



## The Impact of Project GLAD on Fifth-Grade Literacy: Sheltered Instruction & English Learners in the Mainstream Classroom

**Theresa Deussen, Angela Roccograndi, Makoto Hanita,  
Elizabeth Autio & Claudia Rodriguez-Mojica  
AERA 2015, Chicago**

### **Sheltered instruction in the mainstream classroom**

- Provides intentional linguistic and other supports to English learners (ELs) to facilitate their learning of grade-level content, with a secondary goal of developing academic English
- Has only limited research evidence to demonstrate that it achieves its goal of helping to close the achievement gap between ELs and non-ELs (Goldenberg, 2013)

### **Project GLAD (Orange County Department of Education)**

- 35+ unique instructional strategies, intended to be used for thematic content-area instruction
- Focus & Motivation, Input, Guided Oral Practice, Reading, and Writing
- No specific curriculum, teacher-made materials
- No prior evaluation

### **Research Questions**

- What is the impact of Project GLAD on the reading comprehension, vocabulary, and expository writing of ELs?
- Does any impact differ by English language proficiency?
- What is the impact of Project GLAD on achievement of non-ELs in the same classrooms?

### **Study Design & Sample**

- Cluster randomized design, 5th-grade classrooms in 30 Idaho schools (15 T, 15 C)
- 30 schools across 21 districts, half of them rural
- 92 classrooms, teachers 98% White, average 10+ years' experience
- 2 consecutive cohorts of students in the same classrooms
- Ever-ELs ( $n = 588$ ), 92% Latino, 93% FRL eligible, 14% Sped eligible
- Non-ELs ( $n = 3895$ ), 76% White, 58% FRL eligible, 8% Sped eligible

## **Delivery of the Intervention**

- 2-day workshop, August 2011; 5-day demonstration, October 2011
- 3 days' follow-up coaching, 2011–2012
- Workshop and demonstration for 8 new (replacement) teachers in 2012
- 3 days' follow-up coaching for all teachers, 2012–2013
- Teachers used Project GLAD strategies but frequency and fidelity varied

## **Measures**

- Gates-MacGinitie reading comprehension and vocabulary (pre/post)
- Science writing prompts, 3 choices, scored using 6-Traits rubric (post only)
- Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA), grade 4

## **Analysis**

- 2-level (student and school) HLM
- Ever-EL and non-EL analyzed separately
- Combined 2 cohorts ever-EL
- Impact for non-EL estimated separately by year because cohort was significant

## **Results: Research Question 1, Ever-ELs**

- Reading comprehension (Hedges'  $g=0.14$ ,  $p=0.07$ )
- Vocabulary (Hedges'  $g=0.14$ ,  $p=0.08$ )
- Writing (Ideas trait: Hedges'  $g=0.22$ ,  $p=0.09$ )

## **Results: Research Question 2, Variation by proficiency level**

- Greatest impact for intermediate level ELs (level 3)
- Reading comprehension (Hedges'  $g=0.29$ ,  $p=0.10$ )
- Vocabulary (Hedges'  $g=0.38$ ,  $p=0.02$ )
- Writing (Ideas trait: Hedges'  $g=0.46$ ,  $p=0.02$ ; Organization trait: Hedges'  $g=0.39$ ,  $p=0.03$ )

## **Results: Research Question 3, Non-ELs**

- No significant or near-significant impacts, with one exception
- Coefficients in a positive direction in Year 1, negative direction in Year 2
- Vocabulary in Year 2 was negative and approached significance (Hedges'  $g=-0.08$ ,  $p=0.06$ )

## **Discussion**

- Size of gains for Ever-ELs are not sufficient to close achievement gaps though gains for intermediate ELs are much larger
- No evidence from this study for claims that sheltered instruction is "good for all students"
- Though this is just one study, it raises questions about whether many districts' heavy reliance on sheltered instruction alone can yield the outcomes they hope for

Download the paper at: [educationnorthwest.org/aera2015](http://educationnorthwest.org/aera2015)

For further information, contact: [Theresa.Deussen@educationnorthwest.org](mailto:Theresa.Deussen@educationnorthwest.org)