are thinking": An investigation of five Latina LTELs constructing meaning with academic texts. *Linguistics and Education, 35*, 1–14.

Brown, J.E. & Campbell Ault, P. (2015). Disentangling language differences from disability: A case study of district-preservice collaboration. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research, 6,* p. 111-166.

Campbell Bartoletti, S. (2008). *The boy who dared*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Celic, C., & Seltzer, K. (2013*). Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators.* New York: CUNY-NYSIEB, The Graduate Center, City University of New York. Retrieved on June 6, 2017 from http://www.cuny-nysieb.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Translanguaging-Guide-March-2013.pdf.

Cheatham, G.A., & Hart Barnett, J.E. (2016). Overcoming common misunderstandings about students with disabilities who are English language learners. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 1–6.

Collier, V.P. (1995). Acquiring a second language for school. *Directions in Language and Education, 1*(4), 3–14.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2008). *BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction.* In *Encyclopedia of Language and Education,* vol. 2, ed. Nancy Hornberger, 71-84. New York: Springer Science and Business Media.

Ebe, A. (2015). The power of culturally relevant texts: What teachers learn about their emergent bilingual students. In Y.S. Freeman & D.E. Freeman (Eds.), *Research on preparing inservice teachers to work effectively with emergent bilinguals*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Books LTD.

EngageNY (2014). Ensuring equal educational opportunities for English language learners: Blueprint for English language learner success and amended commissioner's regulations Part 154. Retrieved on February 1, 2017 from https://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/FBM-SupportingELLS.pdf.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149–171.

Flores, N., Kleyn, T. & Menken, K. (2015) Looking Holistically in a Climate of Partiality: Identities of Students Labeled Long-Term English Language Learners, *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 14:2, 113-132, DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2015.1019787

Forrest, S. (2006). Three foci of an effective high school Generation 1.5 literacy program. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *50,* 106–112.

Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2009). *Academic language for English language learners and struggling readers: How to help students succeed across content areas*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

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

Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D., & Mercuri, S. (2002). Closing the achievement gap: How to reach limited-formal-schooling and long-term English learners. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fredrickson, B. L., Cohn, M. A., Coffey, K. A., Pek, J., & Finkel, S. M. (2008). Open hearts build lives: Positive emotions, induced through loving-kindness meditation, build consequential personal resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(5), 10-45.

Frey, N. & Fisher, D. (2009). The release of learning. *Principal Leadership, 9*(9), 18–22.

García, O., Johnson, S.I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia: Caslon.

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

Gottlieb, M. (2006). *Assessing English language learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kagan, S. (1986). Cooperative learning and sociocultural factors in schooling. In *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students*, 231–298. Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Lai, T. (2013). *Inside out and back again*. Manchester, NH: University of Queensland Press.

McLeod, J. D., & Fettes, D. L. (2007). Trajectories of failure: The educational careers of children with mental health problems. *American Journal of Sociology, 113*(3), 653-701.

Menken, K. & Kleyn, T. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *13*(4), 1–19.

Menken, K., Kleyn, T. & Chae, N. (2012, August). Spotlight on 'long-term English language learners': Characteristics and prior schooling experiences of an invisible population. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 6*(2), 121–142.

New York State Education Department (NYSED). (2019). Program options for English language learners/Multilingual learners. Retrieved February 12, 2019 from http://www.nysed.gov/bilingual-ed/program-options-english-language-learnersmultilingual-learners

New York State Education Department (NYSED). (2018). New York State's final every student succeeds act (ESSA) plan summary. Retrieved February 12, 2019 from http://www.nysed.gov/common/nysed/files/programs/essa/nys-essa-plan-summary.pdf

New York State Education Department (NYSED). (2017). English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners Demographics/Data Reports. Retrieved February 12, 2019 from

http://www.nysed.gov/bilingual-ed/schools/english-language-learnermultilingual-learners-demographicsdata-reports.

New York State Education Department (NYSED) (2014). Amendment of the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education, Part 154, adopted 9/15/2014. Retrieved February 12, 2019 from http://www.counsel.nysed.gov/common/counsel/files/rulesandregs/TERMS%20154-1%20%26%20154-2.pdf.

NYSUT Research and Educational Services. (2015, August 6). Fact Sheet 15-07: NYS Requirements for Bilingual Education and English as a New Language Programs. Retrieved January 17, 2017 from http://www.nysut.org/resources/all-listing/2015/april/fact-sheet-15-07-nys-requirements-for-bilingual-education-and-english-as-a-new-language-programs.

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

Pearson, P.D., & Gallagher, M. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *8*(3), 317–344.

Soto, M., Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (2013). In for the long haul. *Language Magazine, 13*(1), 24–28.

Valdés, G.V., Poza, L., & Brooks, M.D. (2014). Educating students who do not speak the societal language: The social construction of language-learner categories. *CLDE Faculty Publications, 2*.