

Lesson Delivery: A Key Component to Ensure Maximum Benefit to the Learner

Desarrollo de una clase: Componente vital para brindar al aprendiz el máximo beneficio en su proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje

Edith Viviana MORALES HENAO
Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana (ÚNICA)
(Bogotá, Colombia)

Abstract

Professors at the Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana (ÚNICA) have aimed to deliver lessons for second language learners that integrate content and language, resulting in an integrated lesson design. The Center for Applied Linguistics (Washington, DC) recommends the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) as a way of helping teachers plan and deliver integrated lessons. The effectiveness of this protocol has been corroborated on the K-12 level, and during 2008, through action research, a group of researchers studied its applicability on the higher education level at ÚNICA. The purpose of this study was to describe professors' experiences as they were trained on SIOP. The analyzed data showed that professors truly understand the importance of stating clear content and language objectives. Data also revealed that the time stated for each lesson was appropriate; however, it was noticed that professors should allocate time for every task and include more strategies to have better and higher student participation. Additionally, it was observed the need of using different questions to make content more comprehensible for learners. This study provided professors and researchers with a productive outcome in their professional development and reinforced their belief in the importance of joining hands to accomplish goals that make education a joy.

Key Words: Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP); lesson delivery and allocated time; engaged time; academic learning time; pacing.

Resumen

La Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana (ÚNICA) ha buscado desarrollar clases para estudiantes de segunda lengua en donde se integren el contenido y aprendizaje del inglés. El Centro de Lingüística Aplicada de (Washington, DC) recomienda el Protocolo de observación de la Instrucción Protegida (SIOP,) dada su efectividad en (K-12) para planear y desarrollar clases que integran estos dos componentes. Durante el 2008, algunos profesores e investigadores de ÚNICA estudiaron la aplicabilidad de SIOP en su institución. Este estudio reveló las experiencias de los profesores mientras eran entrenados en el diseño y desarrollo de clases conforme a dicho protocolo. Los profesores aprendieron sobre la importancia y el impacto que tiene el establecer objetivos de contenido y de lengua. Igualmente, se evidenció que el tiempo estimado para cada lección fue apropiado, sin embargo los profesores deben destinar un tiempo para cada actividad a desarrollar en clase e incluir más estrategias que permitan el alcance de mejores niveles de pensamiento. Adicionalmente, se observó la necesidad de usar tácticas que hagan el contenido de clase mucho más comprensible. Esta investigación permitió a sus participantes crecer más a nivel profesional y fortalecer su convicción respecto a unir fuerzas y destrezas para alcanzar metas que hacen de la educación un gozo.

Palabras Claves: Protocolo de observación de la Instrucción Protegida (SIOP); desarrollo de la clase; tiempo designado para el desarrollo de la clase; participación activa de los estudiantes; tiempo designado para el desarrollo de cada actividad de la clase; ritmo del desarrollo de la clase.

INTRODUCTION

Sheltered instruction as an approach for teaching content to English learners (ELs) seeks to help students comprehend the subject matter concepts while they develop their language ability. According to Lemke (1988, p. 81), “educators have begun to realize that the mastery of academic subjects is the mastery of their specialized patterns of language use, and that language is the dominant medium through which these subjects are taught and students’ mastery of them tested”. Given that we use language to show our knowledge, sheltered teachers are focused on using several instructional strategies that support ELLs not only in the knowledge of English, but also in the knowledge of content.

A group of professors and researchers at the *Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana* (ÚNICA) have aimed to deliver lessons in English for second language learners which do just this: they integrate content and language, resulting in an “integrated lesson” design. The Center for Applied Linguistics (Washington, DC) recommends the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) as a way of helping teachers plan and deliver integrated lessons to second language learners.

The rigorous literature review carried out in this study allowed the research team to identify and position the following theories and research as contributions to this project. First, Virginia Collier’s Prism Model (1995) let the research group understand the relationship between conceptual learning, linguistic learning, and academic development in a bilingual learner’s languages, through a specific social context. Also theories such as Vygotsky’s Socio-Cultural Model (1962), Krashen’s Input Hypothesis (1982), and Cummins’ Context-Embedded and Context-Reduced Environments (1981) were relevant to this study, as well as Bloom’s Taxonomy (1956). After reading about these theories, Content Based Instruction (CBI) became much more meaningful to the research group specially when doing research on Sheltered Instruction.

The SIOP model gathers these theories so that it allows teachers to combine language, cognition, and academic development. For instance, Cummins’ Context Embedded and Cognitive Demand help teachers to properly plan lessons based on a protective style of instruction. Krashen’s Input Hypothesis moves teachers to provide students with plenty of cues to easily access content-based texts in a second language. Bloom’s work is also perceived in the model because it lets teachers plan lessons that stimulate and facilitate the development of students’ higher order thinking (Noel, 2008).

The SIOP provides a complete structure for lesson delivery, the seventh component of the protocol. Lesson delivery parallels lesson preparation, the first component of the model that was studied at ÚNICA during the first semester of 2008. The effectiveness of lesson delivery is closely related to how well teachers prepare class. According to the model, lesson delivery has three main elements. First, it encourages teachers to monitor how well content and language objectives are supported during the lesson. Second, it fosters student engagement while the lesson is delivered, and finally it leads teachers to apply appropriate pacing strategies for ELs.

During the development of this study, professors at ÚNICA were carefully observed and trained while they attempted to include in their classes what the SIOP model recommends about lesson delivery. Theirs was a very challenging task because delivering lessons that include all the elements of the component is often demanding. Moreover, keeping students engaged from 90 to 100 percent goes beyond theories. Throughout this overview of model-style lesson delivery, the seventh of eight sub-studies on the SIOP model applicability at ÚNICA, readers will receive first, a general recount about professors’ experience while including lesson delivery elements in

their classes. Then, through description and reflection they will discover the identified strengths and weaknesses professors had in the implementation of this component during their class delivery. Finally, they will be advised on some relevant suggestions on how professors can maintain students actively engaged in the instructional process; students' achievement is closely linked to this aspect.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Context

Professors at ÚNICA teach English as well as content to bilingual education undergraduate students. There are many highly skilled professors, but delivering lessons with the elements suggested in the model is something new for them. Professors need to understand how to deliver lessons that keep students participating actively while using an integrated curriculum that includes clear language and content objectives.

According to Popham (2006, p. 82), "students are active participants in learning processes when teachers empower them to monitor their own process toward clearly understood curricular aims". Since clear content and language objectives guide teaching and learning, students should be informed of both in order to achieve the stated goals and expectations (Echevarria, Short, & Vogt, 2004), but do professors realize that they must do so to complete the educational experience? According to previous observations, professors at ÚNICA do plan tasks that engage students and that are appropriate for students' level of proficiency. Probably this is the result of about a year of training in the implementation of lesson planning as well as lesson delivery (Morales & Peña, 2008).

The SIOP model is a way of helping teachers deliver lessons to second language learners, one which includes both content and language objectives. The effectiveness of this protocol has already been corroborated on the K-12 level, and through action research at ÚNICA it was found that the model also works on the higher education level. The purpose of this sub-study was to help professors become familiar with the SIOP and see if they feel comfortable with it when delivering lessons because it has already been recognized as a useful tool for those working in bilingual education. Five volunteer professors at ÚNICA were trained on the SIOP model and learned how to apply it into their classes. During the second semester of 2008, among other components of the model, professors worked on the implementation of *Lesson Delivery* in their classes. The main objective of this sub-study was to facilitate the understanding of the elements of *Lesson Delivery* in order to help professors incorporate them in the classes. It is important to highlight that this component is a decisive point in student academic success.

Area of Focus

The purpose of this study was to describe the experiences of five ÚNICA professors in their training based on the *Lesson Delivery* component of the SIOP model.

Research Questions and Plan

This study is part of a big research that took place along several phases of a multi-semester project which seek to explore the usefulness of CBI, in this case of the SIOP model, at ÚNICA while professors learn how to apply this protocol into their lessons. The focal point of this study

was to describe the experiences of professors when teaching based on lesson delivery, one of the eight components of the SIOP model. Features such as content and language objectives, student engagement and pacing were considered in the description and analysis of this research.

Data Collection

The following paragraphs will show what the intervention was, who participated in the action research group, the agreements which were made, what the agenda was from August to November 2008, what resources were needed and what data sources were used in order to answer the research questions.

Intervention

First, professors were asked to review chapter eight of the SIOP book which is about Lesson Delivery. Once professors reviewed this chapter, they had a common understanding of what the SIOP model suggests to deliver their lessons appropriately. Second, professors had to plan and deliver a lesson that was videotaped. At the end of the lesson, their students answered in written form an informal questionnaire with the following questions: What did you learn from today's lesson? What did you find interesting from today's class? What specific part of the lesson was difficult for you to understand? Third, the videotapes were assembled and carefully observed; afterwards, professors' reflections about their experiences after delivering their lessons were collected. Finally, the collected data were analyzed in order to draw conclusions, present findings, and make suggestions.

Membership of the Action Research Group

During the development of this research, the five professors were videotaped while delivering a lesson they designed in advance. The researcher in charge of this sub-study watched the videos, analyzed data and stated conclusions.

Agreements

Firstly, in order to videotape the classes and to get the current data, the students' written permission was needed to interrupt their class protocol. To get this permission, collaborating professors informed their students about the project and the purpose of videotaping. Once students accepted, they had to sign a special form, which had been designed in advance. Additionally, the five volunteer professors' written permission was required to use pieces of their class video in the workshop presented in October. The purpose of the workshop was to make concepts of the component clearer for all professors and co-researchers.

Timeline

During the month of August, the area of focus was identified, the chapter about Lesson Delivery was reviewed, and the research questions were developed as well as the action plan. In September, lesson plans, class video-tapes, students' responses, and professors' self-reflections after delivering lessons were collected. All through the month of October, the collected data were analyzed, the findings were presented and the suggestions were given. Lastly, during November, final conclusions were drawn.

Data Sources

During the whole research process, four different qualitative data collection techniques were needed to find out about professors' experiences while delivering their classes using the SIOP model. The data collection tools for this action research were the following: Professors' Lesson Plan Templates, Class Videotapes, Students' Questionnaire, and Professors' Self-Reflections (after delivering class).

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The following conclusions of lesson delivery, the seventh component of the SIOP model, were based on the varied qualitative data collection tools mentioned above. Bearing in mind the research questions, the analysis of the collected data was divided into three parts. The first part focuses on how professors made their lesson support the content and language objectives. The second part shows how professors tried to keep students engaged from 90% to 100% during the lesson. The last part brings to view how appropriate the pacing of the lesson was according to students' language proficiency level. Each part involves general information of the elements engaged in this component besides the analysis of each one of them based on the collected data. The analyses of all the original hardcopies are divided into four parts: first, the analysis of the professors' lesson planning template; second, the analysis of each professor's reflection after delivering their lessons; third, the analysis of class videotapes; and finally the analysis of students' responses.

Content and Language Objectives

Content and language objectives must be given in both written and oral forms because this serves to remind students and teachers about the focus of the lesson. Clear goals allow students to know the direction of the lesson and provide a structure to classroom procedures. Moreover, teachers and students can evaluate the extent to which lesson delivery supported content and language goals (Echevarria, Short & Vogt, 2004).

Analysis of professors' Lesson Planning Template

When analyzing the lesson-plan templates, it was found that four (4) of five (5) analyzed lesson plan templates stated the topic of the class. In one of the templates, the professor forgot to write the topic of the lesson; it was difficult for researchers to decide whether or not the objectives matched with the activities. However, after checking the templates carefully, all of them showed a strong link between content and language objectives, and the activities students must carry out to reach them.

Analysis of Teachers' Reflections after Delivering their Lessons

This data source showed four aspects. Firstly, it identified the professors' experiences while basing their teaching on Lesson Delivery. Second, it revealed how professors made their lesson support the content and language objectives. Third, it showed how they tried to keep students engaged from 90% to 100% during the lesson, and finally, the self-reflections allowed the researcher to note how appropriate the pacing of the lesson was according to the students' language proficiency.

Analysis of Class Videotapes

Based on class videotapes, content and language objectives were given in written and oral forms in all classes as it was expected after six months of training on the first three components of the model. According to the protocol, it is good to have content and language objectives written on the board for students to know what they are going to do during the class and what they are supposed to learn from the lesson. However, as observed in one of the classes the professor decided to ask students to write down in their notebook the objectives for the lesson. After having a group discussion with the researchers, it was concluded that this action should be avoided because it is time consuming and time-off-task. As the SIOP suggests, it is enough for students to know what they will learn from a lesson when they see the objectives written on the board and when the teacher reads these for them out loud.

All videos showed that the goals stated for the lesson matched with activities students developed during the whole class. It was significant to find that at the end of the lesson when students and teacher checked if they accomplished the acknowledged objectives; all agreed they had.

Analysis of Students' Questionnaire

The five volunteer professors asked their students to answer the informal questionnaire at the end of the lesson that was video taped. Students were told that the purpose of filling out the survey was to cooperate with the research at ÚNICA, and that it had nothing to do with evaluation. Fifty anonymous surveys were collected from students' voluntary participation. Regarding the first question, “*What did you learn from today's lesson?*”, it was found that 76% of the participants learned the content and language professors expected to be attained according to the stated objectives of the lesson. According to their responses, 12% of them did not attain the content and language objectives because what they said they learned was different from the goals of the lesson plan. Finally, 6% of the students said they only learned content concepts, and 2% of them did not answer this question.

Student Engagement

This aspect is crucial when delivering lessons because sometimes students squander valuable time because of boredom, inattention, socializing, and other off-task behavior. Time-off-task does not always have to do with students' attitude towards class. According to Mastropieri & Scruggs (cited in Echevarria, Short & Vogt, 2004), teachers also waste time when they are ill prepared; have poor classroom management skills, spend excessive amounts of time making announcements, pass out and hand in papers, and so forth. The most effective teachers minimize these behaviors and maximize time spent actively engaged in instruction. Berliner (cited in Echevarria, Short & Vogt, 2004) suggests three aspects of student engagement teachers must bear in mind when delivering classes:

1. *Allocated Time* reflects teachers' decisions regarding the amount of time spent studying a topic—for example, how much time to spend on reading comprehension versus decoding skills (Echevarria, Short & Vogt, 2004, p. 156).
2. *Engaged Time* refers to the time students are actively participating in instruction during the time allocated. According to Schmoker (cited in Echevarria, Short & Vogt, 2004), there is research on engaged time-on-task which has consistently concluded that the more actively students participate in the instructional process, the more they achieve. Additionally, these researchers point out that instruction that is understandable to ELs

creates opportunities for students to talk about the lesson's concepts, and provides hands-on activities to reinforce learning. This kind of instruction captures students' attention and keeps them more actively engaged (Echevarria, Short & Vogt, 2004).

3. *Academic Learning Time* focuses on students' time-on-task, when the task is related to the materials on which they will be tested (Echevarria, Short & Vogt, 2004, p. 156). However, at ÚNICA this aspect was found to be different because professors always assign several tasks in classes that are not graded, but still they are part of time-on-task work.

According to the model, effective sheltered teachers plan to use the entire class time efficiently which means to have from 90 percent to 100 percent of the class students' engaged. In short, students' engagement can be seen as a balance between teacher presentation of information and opportunities for students to apply the content in meaningful ways (Echeverría, Short & Vogt, 2004).

Analysis of professors' Lesson Planning Template

Regarding allocated time, only two (2) of five (5) templates clearly showed professors decision regarding the amount of time to spend studying a topic and a given academic task. In relation to engaged time, four (4) of five (5) lesson templates seemed to engage students because of the activities professors planned and the time estimated to develop them. Some questions and activities that illustrate how professors planned engaged time in their lessons are the following:

- **Questions:**
 1. Do you remember how you felt when you were a teenager?
 2. Consideran que un mito es importante ¿Por qué?
 3. How do you know when an argument is a good one?
- **Activities:**
 1. Students discuss their change of styles in Spanish to identify themselves as part of a speech community
 2. Students role play a situation as an example of physical changes teenagers go through
 3. Los estudiantes crearan un mapa conceptual basado en el texto: *Conceptos sobre los Mitos*.

One of the templates could not be analyzed because it did not specify the activities in it. This could be a reminder for professors to write their lesson plans as clear as possible. An effective strategy to write a lesson-plan is to think that others are going to deliver that lesson, so that it needs to be clear enough not only for the designer, but for the one that could substitute him. Regarding academic learning time, only two (2) of five (5) templates clearly showed the time assigned for each task to be developed during the class.

Analysis of Teachers' Reflections after Delivering their Lessons

Professors' reflections on student engagement show their belief on the importance of teaching students how to apply what they learn in class into their daily life activities. The following pieces of professors' reflections reveal some of their thoughts:

- "We need to show students how to do, instead of asking them to do. In other words, students should be the actors of the class, the ones who speak, who write, who produce, and who create."

- “Learning processes must be meaningful, so our students get to a higher stage of understanding. Then, we have to provide the necessary tools for them to learn by doing and experiencing”.

In short, professors consider that student engagement occurs not only during the lesson, but also after leaving the classroom.

Analysis of Class Videotapes

After watching the videos it was concluded that there are variables such as, student background, and age, as well as teacher academic purposes that affect *allocated time*; the allocated time for certain topics or activities might vary depending on the mentioned variables. It was revealed in all class videos that allocated time was appropriate for the topic and the activities students carried out. However, the following situation should be considered as a hazard for time-on-task. One of the professors spent a lot of time reviewing and introducing new vocabulary as well as content concepts. This activity took her from 20 to 50 minutes, which may be too much time when students do not participate actively.

Engaged time was excellent because almost all students participated actively. For instance, at the beginning of one of the classes students reviewed vocabulary; this activity took them around 20 minutes in which they vigorously participated. Stress-free participation was observed during the whole class. In another class video, it was found that only few students participated actively when having class discussion. During the chat, the interventions were made by the same three or four students. In order to lessen the occurrence of this situation, it would be appropriate and useful to bring into play strategies like “Think-Pair-Share”. This strategy, recommended by the SIOP, engages all students because after listening to the teachers’ questions each student has to think of an answer, then share it with a partner, and finally some students can share their responses with the whole group at random or willingly.

It was obvious that students’ participation is higher when professors provide them much more guidance than instruction. Sometimes professors did not let students take their time to digest, construct, and show what they can do. Instead, a few professors ended up answering their own questions, which was not fruitful because it stopped students’ inspiration.

Students’ participation in class was highly linked to the nature of the class as discovered after watching all videos. For instance, there was a big difference in this regard in one of the courses in relation with the other ones. This course lesson was about APA citation and the writing process, which are technical topics, so that students could not participate actively. Most of the time, students were passive because the lesson was more like a lecture. However, it does not mean that technical courses do not provide students with opportunities to participate dynamically.

Regarding *academic learning time*, first of all it is necessary to mention that at ÚNICA this aspect was found to be different from what the model states because professors always assign several tasks in classes that are not graded, but still they can be considered as part of time-on-task work. Based on the collected data, it was observed that even though most of the professors did not state time for each activity developed in class, some of them throughout monitoring students’ work could manage time-on-task very well.

As noticed in some of the videos, academic learning time was a challenging issue for some of the professors. For example, there was a class in which all students had read about the topic in advance; they had background information. Nevertheless, it was observed that sometimes the professor did not give enough time for students to think about their responses. Given that students read before class, the teacher expected them to have answers for the

questions she had already prepared. Even though, students were able to answer, the lack of time to think or refresh their mind in order to provide accurate responses was evident.

Another case in which students did not have enough time to construct their responses is described as follows. One of the professors asked students to write down some questions to answer in five minutes. They took three minutes to write the questions down and then almost ten minutes to answer around five questions. This was not enough time for the task according to students' participation. The fastest students had the chance to participate but the others did not. As the model recommends, "Think-Pair-Share" or "Chunk & Chew" are useful strategies to let students have enough time to reflect and discuss. "Chunk & Chew" may especially help teachers, keeping in mind that pauses after every ten minutes of input provide time for students to assimilate information and participate more frequently.

In relation to academic learning time, the class videos revealed that the majority of the professors did not set enough time for each task learners had to carry out. Fortunately, they managed class very well; however, it is important to consider that this issue could bring time-off-task when delivering a lesson. When teachers do not allocate time for tasks, students start socializing, or get bored (Echevarria, Short & Vogt, 2004). While analyzing the class videos, it was observed that sometimes professors wasted time when they had to repeat instructions because they were initially given too fast and each step of the activity did not have a specific allocated time for students to complete the task step by step. Based on this situation, we suggest professors consider how useful it might be to assign time for every step in order to reduce time-off-task.

Analysis of Students' Questionnaire

For the second question of the survey, "*What did you find interesting from today's class?*", it was found that 92% of the students considered that the whole class was interesting. The following example synthesizes students class perception: "It is very interesting to have the opportunity to participate in class and create our activities because we are not just learning theory but also practical things". Just 8% of the participants did not answer this question of the survey. In general terms, students' responses allowed the researcher to state that *student engagement* at UNICA classes is outstanding when comparing the questionnaire answers to what the model suggests.

Pacing

The term *pacing* here refers to the rate at which information is presented during a lesson. There are some variables teachers must consider in this feature such as: nature of the content, students' background knowledge, students' proficiency level, and students' interests among others (Echevarria, Short & Vogt, 2004). When delivering class, teachers should check student expressions, provide feedback, and make questions "dip-sticking" to see if the pacing is too fast or slow.

Analysis of professors' Lesson Planning Template

In general terms, the conclusion here was that each lesson plan template was smoothly designed according to students' level of proficiency. They all proposed challenging but achievable activities according to the nature of the content. Also, these templates stated questions or activities that took into account student's age, background and interests.

Analysis of Teachers' Reflections after Delivering their Lessons

One professor considered that pacing depends on the group level; she said that there are groups that go beyond her expectations, as well as others that need more support and guidance. This professor took into consideration one of the variables that the SIOP model states about pacing, students' proficiency level. Echevarria, Short & Vogt (2004) state that while teachers design their lessons, as well as while they deliver them, they must take into consideration the level of their students in order to gear them in the accomplishment of the lesson's objectives.

Another professor said that sometimes students take more time than the allocated one for tasks. This professor considered that occasionally she takes for granted students' difficulties, and does not estimate enough time for them to complete an activity.

Analysis of Class Videotapes

In this regard, the rate of professor's instruction was appropriate for students' level of proficiency because learners' interventions and gestures did not show evidence of misunderstanding or confusion while professors delivered their lesson. People may assume that when classes are delivered in students' native language pacing is not that relevant. However, pacing does not have to do only with the rate of instruction but with students' background knowledge of a topic and interests among other variables. In one of the classes, which is delivered in Spanish, it was observed that pacing was suitable regarding the aforementioned variables.

In general terms, most of the professors assumed students did not have any hesitation or misunderstanding; maybe they took clarity for granted rather than ambiguity in their instruction. The SIOP recommends checking if students understand the lesson through "dip-sticking", glimpsing at their expressions, asking if the pacing is too fast or slow and so forth.

Analysis of Students' Questionnaire

In the last question, "What specific part of the lesson was difficult for you to understand?", 40% of the participants said it was challenging to comprehend some aspects of the main content of the lesson. Considering the data from the class videos, professors' pacing was appropriate so that the lack of understanding might be a matter of topic nature and level of difficulty (e.g., APA citation). Regarding the language objectives of each the lesson, it was found that 6% of the students had some difficulty when understanding some issues of this area. According to 32% of the students, there was a completely clear comprehension of the lesson so that they did not have any hesitation or misunderstanding; 22% of participants did not answer the question.

ACTION PLAN

In order to avoid misunderstandings regarding the concepts about lesson delivery described in the SIOP book, professors were told to re-read chapter eight. Then, they attended two workshops on this component; the first workshop served to clarify concepts and the other one was to present findings and make suggestions. During the first session, after watching a SIOP class video based on lesson delivery, the professors and researchers discussed the notes they had taken individually related to patterns they had identified for content and language objectives, students' engagement, and pacing. Next, the subjects worked through guided activities that gave them a clearer understanding of the different elements in the component.

In the second workshop, findings from the analyzed data were presented. First, it was found that professors at UNICA truly understand the importance of stating clear content

and language objectives that must be written and given orally for students to know the focus of the lesson. Furthermore, the five professors experienced the advantages of delivering lessons that support content and language goals. Regarding *allocated time*, all videos revealed that the time stated for the lesson was appropriate for the topic and the activities students carried out.

With respect to *engaged time* it was found that professors need to use strategies such as “Think-Pair-Share” and “Chunk & Chew” among others to have better and higher student participation. It is necessary to implement strategies for improving students’ time-on-task throughout a lesson in order to provide students with many more opportunities for dynamic participation. According to the gathered data, *academic learning time* was an aspect on which professors need to improve, because having time stated for each task helps students have better and fruitful interventions.

CONCLUSION

Bearing in mind the research questions, and the purpose of this study, which was to implement CBI through the SIOP model while describing the experiences of professors at ÚNICA as they went through a learning process on how to deliver lessons based on the SIOP model, it must be said that the whole process was successful since professors eventually understood each element of the lesson delivery component. The following findings support professors’ fruitful experiences regarding lesson delivery.

First of all, it was found that professors learned how to state content and language objectives according to the SIOP. This fact allows students and professors to know what the focus of a lesson is and what professors expect students to accomplish at the end of a class. Additionally, there is no doubt about professors’ understanding of the importance of writing the lesson objectives on the board, besides reading them out loud at the beginning and at the end of the class.

The collected data showed that professors needed to state in their lesson plan the allocated time for the lesson, so both professors and students know how much time they will spend on a topic. Also, the hard-copy documents and the class videos revealed that in order to avoid time-off-task, professors should allocate time for every task students have to complete during a lesson.

Academic learning time was something professors found difficult to implement at ÚNICA, but once they understood the purpose of this element which is to keep away from time-off-task and to foster student engagement, they agreed on following this prototype when delivering classes. Even though, student engagement at ÚNICA was found to be high according to the model, professors and co-researchers agreed on the need of exploring different strategies that might improve students’ participation.

Finally, after analyzing data it was found that professors did not have any problem in terms of pacing. The pace of every observed class was suitable regarding students’ language proficiency level, background knowledge, and interests among other significant variables.

Up to this point, it is worth highlighting that without the effort and commitment of the research group director, the five volunteer ÚNICA professors and the co-researchers, this study would not have had a productive outcome, not only for professors in their professional development but also for starting teachers in their early pedagogical experiences. Moreover, this research allowed the whole team, once again, to reinforce their belief in how valuable it is to join hands in a cooperative environment in which teachers and students *learn together* while accomplishing the specific goals that make education a joy.

REFERENCES

- Baker, C. (2001) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (3rd ed.) Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Bloom, B.S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook I: The cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay Co., Inc.
- Collier, V. (1994). *Acquiring a second language for school*. Washington: George Mason University.
- Collier, V. (1995). *Promoting academic success for ESL students: Understanding second language acquisition for school*. Elizabeth: New Jersey Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages-Bilingual Educators.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California Department of Education. *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles: California Department of Education.
- Cummins, J. (1994). The socioacademic achievement model in the context of coercive and collaborative relations of power. In R.A. DeVillar, C.J. Faltis & J. Cummins (Eds.) *Cultural diversity in schools: From rhetoric to practice* (pp. 363-392). Albany: SUNY Press..
- Curtain, H. (1995). Integrating Foreign Language and Content Instruction in Grades K–8. *Digest*. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/int-for-k8.html>
- Echevarria, J., Short, D. & Vogt, M.E. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Haynes, J. (2005). How long does it take to learn English? Retrieved from http://www.everythingsl.net/inservices/long_does_take_learn_english_55843.php
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Lemke, J. (1988). Genres, semantics, and classroom education. *Linguistics & Education*, 1(1), 81-99.
- Morales & Peña (2008). Discovering New Dimension in and Old Task. *The Colombian Bilingual Journal*, 2, 51-67.
- NCRCDSLL. (1994). Integrating Language and Culture in Middle School American History Classes. *Digest*. Retrieved from <http://www.ericdigests.org/1994/history.htm>
- Noel, B. (2008). Students Learn English Better ... Learning to Teach it! *The Colombian Bilingual Journal*, 2, 102-118.
- Owens, C. (2002). Content-based English for academic purposes in a Thai university. In J. Crandall & D. Kaufman (Eds.) *Content-based instruction in higher education settings* (pp. 45-62). Alexandria: TESOL.
- Oxford, R. (2008). Integrated Skills in the ESL/EFL Classroom. *Digest*. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/resources/Digest/0105oxford.html>
- Popham, J. (2006). Assessment for Learning: An Endangered Species? Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ745549&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ745549pearsonlearning.com/celepress/dra_validation.html
- Pollock, J. (2008). Improving Student Learning One Teacher at a Time: Replacing Hope with Certainty. *Digest*. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/portal/site/ascd/template.chapter/menuitem.ccf6e1bf6046da7cdeb3ffdb62108a0c/?chapterMgmtId=5cf4dd77a7e91110VgnVCM1000003d01a8c0RCRD>

- Short, D. (1994). Expanding middle school horizons: Integrating language, culture, and social studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 581-608.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2006). Linguistic genocide? Children's right to education in their own languages. *Communicating Development Research*, 5(3). Retrieved from <http://www.id21.org/insights/insights-ed05/pdf.html>
- Song, B. (2006). Content-based ESL instruction: Long-term effects and Outcomes. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 420-437.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S.M. Gass & C.G. Madden (Eds.) *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-256) New York: Newbury House.
- Tucker, G.R. (1990). Cognitive and social correlates of additive bilinguality. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 90-101). Washington, DC: Georgetown.

BIODATA

Edith Viviana MORALES HENAO has a Bachelor's degree in Bilingual Education from Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana (ÚNICA). She has worked over two years at English schools in Bogotá teaching English as a Second Language (ESL). In 2006 she along with Josephine Taylor, the academic director of Centro Colombo Americano, presented at the 9th Annual ELT Conference in Bogotá, a workshop called *Intercultural Competence without International Experience*. They both also published an article for the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC). During 2008, she collaborated on the university-wide Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Research Project. In the same year, she and a colleague published an article in *GIST: The Colombian Journal of Bilingual Education*. In April 2009 she and Barbara Noel, Dean of Academic Affairs at ÚNICA, presented a research report at the 12th ELT Conference in Bogotá. Her research interests include intercultural communication, language, academic and cognitive development in L1 and L2, language-content integration, teacher training, and teaching models to support English language learners.