

What Works Clearinghouse



Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)

Effectiveness¹ No studies of *SIOP* that fall within the scope of the English Language Learners (ELL) review protocol meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards. The lack of studies meeting WWC evidence standards means that, at this time, the WWC is unable to draw any conclusions based on research about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of *SIOP*.

Program Description² The *Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)* is a framework for planning and delivering instruction in content areas such as science, history, and mathematics to limited-English proficient students. The goal of *SIOP* is to help teachers integrate academic language development into their lessons, allowing students to learn and practice English as it is used in the context of school, including the vocabulary used in textbooks and lectures in each academic discipline. Using this planning

framework, teachers modify the way they teach so that the language they use to explain concepts and information is comprehensible to these students. The *SIOP* planning and observation framework covers eight areas of instruction: preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice and application, lesson delivery, review, and assessment. In most cases, teachers receive professional development on the *SIOP Model* before using it to modify their lessons.

The WWC identified eight studies of *Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)* that were published or released between 1983 and 2008.

Two studies are within the scope of the review protocol and have an eligible design, but do not meet WWC evidence standards.

- One study does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.
- One study includes only one unit of analysis in one condition, which makes it impossible to attribute the observed effect solely to *SIOP*.

Four studies are out of the scope of the ELL review protocol because they have an ineligible study design that does not meet WWC evidence standards. These studies do not use a comparison group.

Two studies are out of the scope of the ELL review protocol because there was either not enough information about the study design to assess whether it meets standards, or the study did not use a sample aligned with the protocol.

1. The studies in this report were reviewed using WWC Evidence Standards, Version 2.0 (see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Chapter III).
 2. The descriptive information for this program was obtained from a publicly available source: the program’s website (<http://www.cal.org/siop>, downloaded March 2009). The WWC requests developers to review the program description sections for accuracy from their perspective. Further verification of the accuracy of the descriptive information for this program is beyond the scope of this review.

References Studies that fall outside the English Language Learners review protocol or do not meet evidence standards

Dennis, R. L. (2004). The effects of the *Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol Model* on the vocabulary development of English language learners in the content area. *Masters Abstracts International*, 43(04), 101–1073. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2006). School reform and standards-based education: A model for English-language learners. *Journal of Educational Research*, 99(4), 195–210. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.

Additional source:

Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2008). Making content comprehensible for non-native speakers of English: The *SIOP Model*. *International Journal of Learning*, 14(11), 41–50.

Engel, S. (2007). *SIOP and the struggling reader: In what ways could the use of the Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) be appropriate for struggling readers?* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin–Green Bay. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

Gammon, M. L. (2004). Bilingual Education: Program Development and Implementation Grant: Final evaluation. Arizona/USA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol.

Guarino, A. J., Echevarria, J., Short, D., Schick, J. E., Forbes, S., & Rueda, R. (2001). The *Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol*: Reliability and validity assessment. *Journal of Research in Education*, 11(1), 138–140. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

Miner, K. A. (2006). Fostering teacher efficacy for teaching elementary English language learning students using the *Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol* and systems-level supports: A case study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(07A), 160–2411. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit of analysis in one or both conditions.

Pascopella, A. (2008). Missouri district brings struggling learners up to snuff. *District Administration*, 44(13), 73. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.