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Reviewing Why are We Here?

• To understand the appropriate process for serving and evaluating culturally and linguistically diverse populations

• Minimize the under & over identification of ELL Students for special education services

• Engage in a paradigm shift that “intervention or teaching represents ongoing assessment.”

• How does this process align with RtI, PSW and, XBA paradigms.
Who Are You - The Same as Yesterday?

• Why am I asking?

What Did We Cover Yesterday?

• What were some **KEY** Concepts?
  – I didn’t teach you how to be a teacher.

FYI: Over the last few slides, we just covered the following:
• Intentionality
• The framework for “Meaning”
• Transfer
What are We Covering Today?

Pre-Referral

When Does an Evaluation Planning Meeting Occur?

SPED Eligibility

Again, Follow the Data !!!

ELL/SPED Evaluation-Eligibility Paradigm

-- Bosker, 2002
Activity 1: The Evaluation Process can be “Complistic”

We know more than we think!
- Take 10-12 minutes: Review the Background Information Communication Disorders Report with groups of 2 or 3.
- Take a sheet of paper and draw a line down the middle lengthwise
- On one side, identify Red Flag characteristics pertaining to development or learning
- On the other side, list evaluation tools or techniques utilized to collect evaluation data.

How much of this do you already do?

The Law is Your Friend

- The Fourteenth Amendment (1868) – Constitution of the United States: “No state shall...deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”
- Lau v. Nichols (1974): US Supreme Court’s Interpretation of the Civil Rights Act indicated that local school districts and states have the obligation to provide appropriate services to limited-English-proficient students.
What Does IDEA Say?

• Assessment & evaluation material is not to be discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis.

• **2004 Adjusted Language now includes**
  ...evaluations are to be provided and administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally, unless it is not feasible to so provide or administer.

• Ensure the evaluation measures the extent to which the child has a disability and needs special education, rather than measuring the child’s English language skills.

• A variety of tools & methods are used to determine a disability exists.

• No single measure or assessment is used as the sole criterion for determining a disability exists.
ELL/SPED Evaluation-Eligibility Paradigm

Cross-Platform Correlation

~ Bender, 2002

National CEU
Eliminating The Gap
Everybody Likes a Checklist

- Review the Pre-Referral and Evaluation Checklist
- See Descriptions for further detail
- (see pages included in packet)

---

### English Language Learner for SLP/E Services

(See attached descriptions for each area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Study Team Information</th>
<th>(All Team Members can Contribute to the Collection of Data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESL, pre-referral note taken:</strong> (i.e., school history, teacher concern, ESL test data, interventions, parent concerns)</td>
<td>Date Initiated:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Person Responsible for General instruction: education teacher, ESL Teacher, and/ or educator who know student best.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obtain information pertaining to the student’s primary language and culture:</strong></td>
<td>Date Completed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information can be obtained from a variety of resources (i.e., see attached resource list)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule an interpreter if needed (Note: Utilize best practice guidelines):</strong></td>
<td>Date Completed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• See information attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obtain developmental &amp; medical history (i.e., birth history, ear infections, communication skills, crying/walking, etc.)</strong></td>
<td>Date Completed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtain parent’s observations pertaining to student’s communication skills in primary language and comparison to siblings and/or peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This can be obtained from parent interview, intake records, or the student’s cumulative file.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obtain academic history of student in primary or secondary language:</strong></td>
<td>Date Completed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obtain classroom teacher &amp; ESL teacher’s observations:</strong></td>
<td>Date Completed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obtain data on student’s EFL acquisition:</strong></td>
<td>Date Completed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This can be obtained using the BOSCALP observational checklist, second language acquisition chart, a conversational sample and observations, or other testing tools designed to reflect EFL skill development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Study Team Information – Continued

- Obtain data on student’s CALP acquisition
  - This can be obtained using the BECS/CALP observational checklist, second language acquisition chart, student work samples, or other testing tools designed to reflect CALP skill development
  - Date Completed:

- ESL testing data (e.g., OREELPA, ITP, LIA, BVIAT, WoodsPad-Shane, etc.)
  - Note: Language proficiency data needs to be interpreted in a guarded fashion and according to the parameters outlined within the tool examiner’s manual
  - Date Completed:

- Current academic performance
  - Note: Data should be interpreted in terms of second language acquisition expectations and can also be used as baseline data when using a curriculum-based assessment methodology. If available, academic data in ESL should also be collected.
  - Date Completed:

- Response to Intervention Data (if available)
  - Continuous monitoring data to assess the student’s ability to learn, retain, and transfer new information within the context of the second language acquisition continuum.
  - Date Completed:

- Other Data Collected
  - List other data collected:
    - 
    - 
    - 
    - 
  - Date Completed:

Student Study Team Recommendations

Note: The Student Study Team should ask the following questions to help determine the next course of action:

1. Does the student data reflect typical characteristics pertaining to development and/or learning:
   - Yes or No? (If “Yes”, go to number 2)
     - If “NO”, the student study team should make recommendations to the teacher and/or parent that will better provide support systems (e.g., appropriate teaching strategies, accommodations, modifications, etc.) to the student, teacher, or parent that relates to the initial concerns reflected within the referral.
     - Date Completed:

2. If “Yes”, are the noted areas of concern related to typical second language acquisition and/or acculturation characteristics?
   - If “Yes”, the student is most likely struggling with academics or development due to the complexities of learning a second language and acculturating. This is most likely not due to an underlying learning or language disability. The student should continue to receive building level resources with instruction being differentiated with the student’s comprehensible input level and their stage of second language acquisition.
   - If “No”, then the areas of concern are not consistent characteristics of second language acquisition and/or acculturation and further data collection and analysis may be appropriate to rule out eligibility for special education services. (If “NO”, go to number 3)

3. Make referral to special education evaluation team, or appropriate agency, for a review of the student study team data and recommendations for further evaluation.
   - Referred To:
   - Date Submitted:
### Special Education Evaluation

Note: All of the data collected prior to the evaluation planning meeting should be incorporated into the analysis of data obtained during a special education evaluation. The information collected is specific to second language acquisition, acculturation, and response to intervention can assist in recommendations related to areas of the handicapping conditions (e.g., Communication Disorders, Specific Learning Disabilities, Autism, Mental Retardation, etc.).

#### Assessment Data that May Be Considered Depending on the Areas of Concern:

- **Observational & Developmental Information**
  - Analysis should take into account second language acquisition and acculturation characteristics
  - Example: Strategies for Data Collection
  - Classroom and/or student observations
  - Parent Interview
  - Developmental Checklist
  - Language sample

- **Standardized (Norm-Referenced) Assessment Data**
  - To be interpreted in a guarded manner and recognizing that scores are influenced by different degrees of cultural and linguistic impact
  - Possible Areas of Assessment
    - Receptive Language Skills
    - Expressive Language Skills
    - Comprehension Language Skills
    - Reading Skills
    - Math Skills
    - Writing Skills
    - Other
    - Other

- **Criterion-Referenced Assessment Data**
  - To be interpreted in a guarded manner and aligned with the stages of second language acquisition
  - Possible Areas of Assessment
    - Receptive Language Skills
    - Expressive Language Skills
    - Comprehension Language Skills
    - Language Sample
    - Reading Skills
    - Math Skills
    - Writing Skills
    - Other
    - Other

- **Tier 3 Response to Intervention Data and/or Dynamic Assessment Data**
  - Continuous monitoring data to assess the student’s ability to learn, retain, and transfer new information within the context of the second language acquisition continuum
  - Possible Areas of Assessment
    - Receptive Language Skills
    - Expressive Language Skills
    - Comprehension Language Skills
    - Reading Skills
    - Math Skills
    - Writing Skills
    - Other
    - Other

### Assessment Data that May Be Considered – Continued

- **Capacity to Learn** (i.e., when appropriate, assessment of intellectual capacity using norm-based instruments and methods that are sensitive to linguistic and cultural factors)
  - Non-Verbal Tests (e.g., UNIT)
  - Cross-Battery and/or PBIS Approach
  - Oral Cultural Language Interpretive Matrix

- **Adaptive Skills – If Needed**
  - Note: Translated or interpreted versions for both Home and School
  - Date Completed (Home)
  - Date Completed (School)

- **Neuropsychological Evaluation – If Needed**
  - Date Completed:

- **Consultation from Autism Specialist – If Needed**
  - Date Completed:

- **Gross and/or Fine Motor Information – If Needed**
  - Date Completed (PE)
  - Date Completed (OT)

- **Adaptive PE Information – If Needed**
  - Date Completed:

### Evaluation Team Summary

- **ELL/SPED Evaluation Rubric** (Create a checklist that synthesizes evaluation data related to typical versus atypical developmental and/or learning patterns in relation to second language acquisition)
  - Teams may use the ESL Flag Bailey that is provided. This tool assists in synthesizing evaluation information and identifying if the data reflect a preponderance of atypical learning and/or developmental patterns unrelated to second language acquisition or acculturation.
  - Utilizes translated documents for parents (i.e., parent rights book & due process paperwork. Many ESL have these available in multiple languages (e.g., Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Russian).
Evaluation Data to Consider for an ELL Student Being Evaluated for Special Education Services

1. ESL Pre-Referral Packet: This document is essential. Without this, a referral for a special education evaluation is premature. The individual responsible for completing this document may include: the ELL teacher, the classroom teacher, or representatives from the BSC. Vital information from this document would include:
   - Home language
   - Academic (i.e., years in an English speaking school setting)
   - Attendance stability
   - Teacher concerns
   - Strategies employed to address noted concerns (also note duration and success rates)
   - ESL testing data
   - Parent report

2. Information on Cultural & Linguistic Characteristics of Student’s Home Language and Community: This section is critical and a step that needs to occur very early in the evaluation process. This step is essential because the test or our data will need to be interpreted through this lens. Characteristics that may differ from the English-speaking culture may include:
   - Diachronic speech patterns
   - Language patterns (i.e., syntax, syntax & morphology)
   - Social Distance (i.e., social pragmatic skills)
   - Academic preparation & behavior (e.g., home engagement & communication style)
   - Family literacy & communication
   - Gender relations
   - Geopolitical & religious differences (Note: take note of individual’s displacement by war or coming from refugee camps)

3. Developmental & Medical History: This section is very critical. What needs to be recorded is that this may have to be done with an interpreter. It is recommended that one designated person conduct the interview with the interpreter and the parent. If there are multiple team members involved, the team should coordinate their questions. The interpreter should be equal for all team members to prevent following the interview. It is also important to recognize that some questions that are asked may be considered inappropriate within a specific culture. It is important to review the interview questions with the interpreter prior to the meeting in order to identify any questions that may be sensitive. The interviewer and the interpreter can then problem-solve alternative ways to obtain information needed from any identified sensitive questions.

4. Academic History in Primary Language: It’s important to note if the student has received any type of schooling within their home language. If so, the acquisition of the second language may be more efficient due to skills developed in the primary language. It’s also important to note if the student has received specific/field instruction in their home country.

5. Parent Observations (Communication Skills, Comparison to Siblings/Peers): This descriptive data can be very compelling. However, it’s important to note that when asking parents from multicultural backgrounds general questions about their child’s abilities, they will usually indicate that the child’s first language is more specific questions about the child’s skills (e.g., literacy, math, social skills), etc.

ELL/SPED Evaluation- Eligibility Paradigm

**National CEU**

**Eliminating the Gap**
Platform

1st Step: Pre-Referral
This is an essential 1st Step that identifies key information and puts a pause in the process, when needed (A modified version is also needed for EI/ECSE)

Data to be considered should include, but not limited to include:

- Home Language & Culture
- L1/L2 Acquisition Characteristics
- Academic History (L1 & L2)
- Attendance Stability
- Teacher Concerns
- Response to Interventions
- ESL Testing Data
Using Cultural and Linguistic Information from the Pre-Referral

• We go back and ask the two essential questions - **but now to answer diagnostic questions!**

  – What’s the language and culture of the student?

  – How many years have they been in an English-speaking school setting?

---

**Stages of Sequential Language Acquisition**

**Pre-Production/Comprehension (no BICS)**
Sometimes called the silent period, where the individual concentrates completely on figuring out what the new language means, without worrying about production skills. Children typically may delay speech in L2 from one to six weeks or longer.

  • listen, point, match, draw, move, choose, mime, act out

**Early Production (early BICS)**
Speech begins to emerge naturally but the primary process continues to be the development of listening comprehension. Early speech will contain many errors. Typical examples of progression are:

  • yes/no questions, lists of words, one word answers, two word strings, short phrases

**Speech Emergence (intermediate BICS)**
Given sufficient input, speech production will continue to improve. Sentences will become longer, more complex, with a wider vocabulary range. Numbers of errors will slowly decrease.

  • three words and short phrases, dialogue, longer phrases
  • extended discourse, complete sentences where appropriate, narration

**Intermediate Fluency (advanced BICS/emerging CALP)**
With continued exposure to adequate language models and opportunities to interact with fluent speakers of the second language, second language learners will develop excellent comprehension and their speech will contain even fewer grammatical errors. Opportunities to use the second language for varied purposes will broaden the individual’s ability to use the language more fully.

  • give opinions, analyze, defend, create, debate, evaluate, justify, examine

**Beginning Fluency**

**Advanced Fluency**

• Female
• CA: 9-11
• Grade 4th
• Schooling: K-3rd grade
• Homeschooled this year
Difficulties in L1 & L2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BICs Speaking</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Give coherent answers (both oral &amp; written)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exchange common greetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Name familiar objects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Describe classroom objects according to color, shape, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Describe people according to physical and emotional states</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Describe what is happening when given a scenario or a concrete representational activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Appropriately initiate, maintain, and respond to a conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Recall ABCs, numbers 1-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Appropriately answer basic questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Participate in sharing time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BICs Speaking</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ask answers specific question regarding topics discussed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use adequate vocabulary appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use unfamiliar concepts appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ask for clarification during academic tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Express reason for opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Many items reported indicated student was only able to perform targets some of the time (e.g., emerging)

### BICS % for L1

26% correct

### BICS % for L2

16% Correct
Sequential Second Language Acquisition Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Reaction: 0-6 Months in US School</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Uses English in social and classroom interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responds primarily nonverbally (with gestures &amp; actions)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Displays limited comprehension</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responds to greetings, introductions, farewells</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Points to objects</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Answers questions about self only with yes or no</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicates basic personal needs, such as need to use the restroom, with gestures and actions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses the primary language to express when an English expression is not understood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Reaction: 6-12 Months in US School</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Uses English in social and classroom interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Produces simple phrases and simple sentences that may contain errors</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participates in everyday conversations familiar topics</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Displays a fundamental comprehension of social interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Answers questions about self using phrases</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exhibits general ability to communicate for simple, occasional communication breakdowns in which he or she may ask for help</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** First identify which stage student should be performing at based on the number of weeks the student has been in an English-speaking school setting. Then complete the document by placing a “+” or “-” in the appropriate box reflecting student’s ability to perform the noted task. Struggles in skill ability within stages the student should be capable of performing may reflect instructional gaps or atypical second language acquisition development. Four separate sections are provided to document quarterly progress (i.e., Q1-Q4). Student performance can be identified through parent/teacher observations, student work samples, or formal interactions between student and educator (e.g., classroom teacher, ESL teacher, SPED teacher, or paraprofessional).

---

**Example Tracking Sheet**

**Using the Tracking Sheet for Diagnostics & Instruction**
Reviewing the Initial Data

• What do the second language acquisition charts suggest about:

  – Communication skills?
  
  – Academic Skills?

What can you do if there are exclusionary factors at this point?

Platform

1:

- ESL Pre-Referral
- Info on Language and Culture
- Second Language Acquisition (e.g., BICS/CALP)
- Developmental & Medical History
  ✔ Academic History (L1/L2)
  ✔ Parent Observations

  ✔ Comparisons to siblings & Peers
  ✔ Teacher observations
  ☑ ESL Testing **
  ✔ Communication (L1/L2)
  ☑ Academic Information (e.g., work samples, criterion-referenced data, standardized data, etc.)
ESL Testing

• What are you using?
  – WMLS, LAS, IPT, BVAT, ORELPA? A combination?

• Do you know what the test results suggest? Do you know the strengths and weaknesses of the test you are using?

WMLS Review

• What data does the test provide?

• What are some cautions with interpreting bilingual tests?

• How does second language acquisition impact our interpretation?
Interpreting RPIs

Relative Proficiency Indexes (RPIs): The RPI allows statements to be generated about a subject’s expected level of proficiency on tasks similar to the ones tested. For the RPI, the constant term is the denominator. The subject’s proficiency level is used as the numerator and the average proficiency (90) of the comparison group is used in the denominator of the RPI.
• **Examples:** 56, 90, 98  Proficiency of Subject
90 90 90  Proficiency of Comparison Group

• An RPI of 90/90 means that the subject would be predicted to demonstrate 90% proficiency with similar tasks that average individuals in the comparison group (age/grade) would also perform with 90% proficiency. Example: An oral language RPI of 56/90 (age) is interpreted to mean that when others at the subject’s age show 90% proficiency on a variety of oral language tasks, the subject is predicted to show 56% proficiency on the same tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPI</th>
<th>CALP Stage/Level</th>
<th>Approximate Time of Acquisition within English School</th>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Developmental Level</th>
<th>Functional Level</th>
<th>Age-Grade Level Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90/90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 Years – 5 Years</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-85/90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 Years – 5 Years</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Age Appropriate</td>
<td>WNL</td>
<td>Manageable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50/75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 Year – 3 Years</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Mildly Delayed</td>
<td>Mildly Impaired</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-25/40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 months – 1 Year</td>
<td>Very Limited</td>
<td>Moderately Delayed</td>
<td>Moderately Impaired</td>
<td>Extremely Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-35/35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 – 6 months</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Extremely Delayed</td>
<td>Severely Impaired</td>
<td>Impossible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Herbert, M. & Syal, S. (2005)
Academic Assessment

- Using norm-referenced assessment data.
  - What tools are being used?
  - What will we already know about the data for an ELL student?

- What are some ways to account for second language acquisition characteristics?
Another Strategy

- Do any of your academic tests provide RPI information?
  - WJ-III, WMLS, BVAT
### STUDENT PERFORMANCE SUMMARY: WJ-III ACHIEVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACHIEVEMENT CLUSTER</th>
<th>RPI</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>LOW Functional Limitation (&lt;70)</th>
<th>LOW-AVERAGE Weakness (50-80)</th>
<th>AVERAGE (90-110)</th>
<th>HIGH-AVERAGE Strength (111+)</th>
<th>CALP</th>
<th>+ 1.5 SD ± 1.5 SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Expression</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Comp.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Reading</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0-46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Fluency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoneme/Grapheme Know. (13-20)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Calculation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>-1-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Reasoning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>-1-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Fluency</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Expression</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Expression (Use BVI Cluster)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Writing Skills</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Fluency</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Knowledge</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Skills</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Applications</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Where should the student be performing according to typical second language acquisition (with proper instructional support) and compare that to where they are functioning.**

Adapted from Herbert, M. & Syal, S. (2005)
Platform 2:

- **RTI**

  - Analysis of how student responds to different levels of educational support and intervention over time using a research-based methodology with continuous monitoring techniques.

  - Can these be RtI-based Instructional Methods?
    - Differentiated Instruction
    - Sheltered Instruction
    - Guided Language Acquisition Design
    - Dynamic Assessment
    - SPED Program**
The Overall RtI System

Enter a School-Wide Systems for Student Success

**Academic Systems**

- **Intensive, Individual Interventions**
  - Individual Students
  - Assessment-based
  - High Intensity
  - Of longer duration

- **Targeted Group Interventions**
  - Some students (at-risk)
  - High efficiency
  - Rapid response

- **Universal Interventions**
  - All students
  - Preventive, proactive

**Behavioral Systems**

- **Intensive, Individual Interventions**
  - Individual Students
  - Assessment-based
  - Intense, durable procedures

- **Targeted Group Interventions**
  - Some students (at-risk)
  - High efficiency
  - Rapid response

- **Universal Interventions**
  - All settings, all students
  - Preventive, proactive

---

How Does it Fit Together? Group-Level Diagnostic Std. Treatment Protocol

**Step 1**
All Students at a grade level

**Step 2**
Addl. Diagnostic Assessment

**Step 3**
Instruction

**Step 4**
Results Monitoring

- Universal Screening
- Fall
- Winter
- Spring
- Intensive
- Supplemental
- Core
- Group Diagnostic
- Individual Diagnostic
- Individualized Intensive
- Small Group Differentiated by Skill
- Grades Classroom Assessments Yearly ITBS/ITED

---
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For RtI to Be Effective We Must

- Use an instructionally relevant and efficient resource deployment system
- Use scientifically research-based practice to extent available
- Match instruction to individual student needs
- Make sure the instruction is sufficiently explicit and sufficiently intense
- Monitor implementation fidelity
- Monitor student response and change instruction as necessary

Quote

- We have witnessed over the last 30 years numerous attempts at planned educational change. The benefits have not nearly equaled the costs, and all too often, the situation has seemed to worsen. We have, however, gained clearer and clearer insights over this period about the do’s and don’ts of bringing about change….One of the most promising features of this new knowledge about change is that successful examples of innovation are based on what might be most accurately labeled “organized common sense.” (Fullan, 1991, p. xi-xii)

Response to Intervention & Dynamic Assessment

RtI and Dynamic Assessment are evaluation processes that are fluid in nature and change with a student’s development and learning -

This is very different from using a static model of evaluation that primarily identifies knowledge previously learned.
Demystifying RTI and Dynamic Assessment

• Who works with children on a regular basis (e.g., classroom, resource, intervention & treatment)?

• After working with the student, how do you know what the next lesson will look like?

• Do you administer a standardized test after each session?

• What is intervention and student support? **Ongoing Assessment!!**

• RTI and DA is intended to identify how a student learns, retains, & transfers information.

• The process can assist in identifying typical and atypical learning patterns.

The Fundamentals of “Intervention” can Assist with Assessment

• RtI-based methodology uses a cognitivist view of learning vs. a task completion approach - Think in terms of the “Zone of Proximal Development” (Vygotsky, 1978)

• The ZPD focus occurs within a contextualized learning experience and reflects the distance between independent problem solving and the level of potential development demonstrated by assisted performance.
Intervention is Ongoing Assessment: How the Teaching Phase is Structured is Critical

- Test – Teach – Retest: The lessons during the “teach” phase should include these main components:
  - Intentionality
  - Meaning
  - Transcendence
  - Planning & Competence
  - Transfer
## Important Component of RtI

- Critical to be able to **scaffold** and **task analyze** teaching concept into hierarchical discrete points in order help student if they are struggling.

- **Remember**: Transfer of knowledge from pre to post-test provides only 1 dimension of information. The multidimensional utility of RtI is to identify how a student learns information, retains it, and transfers it.

## Can we Use RtI Methods Outside of the Context of Learning Disabilities?

- In what areas?

- What tools or methods could be used other than DIBLES (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills)?
Identifying Non-Responsiveness

McMaster, Fuchs, Fuchs, and Compton suggested: Developing valid methods of identifying non-responders is a recognized goal of early reading intervention research. One alternative to the performance-level-only and growth-rate only methods is a “dual-discrepancy” approach.

This is where a student must be discrepant from their peers in both performance level and growth rate to be considered unresponsive (2002).

Curriculum-Based Dynamic Assessment

A Response to Intervention Model that can Help Identify Learning Patterns between Traditional and Non-Traditional Learners
Activity 3

• Characteristics of a Traditional Learner vs
• Characteristics of a Non-Traditional Learner

• What characteristics would suggest that a non-traditional learner may have learning patterns consistent with a type of language-learning disability?

• Traditional Learning Curve

![Traditional Learning Curve Diagram]
• Non-Traditional Learning Curve

- Learning Curve for Student with Special Needs
Principles of Dynamic Assessment

- A shift from static to fluid measures of ability.
- The assessor actively works to facilitate learning and induce active participation in the learner.
- Focus on process of learning rather than completing a specific product: Metacognitive & metalinguistic skills
- Produces info on modifiability & the means by which change is best accomplished.

Documenting Change During a Teaching Experience

- Review DA protocol and scoring criteria to located in packet

- Flexibility in using the protocol for data collection (General Education, ESL Teachers, SPED Teachers, SLPs).
### Dynamic Assessment Scoring Sheet

#### Learning Strategy Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Criteria (Cycle One)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student exhibits an</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orienting response and focus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to task-relevant stimuli</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task-Specific Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student performs features</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the target task (e.g.,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answering questions,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>describing, sequencing, use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparative relationships,</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summarizing, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student verbalizes or uses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systematic strategy to task</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Regulation / Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student waits for</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction, seeks help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when needed, corrects self or</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reverts self</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student shows enthusiasm for</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>task &amp; persists in the</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face of frustration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction with Adults</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks help when needed &amp;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change responses according to</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adult cues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Learning Strategy Score:** (Use score for Analysis on Reverse Side)

#### Modifiability Scale

| Modifiability Scale (Note: overall performance after each teaching session) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Examiner Effort | Extreme (1) | High - Moderate (2) | Moderate-Slight (3) | Slight-None (4) |
| Student Responsiveness | None (1) | Slight (2) | Moderate (3) | High (4) |
| Transfer | None (1) | Low (2) | Moderate (3) | High (4) |

**Total Modifiability Score:** (Use Score for Analysis on Reverse Side)

### Dynamic Assessment Scoring Criteria

#### Learning Strategies Checklist

**Attention:** The student exhibits an orienting response and focus to task-relevant stimuli (i.e., ignoring irrelevant stimuli), throughout length of task. Student who is distractible may need greater repetition of instruction and may require more mediation to learn.

1. 5. Orienting response and on-task behavior without prompts.
2. 4. Attentional prompts needed only at the beginning of mediation session.
3. 3. Prompting / repetition needed less than 50% of the time.
4. 2. Prompting / repetition needed more than 50% of the time.
5. 1. High distractibility and minimal attention.

**Task-Specific Performance:** Teaching strategies are used to help a student develop metacognitive and metalinguistic skills related to a task. The examiner may engage the student with concepts pertaining to who, what, when, where, and why related questions. In addition, the examiner should introduce “what if” questions to facilitate thinking about alternative strategies and answers. Students may also discuss with the examiner the relative benefits of alternative scenarios or strategies. This type of teaching encourages independent, hypothetical thinking and learning.

1. 5. Use of targeted features with minimal difficulty and prompting.
2. 4. Use of targeted features between 50-90% of the time with prompting or use of responses that are close to the target but still inaccurate.
3. 3. Use of inaccurate responses between 25-50% of the time with prompting.
4. 2. Use of guesses or irrelevant responses.
5. 1. No response.

**Planning:** The student verbalizes or uses a systematic strategy to engage or complete targeted task.

1. 5. Use or verbalization of systematic strategy to task with minimal difficulty or prompting.
2. 4. Use or verbalization of systematic strategy to task between 50-90% of the time with prompting.
3. 3. Use or verbalization of systematic strategy to task between 25-50% of the time with prompting.
4. 2. Use or verbalization of systematic strategy to task less than 25% of the time with prompting.
5. 1. No systematic strategy used for task.

**Self-Regulation:** The student demonstrates self-awareness and self-regulation skills. For example, the student waits for instructions, asks for assistance when task becomes difficult, responds to instruction with minimal...
### Dynamic Assessment Scoring Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name: Learner’s Name:</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria (Cycle One)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Strategy Checklist</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scoring Criteria (Cycle One)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student Needs Verbal &amp; Touch Cue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student exhibits an orienting response and focuses to task/relevant stimuli</td>
<td>1 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task-Specific Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student performs features of the target task (e.g., answering questions, describing, sequencing, use comparative relationships, summarizing, etc.)</td>
<td>1 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student verbalizes or uses systematic strategy to task</td>
<td>1 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Regulation/Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student waits for instruction, seeks help when needed, corrects self, or revises self</td>
<td>1 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student shows enthusiasm for task &amp; persists in the face of frustration</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction with Adults</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeks help when needed &amp; changes response according to adult cues</td>
<td>1 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Learning Strategy Score:** 14  
(Use score for Analysis on Reverse Side)

### Differentiation Criteria

#### Learning Strategies Checklist:

- **6 Points**: Profound Learning Challenges
- **7-12 Points**: Severe Learning Challenges
- **13-18 Points**: Moderate Learning Challenges
- **19-24 Points**: Mild Learning Challenges
- **25-30 Points**: Typical Learning Characteristics (i.e., Learn, Retain, & Transfer Information)

#### Modifiability Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Points</th>
<th>7-5 Points</th>
<th>10-12 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Learning Patterns - Atypical &amp; Severe</td>
<td>Observed Learning Patterns - Atypical &amp; Mild</td>
<td>Observed Learning Patterns - Typical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** To maximize the validity of the Dynamic Assessment results, the teaching lessons need to be within the student’s “zone of proximal development” (i.e., within their developmental range). If a targeted lesson is too easy or challenging, the results of the Dynamic Assessment can be compromised.

**Adapted from:**


Utility of Protocol

• Using this protocol as part of an evaluation and/or use in progress monitoring

• The use by different disciplines

Confused on Where to Start?

• The baseline data is already collected - Go back to the pre-referral data:

Examples - Second Language acquisition checklists & OR ELD Standards
Challenges Associated with DA

- Fear & Disequilibrium

- Time (*How much time do you spend giving a standardized test - individually.*)

- Non-Standardized Method

- Qualitative in Nature (i.e., reliability and validity concerns)
Conditioned Behavior

• Our fear and resistance to using DA as a reliable and valid SPED evaluation methodology is also due to our current practice of being professionally suppressed by a “conditioned belief system” and forced to rely on norm-referenced standardized tools for decision making.

• When was the last time you challenged a professional or colleague on their student data at an IEP meeting?

• Valid and reliable assessment data is based upon both quantitative and qualitative measurement.

The Benefits of a Dynamic Assessment Approach

• Can assist in the evaluation process of an ELL student being considered for SPED (language, reading, math, writing, social skills, etc. – It can be adapted to any target concept) and can be used at any RtI Intervention Level.

• Ability to identify and support a student within their “Zone of Proximal Development” and stage of second language acquisition.

• Ability to identify potential IEP goals & objectives

• Ability to track student progress

• Ability to identify student accommodations & modifications
DA Process: Test – Teach - Retest

- Pre-test (i.e., Baseline)
  - Identify skill area deficits (this can be obtained from many sources)

- Teach

- Post-Test (outcome scores only provide 1 dimension of information)

- See Pages in Packet

What the Research States

- Specificity rate of 95.3% of classification of traditional learner (good – Plante & Vance, 1994)
- Sensitivity rate of 77.8% of classification of low language ability (fair – Plante & Vance, 1994)
- Reliability was noted at .82 and higher
- Gains were not due to the “practice effect” but due to the MLE treatment
- Traditional learners made significant gains during the short MLE

~ Pena, Iglesias, Lidz (2001)
We’re Not Splitting the Atom

- REMEMBER: Intervention is ongoing assessment (Dr. Rhea Paul)

- Don’t be handicapped by fancy terms

- Most of US DO THIS EVERYDAY - the “trick” is in the thoughtful and planful execution of intervention by using research-based teaching methods and the use of reliable and consistent progress monitoring tools.

ELL/SPED Evaluation-Eligibility Paradigm

Culture & Language

Red Flag

Matrix

Culture & Language

Response to Intervention
- Differentiated Instruction
- Dynamic Assessment

Cross-Platform Correlation

~ Bezdor, 2002
Nondiscriminatory Assessment and Standardized Testing

“Probably no test can be created that will entirely eliminate the influence of learning and cultural experiences. The test content and materials, the language in which the questions are phrased, the test directions, the categories for classifying the responses, the scoring criteria, and the validity criteria are all culture bound.”

Jerome M. Sattler, 1992

Platform 3:

- Use tools that are sensitive to culture and linguistic demands and/or adapt administration procedures (e.g., Testing the Limits)

- Non-Verbal Tests: Just because oral language is removed, this doesn’t remove language mediation or issues of acculturation – Need to interpret carefully due to not providing full depiction of cognitive constructs.

- Do not make eligibility decisions solely based upon full-scale scores that are significantly weighted on “static” background knowledge
So Now What?

- How to determine where to start?
  - The Ochoa & Ortiz Multidimensional Assessment Model for Bilingual Individuals

This can serve as a GUIDE.
**Cultural Language Interpretive Matrix (C-LIM)**

- Using the CHC Cross-Battery foundation, Ortiz and Flanagan developed classification systems to describe the impact that culture and language weighed on the assessment results of certain tests.

---

**Cattell-Horn-Carroll theory of Cognitive Abilities** or CHC theoretical Approach

- The appeal of the CHC Cross-Battery Approach lies in the fact that:
  - It is based on the most validated and established contemporary theory of cognitive abilities within the psychometric tradition
  - It provides a defensible interpretive method for identifying cognitive processing strengths and weaknesses (important in LD evaluations)
  - It guards against the major sources of invalidity in assessment and interpretation
  - It is psychometrically sound
  - It allows for flexibility in designing assessment batteries to meet the unique needs of the individual
  - It is systematic in its approach and specifies methods for evaluating the cognitive capabilities of all individuals, including those from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds

Cultural and Linguistic Classification of Tests
Addressing Validity in Diagnosis and Interpretation

DEGREE OF LINGUISTIC DEMAND
LOW  MODERATE  HIGH

DEGREE OF CULTURAL LOADING
LOW  MODERATE  HIGH

CHC BROAD/NARROW
ABILITY CLASSIFICATIONS
Cultural and Linguistic Classification of Tests
Addressing Validity in Diagnosis and Interpretation

Defining Cultural Loading

- Requires the individual being assessed to have specific knowledge of, or experience with, mainstream US culture. Classifications were determined by:
  
  – Whether there was an emphasis on a particular thought or conceptual process.
  – The nature of the expected response.
  – And the amount of verbal and non-verbal communication between the examinee and examiner
Defining Linguistic Demand

- Refers to the amount of linguistic facility required by a given test and based on 3 factors:
  - Verbal vs nonverbal language requirements on the part of the examiner.
  - Receptive language requirements on the part of the examinee.
  - Expressive language requirements on the part of the examinee.

Culture-Language Test Classifications (C-LTC): WISC-IV

Note: Some of the ability and culture-language classifications listed in this packet are preliminary, based primarily on expert consensus procedures and judgment, and thus subject to change in accordance with future research findings. They are not intended for diagnostic purposes but rather to guide decisions regarding the relative influence of acculturation and English-language proficiency on test results.
Selecting a Test

• By knowing how much cultural loading and linguistic demand is inherent within certain tests (and their subtests), you can better choose a test that is less culturally and linguistically influenced -

**leading to more valid results.**

What are Expected Patterns for Typical ELL Students

• Looking at the C-LIM, the student’s scores should decrease in regressive manner as linguistic demand increases and cultural loading increases.

• When this pattern for diverse learners is not found, then it can be said that the primary influence may be due to variable other than cultural and linguistic factors.
### Culture-Language Interpretive Matrix (C-LIM): Case Study Example

**WISC-III & LEITER-R BASED CROSS-BATTERY DATA FOR ELIZABETH (ENGLISH)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of Cultural Loading</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degree of Linguistic Demand</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WISC-III Design Analogies GP 122</td>
<td>Leiter-R Design Analogs GP 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leiter-R Reversal Patterns GP 114</td>
<td>Leiter-R Reversal Patterns GP 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>WISC-III Block Design Gv 105</td>
<td>WISC-III Block Design Gv 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WISC-III Symbol Search Gv 100</td>
<td>WISC-III Symbol Search Gv 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WISC-III Coding Gv 705</td>
<td>WISC-III Coding Gv 705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WISC-III Digit Span Gs 85</td>
<td>WISC-III Digit Span Gs 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>WISC-III Object Assembly Gs 115</td>
<td>WISC-III Object Assembly Gs 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WISC-III Mazes Gs 95</td>
<td>WISC-III Mazes Gs 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WISC-III Arithmetic Gp 95</td>
<td>WISC-III Arithmetic Gp 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x = 118</td>
<td>x = 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Leiter-R Associated Pairs Gv 94</td>
<td>Leiter-R Associated Pairs Gv 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leiter-R Delayed Pairs Gv 99</td>
<td>Leiter-R Delayed Pairs Gv 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x = 105</td>
<td>x = 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>WISC-III Similarities Gv 89</td>
<td>WISC-III Similarities Gv 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WISC-III Vocabulary Gs 70</td>
<td>WISC-III Vocabulary Gs 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WISC-III Information Gs 70</td>
<td>WISC-III Information Gs 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WISC-III Comprehension Gs 45</td>
<td>WISC-III Comprehension Gs 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x = 95</td>
<td>x = 76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What’s Up with That?

- Averaging standard scores within the cells?

- **From Ortiz:** It is only to depict a numerical representation of overall performance on tests that share similar levels of cultural loading and linguistic demand.
**What Would Atypical Look Like?**

- “When examination of the data reveals patterns that are not consistent with those expected or predicted for diverse individuals, it is reasonable to assume that other factors, including the possibility of a disability, are playing a primary role in affecting test performance.”

Culture-Language Interpretive Matrix (C-LIM):
Case Study Example
WJ III DATA FOR MIGUEL (ENGLISH)

Making it Easy with the C-LIM Computer Program

- Find your test and plug in your scores.
- The C-LIM will automatically convert your scaled scores into standard scores.
The Descending Profile Range Reflects an ELL Students Profile & Degree of Cultural and Linguistic Impact
**Is there More?**

- Now that we’ve concluded that the student’s scores are atypical, even after we account for cultural loading and linguistic demand - now what?

- You can now use the CHC Cross-Battery approach of data interpretation to identify the student’s strengths and weaknesses. **Note:** Make sure you have enough cognitive abilities represented in your data set for proper analysis.
Depending on your district's eligibility criteria using PSW data, the C-LIM tool and analysis approach can provide the evaluator and team a mechanism to determine if your information is valid or being influenced by linguistic demand or cultural loading.
The CELF-4 and CASL are included in the C-LIM (represented in cells M/H and H/H)

### General Guidelines for Expected Patterns of Test Performance for Diverse Individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Cultural Loading</th>
<th>Degree of Linguistic Demand</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 1-2 point</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 3-4 points</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 5-7 point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different: 2-4 point</td>
<td>Different: 4-7 points</td>
<td>Different: 7-10 point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markedly Different: 5-7 point</td>
<td>Markedly Different: 7-10 points</td>
<td>Markedly Different: 10-15 point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 3-4 point</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 5-7 points</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 8-10 point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different: 4-7 point</td>
<td>Different: 7-10 points</td>
<td>Different: 10-14 point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markedly Different: 7-10 points</td>
<td>Markedly Different: 10-15 points</td>
<td>Markedly Different: 15-25 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 5-7 point</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 8-10 points</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 11-13 point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different: 7-10 point</td>
<td>Different: 10-14 points</td>
<td>Different: 15-20 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markedly Different: 10-15 points</td>
<td>Markedly Different: 15-25 points</td>
<td>Markedly Different: 25-35 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Slightly Different** includes individuals with high levels of English language proficiency (e.g., advanced BICS/emerging CALP) and high acculturation, but still accessible to mainstream U.S. English speakers. Examples include individuals who have resided in the U.S. for more than 7 years or who have parents with at least a high school education, and who demonstrate native-like proficiency in English language conversation and solid literacy skills.

**Different** includes individuals with moderate levels of English language proficiency (e.g., intermediate to advanced BICS) and moderate levels of acculturation. Examples include individuals who have resided in the U.S. for 3-7 years and who have learned English well enough to communicate, but whose parents are limited English speakers with only some formal schooling, and improving but below grade level literacy skills.

**Markedly Different** includes individuals with low to very low levels of English language proficiency (e.g., early BICS) and low or very low levels of acculturation. Examples include individuals who recently arrived in the U.S. or who may have been in the U.S. 3 years or less, with little or no prior formal education, who are just beginning to develop conversational abilities and whose literacy skills are also just emerging.
The Use of Standardized Tests

• Many times not appropriate to use in standardized manner (if language & culture are not fairly represented) - Need to review tool

• May use in a criterion manner (e.g., compared to second language acquisition expectations)

• Compare raw and standard scores over time

• Use confidence bands (e.g., ELL students can score on average 10-15 pts. lower).

• Use subtests to probe for additional information

• Use as baseline data for “response to intervention” model

CHC Cross-Battery Resources

BOOKS:


ONLINE:

CHC Cross-Battery Online
http://www.crossbattery.com/

The Institute for Applied Psychometrics
http://www.iapsych.com/
Determining Need for 
SPED Services

• SPED is not designed to be a remedial 
program to teach children English or to 
help students who are behind.

• Eligibility is determined by 3 criteria:
  – Does the child qualify as having an 
educational handicap determined by 
appropriate evaluations?
  – Is there an educational impact?
  – Does the student require “specially 
designed instruction”?

Evaluation Review & Eligibility

• See Evaluation Checklist in packet

• Use Cross-Platform Correlation Paradigm to 
corroborate data. If there are inconsistencies in 
the data, the team should review data to 
determine reason

• Use Data Analysis Rubric: Identify a 
preponderance of atypical developmental and/or 
learning patterns that can not be attributed to 
second language acquisition or culture.
Data Analysis Rubric: Red Flag Matrix

- A tool that allows the examiner(s) to synthesize evaluation data in comparison to 2nd language acquisition.

- A qualitative tool that will reflect atypical developmental & learning patterns that are inconsistent with 2nd language skill development.

- Helps to identify discrepancy patterns related to handicapping conditions.
### Red Flag Matrix - Platform II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Indices</th>
<th>Analysis Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum-Based Measurement</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOP</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Instruction</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Assessment</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Red Flag Matrix - Platform III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Indices</th>
<th>Analysis Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Intellectual Assessment</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td>Note Name of Tool:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine degree of cultural and linguistic loading</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td>Note Name of Tool:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Verbal Intellectual Assessment</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td>Note Name of Tool:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine degree of cultural and linguistic loading</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td>Note Name of Tool:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Layered Assessment</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td>Describe Methods Used:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine degree of cultural and linguistic loading</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td>Describe Methods Used:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due of Testing the Limits</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Skills - Home</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Skills - School</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N TC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Working with an Interpreter
(Cultural Broker)

- **Additional Information in packet**

- Interpretation vs. Translation

- Having a quality interpretation experience can have a tremendous impact on service:
  - Communication with parents
  - Accuracy of diagnostic results
  - Quality of service

---

Eligibility Decision Making Process

1. Does the data reflect atypical patterns inconsistent with second language acquisition development? (Yes/No) **Yes**
   - If yes, go to question 2.
   - If no, identify teaching strategies that will support the student in the classroom to assist with the acquisition of the English language (i.e., BICS/CALP development). The data from the Red Flag Matrix can be used as baseline data for future evaluations.

2. If there are atypical patterns, are there certain domains that are more pronounced in regards to noted concerns? (Yes/No) **Yes**

3. For those domains that reflect atypical patterns, identify the domains that are characteristic of a specific educational handicap (e.g., Communication Disorder, Specific Learning Disability, etc.)

4. Using the ELL/SPED Eligibility Paradigm, does the data reflect atypical developmental and/or learning patterns that are significantly discrepant from the typical stages of second language development or skills within the student’s primary language? (Yes/No) **Yes**

**Analysis Code Key:**

N = No Concern - Student Performing Typically in Relation to L1 or L2 Development
T = Typical - Academic or Social Struggles but Typical in Relation to Second Language Acquisition
C = Concern - Academic or Social Struggles that are Unrelated to Cultural and Linguistic Differences
Role of Team Members

- Use “BID” Process (Briefing, Interaction, Debriefing)
  - **Briefing**: Purpose, format, critical pieces of info, critical questions, type of interpretation
  - **Interaction**: Appropriate seating, define roles, address parent directly, interpreter transmits all that is said, language used is understood by all, no side conversations, attention paid to verbal/nonverbal interaction
  - **Debriefing**: Identify pros/cons and follow-up

Time & Energy and Interpreters

- Logistical challenges for lower incident languages and cultures
- Time of meetings will at least double and be very exhausting – Try not to do back-to-back meetings
- School teams should be briefed on roles and responsibilities pertaining to using interpreters each year to reduce misunderstandings
Report Writing

• Include information pertaining to culture, primary language and second language acquisition.

• Standardized Tests: a disclaimer needs to be noted of how culture and language may have impacted test results.

• Use qualitative information to describe quantitative results.

• Report confidence bands with standard scores.

• Report all student data that will reflect typical vs. atypical patterns.

Time Involved for a Culturally Appropriate Evaluation

• Use your time efficiently.
• Choose tools that will answer the essential questions
• Look for atypical patterns of development or learning
• Literature reflects it takes 2-3 times longer than a traditional monolingual evaluation
• After training & experience, the additional time should not be in the data collection – it will be in the analysis and logistics of working with culturally and linguistically diverse populations.
“My expertise has always been my ignorance, my admission and acceptance of not knowing. My work comes from questions, not from answers… By giving yourself permission not to know, you can overcome the fear that your ignorance will be discovered. The inquisitiveness essential to learning thrives on transcending this fear.”

~ Richard Saul Wurman, 1989

Questions / Comments
The Evaluation and Eligibility Paradigm
The special education (SPED) evaluation-eligibility paradigm uses a cross-platform descriptive correlation approach that requires the corroborations of data to assist in identifying atypical patterns in development and/or learning unrelated to second language acquisition or culture. This approach will improve the reliability and validity of the evaluation process and help reduce the under and over identification of English language learners (ELLs) being considered for SPED services.

~ Bender, 2002
## Student Study Team Information

(All Team Members can Contribute to the Collection of Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date Initiated:</th>
<th>Date Completed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESL pre-referral packet initiated (i.e. school history, teacher concerns, ESL test data, interventions, parent concerns).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Persons Responsible: General education teacher, ESL Teacher, and/or educators who know student best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain information pertaining to the student’s primary language and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Information can be obtained from a variety of resources (i.e., see attached resource list)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule an interpreter if needed (Note: Utilize best practice procedures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ See information attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain developmental &amp; medical history (i.e., birth history, ear infections, communication skills, crawling/walking, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Obtain parent’s observations pertaining to student’s communication skills in primary language and comparisons to siblings and/or peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ This can be obtained from parent interview, intake records, or the student’s cumulative file.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain academic history of student in primary or secondary language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain classroom teacher &amp; ESL teacher’s observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain data on student’s BICS acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ This can be obtained using the BICS/CALP observational checklist, second language acquisition chart, a conversational sample and observations, or other testing tools designed to reflect BICS skill development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain data on student’s CALP acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This can be obtained using the BICS/CALP observational checklist,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second language acquisition chart, student work samples, or other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>testing tools designed to reflect CALP skill development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL testing data (e.g., ORELPA, IPT, LAS, BVAT, Woodcock-Munoz, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Note: Language proficiency data needs to be interpreted in a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guarded fashion and according to the parameters outlined within the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tools examiner’s manual.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current academic performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Note: Data should be interpreted in terms of second language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquisition expectations and can also be used as baseline data when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using a curriculum-based assessment methodology. If available,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic data in L1 should also be collected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Intervention Data (if available)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continuous monitoring data to assess the student’s ability to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learn, retain, and transfer new information within the context of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the second language acquisition continuum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Data Collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- List other data collected:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Study Team Recommendations**

Note: The Student Study Team should ask the following questions to help determine the next course of action:

1. Does the student data reflect atypical characteristics pertaining to development and/or learning: Yes or No? *(If “Yes”, go to number 2)*
   - If “NO”, the student study team should make recommendations to the teacher and/or parent that will better provide support systems (e.g., appropriate teaching strategies, accommodations, modifications, etc) to the student, teacher, or parent that relates to the initial concerns reflected within the referral.

   Date Completed: ________________________________

2. If “Yes”, are the noted areas of concern related to typical second language acquisition and/or acculturation characteristics?
   - If “Yes”, then the student is most likely struggling with academics or development due to the complexities of learning a second language and acculturating. This is most likely not due to an underlying learning or language disability. The student should continue to receive building level resources with instruction being differentiated with the student’s comprehensible input level and their stage of second language acquisition.
   - If “No”, then the areas of concern are not consistent characteristics of second language acquisition and/or acculturation and further data collection and analysis may be appropriate to rule out eligibility for special education services. *(If “NO”, go to number 3)*

3. Make referral to special education evaluation team, or appropriate agency, for a review of the student study team data and recommendations for further evaluation.

   Referred To: ____________________________________

   Date Submitted: ________________________________
Special Education Evaluation

Note: All of the data collected prior to the evaluation planning meeting should be incorporated into the analysis of data obtained during a special education evaluation. The information collected specific to second language acquisition, acculturation, and response to intervention can assist in recommendations related to many of the handicapping conditions (e.g., Communication Disorders, Specific Learning Disabilities, Autism, Mental Retardation, etc.).

Assessment Data that May be Considered Depending on the Areas of Concern:

- **Observational & Developmental Information:** Analysis should take into account second language acquisition and acculturation characteristics.

  - Example Strategies for Data Collection
    - Classroom and/or student observations
    - Parent Interview
    - Developmental checklists
    - Language sample

- **Standardized/Norm-Referenced Assessment Data**
  - To be interpreted in a guarded manner and recognizing that scores are influenced by different degrees cultural and linguistic impact.

  - Possible Areas of Assessment
    - Receptive Language Skills
    - Expressive Language Skills
    - Comprehensive Language Skills
    - Reading Skills
    - Math Skills
    - Writing Skills
    - Other ______________
    - Other ______________

- **Criterion-Referenced Assessment Data**
  - To be interpreted in a guarded manner and aligned with the stages of second language acquisition

  - Possible Areas of Assessment
    - Receptive Language Skills
    - Expressive Language Skills
    - Comprehensive Language Skills
    - Language Sample
    - Reading Skills
    - Math Skills
    - Writing Skills
    - Other ______________
    - Other ______________

- **Tier 3 Response to Intervention Data and/or Dynamic Assessment Data**
  - Continuous monitoring data to assess the student’s ability to learn, retain, and transfer new information within the context of the second language acquisition continuum.

  - Possible Areas of Assessment
    - Receptive Language Skills
    - Expressive Language Skills
    - Comprehensive Language Skills
    - Reading Skills
    - Math Skills
    - Writing Skills
    - Other ______________
    - Other ______________
### Assessment Data that May be Considered ~ Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity to Learn (i.e., when appropriate, assessment of intellectual capacity using non-biased instruments and methods that are sensitive to linguistic and cultural factors)</th>
<th>Possible Areas for Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Non-Verbal Tests (e.g., UNIT)</td>
<td>▫ Specific Learning Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Cross-Battery and/or PSW Approach</td>
<td>▫ Mental Retardation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Ortiz Cultural Language Interpretive Matrix</td>
<td>▫ Autism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▫ Specific Language Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▫ Other____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▫ Other____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▫ Other____________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptive skills - if Needed</th>
<th>Date Completed (Home):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Note: Translated or interpreted versions for both Home and School</td>
<td>Date Completed (School):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Neuropsychological Evaluation – If Needed | Date Completed: |
| Consultation from Autism Specialist – If Needed | Date Completed: |

| Gross and/or Fine Motor Information – If Needed | Date Completed (PT): |
| | Date Completed (OT): |

| Adaptive PE Information – If Needed | Date Completed: |

### Evaluation Team Summary

- **ELL/SPED Evaluation Rubric** (Create a checklist that synthesizes evaluation data related to typical versus atypical developmental and/or leaning patterns in relation to second language acquisition)
  - Teams may use the Red Flag Matrix that is provided. This tool can assist in synthesizing evaluation information and identifying if the data reflects a preponderance of atypical learning and/or developmental patterns unrelated to second language acquisition or acculturation.

- **Utilize translated documents for parents** (i.e., parent rights book & due process paperwork – Many SEAs have these available in multiple languages (e.g., Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Russian))
Evaluation Data to Consider for an ELL Student Being Evaluated for Special Education Services

1. **ESL Pre-Referral Packet**: This document is essential. Without this, a referral for a special education evaluation is premature. The individuals responsible for completing this document may include the ESL teacher, the classroom teacher, or representatives from the BSC. Vital information from this document would include:
   - Home language
   - Academic Hx & years in an English speaking school setting
   - Attendance stability
   - Teacher concerns
   - Strategies employed to address noted concerns (also note duration and success rate)
   - ESL testing data
   - Parent report

2. **Information on Cultural & Linguistic Characteristics of Student’s Home Language and Community**: This section is critical and a step that needs to occur very early in the evaluation process. This step is essential because the rest of our data will need to be interpreted through this lens. Characteristics that may differ from the English-speaking culture may include:
   - Dialectical speech patterns
   - Language patterns (i.e., semantic, syntax & morphology)
   - Social Discourse (i.e., social pragmatic skills)
   - Academic preparation & behavior (e.g., home engagement & communication style)
   - Family hierarchy & communication
   - Gender relations
   - Geopolitical & religious differences (Note: take note of individual’s displaced by war or coming from refugee camps)

3. **Developmental & Medical History**: This section is very critical. What needs to be recognized is that this may have to be done with an interpreter. It is recommended that one designated person conduct the interview with the interpreter and the parent. If there are multiple team members involved, the team should coordinate their questions. The interview should be taped for other team members to preview following the interview. It is also important to recognize that some questions that are asked may be considered inappropriate within a specific culture. It is important to review the interview questions with the interpreter prior to the meeting in order to identify any questions that may be sensitive. The interviewer and the interpreter can then problem-solve alternate ways to obtain information needed from any identified sensitive questions.

4. **Academic History in Primary Language**: It’s important to note if the student has received any type of schooling within their home language. If so, the acquisition of the second language may be more efficient due to skills developed in the primary language. It’s also important to note if the student has received specialized instruction in their home country.

5. **Parent Observations (Communication Skills, Comparison to Siblings/Peers)**: This descriptive data can be very compelling. However, it’s important to note that when asking parents from multicultural backgrounds general questions about their child’s abilities, they will usually indicate that the child’s fine. It’s important to ask very specific questions about the child’s skill level at home in comparison to either siblings or peers within their linguistic and cultural community. If there are concerns, the parent may make comments like:
• He seems slower than his little brother
• He always like playing with the younger kids at church
• He’s always in trouble because he doesn’t listen
• He doesn’t speak Spanish very well – He uses wrong words and makes his sounds funny

6. Classroom Teacher & ESL Teacher Observations: These observations can provide information on the student’s academic skills in comparison to other students from a similar linguistic & cultural background with similar educational experience. This data should also reflect the type of educational strategies (i.e., specific to ELL students) that have been used to support the student within the classroom setting.

7. BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) Development: These basic, context enriched, conversational skills take approximately 2 years to emerge and become established following entering a formalized English-speaking school setting. Information regarding development can be obtained using the BICS/CALP checklists, sequential second language acquisition checklists, appropriate language proficiency test data, a criterion-based student performance test related to second language acquisition skill development, and/or conversational sample observations.

8. CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) Development: These more complex, context reduced, academic skills start emerging during the 2 & 3rd year and reach the level of being commensurate with the student’s English-speaking peer group after 5 and 7 years (some research suggests that the commensurate status can take up to 10 years) of being in a formalized English-speaking school setting. Information regarding development can be obtained using the BICS/CALP checklists, sequential second language acquisition checklists, appropriate language proficiency test data, a criterion-based student performance test related to second language acquisition skill development, conversational samples and academic work samples aligned with CALP acquisition expectations.

9. ESL Testing Data: This would include test data most likely obtained from a school district’s ESL department. Instruments that are used may include the IPT-Oral, Reading, & Writing, the Woodcock-Munoz, the LAS, the BVAT, or a state mandated language proficiency test. Many of these tools are available in both English & Spanish. Each tool may yield different information. Regardless, the analysis should include interpretation pertaining to English development as outlined in the test examiner’s manual and in relation to second language acquisition development.

10. Information Pertaining to the Students Communication Skills in both L1 & L2: It is critical to determine if the student’s communication skills are compromised in both languages. These comparisons should be made across communication contexts and with the assistance of an interpreter. It’s also important recognize the characteristics of language loss & subtractive bilingualism. These skills can be assessed using a language sample, Dynamic Assessment, observations, or the use of standardized tests in a criterion-manner to help determine language patterns that are atypical in relation to that student’s linguistic and cultural community.

11. Current Academic Performance: This is an important barometer reflecting the child’s CALP acquisition as well as the academic discrepancy that may exists between the bilingual student and the average monolingual student within the classroom. It’s important to note that it may be typical for a student not to be performing at grade level but acquiring BICS and CALP at an appropriate rate according to the second language acquisition continuum.
12. **Response to Intervention**: This paradigm will allow an evaluator to measure the student’s ability to learn new information, retain that information, and transfer that information to other tasks. Data should be collected along the RtI continuum of service (Tier I – through Tier III, if needed). For RtI data to be considered, the teaching methodology needs to be research-based and coupled with a continuous monitoring mechanism. If dynamic assessment is utilized, the evaluation construct will employ a Test-Teach-Retest formula to generate both qualitative & quantitative data. It’s important to note that for this paradigm to be used, the evaluator needs to be familiar with this methodology and an appropriate documentation protocol.

13. **Capacity to Learn**: There may be times when a school team will need to address a student’s cognitive functioning level. It is the recommendation that this should be addressed in a manner consistent with federal and state statures as well as a district’s evaluation policy. The critical point here is to use instruments that are sensitive to culturally and linguistically diverse populations, and the use of “testing the limits” principles when appropriate. There should also be a cautionary approach to eligibility decisions that are solely based upon full-scale scores that are significantly weighted on “static” or background knowledge. It is recommended that data be interpreted using the Ortiz Cultural Language Interpretive Matrix in order to assist in interpreting the impact that culture and language may have on a student’s test scores. This information can be found in “Essentials of Cross-Battery Assessment (2nd Ed)”, by Wiley Publishing.

14. **ELL/SPED Evaluation Rubric**: Design or utilize a rubric that allows the examiner(s) to synthesize evaluation data in order to identify typical versus atypical developmental or learning patterns in comparison to second language acquisition development and acculturation. The utility of using this type of rubric will assist a team to review and compare all assessment data and help identify if an ELL student exhibits characteristics that are consistent with having an educational handicap.

15. **Utilize Translated Documents for Parents**: To strive for “informed consent,” with a child’s parent, school teams should utilize translated documents if they are available (i.e., parent rights book & due process paperwork). Many state education agencies have these documents available in multiple languages and usually available in Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Russian. Check with your local SEA (State Education Agency) for these resources.

16. **Additional Data**: Again, it’s important to note that the depth of the assessment will be dependant upon the complexity of the case (e.g., an evaluation for mental retardation will look very different from an evaluation for an articulation disorder). If the team needs to obtain additional data, it’s important to always interpret the information that is obtained through a “cultural lens.”

“The impetus of a successful ELL/SPED evaluation and eligibility recommendation will be predicated on the richness and variety of data collected and on the systematic analysis that will reflect patterns of delayed skill development that are atypical for a student who is learning a second language.”

~Bender, 2002
### Red Flag Matrix - Platform I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Indices</th>
<th>Analysis Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Sequential Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental History</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical History</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Report on Communication</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to Siblings</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Report on Student Behavior</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher Observations</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Teacher Observations</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to Like-Peers</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICS Acquisition</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALP Acquisition</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential Language Acquisition</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Oral Language Proficiency Test</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Reading Proficiency Test</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Writing Proficiency Test</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Profile - L1: Content,Form,Use</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Profile - L2: Content,Form,Use</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance: Reading ( L1 / L2 )</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance: Math ( L1 / L2 )</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance: Writing ( L1 / L2 )</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis Code Key**
- N = No Concern
- T = Typical
- C = Concern

See details on back page

**Years in English-Speaking School Setting:**
- 0-6 Months: Stage 1
- 6 Mon - 1 Yr: Stage 2
- 1 Year: Stage 2/3
- 2 Years: Stage 3
- 3 Years: Stage 3/4
- 4 Years: Stage 4
- 5 Years: Stage 4/5
- 6 Years: Stage 5
- 7 Years: Stage 5
- 8 Years: Stage 5
- 9 Years: Stage 5 +
- 10 Years: Stage 5 +
- 11+ Years: Stage 5 +

**Student Information:**
- Familial, Medical/Developmental, and Educational
- Reviewed Linguistic & Cultural Characteristics: Y / N
- Years in L1 School Setting:
- Years Receiving ESL/Bilingual Support:
## Target Indices Analysis Code Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Indices</th>
<th>Curriculum-Based Measurement</th>
<th>GLAD</th>
<th>SIOP</th>
<th>Differentiated Instruction</th>
<th>Dynamic Assessment</th>
<th>Accommodations</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
<th>(Other)</th>
<th>(Other)</th>
<th>(Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td>N T C</td>
<td>N T C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Intervention</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Indices</td>
<td>Analysis Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Intellectual Assessment</td>
<td>N T C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Determine degree of cultural and linguistic loading</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Verbal Intellectual Assessment</td>
<td>N T C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Determine degree of cultural and linguistic loading</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Battery Assessment</td>
<td>N T C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Determine degree of cultural and linguistic loading</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Testing the Limits</td>
<td>N T C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Skills - Home</td>
<td>N T C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Skills - School</td>
<td>N T C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other)</td>
<td>N T C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other)</td>
<td>N T C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other)</td>
<td>N T C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eligibility Decision Making Process

1. Does the data reflect atypical patterns inconsistent with second language acquisition development? (Yes/No) 

- *If yes, go to question 2.*
- *If no,* identify teaching strategies that will support the student in the classroom to assist with the acquisition of the English language (i.e., BICS/CALP development). The data from the Red Flag Matrix can be used as baseline data for future evaluations.

2. If there are atypical patterns, are there certain domains that are more pronounced in regards to noted concerns? (Yes/No) 

3. For those domains that reflect atypical patterns, identify the domains that are characteristic of a specific educational handicap (e.g., Communication Disorder, Specific Learning Disability, etc.)

4. Using the ELL/SPED Eligibility Paradigm, does the data reflect atypical developmental and/or learning patterns that are significantly discrepant from the typical stages of second language development or skills within the student’s primary language? (Yes/No)

**Analysis Code Key:**

N = No Concern - Student Performing Typically in Relation to L1 or L2 Development  
T = Typical - Academic or Social Struggles but Typical in Relation to Second Language Acquisition  
C = Concern - Academic or Social Struggles that are Unrelated to Cultural and Linguistic Differences
Dynamic Assessment

- Possible Indicators of a Language-Learning Disability
- Questions to Help Determine How a Student Processes
- Learner Profiles
- Warning Signs of a Learning Disability
- Dynamic Assessment Model Overview
- Steps in Dynamic Assessment
- Dynamic Assessment Scoring Sheet
- Dynamic Assessment Scoring Criteria
- Dynamic Assessment Teaching Phase
- Questions to Challenge Thinking
- Dynamic Assessment Observational Checklist
Possible Indicators of a Language-Learning Disability

Culturally and linguistically diverse student with language-learning disabilities demonstrate problems in both the primary language and English. These problems may be observed in the following areas:

- Difficulty in learning language at a normal rate, even with special assistance in both languages
- Deficits in vocabulary
- Short mean length of utterance
- Communication difficulties at home
- Communication difficulties when interacting with peers from a similar background
- Auditory processing problems (e.g., poor memory, poor comprehension)
- Lack of organization, structure, and sequence in spoken and written language; difficulty conveying thoughts
- Slow academic achievement despite adequate academic English proficiency
- Family history of special education/learning difficulties
- Slower development of siblings (as per parent report)
- Reliance on gestures rather than speech to communicate
- Inordinate slowness in responding to questions
- General disorganization and confusion
- Difficulty paying attention
- Need for frequent repetition and prompts during instruction
- Need for a program of instruction that is more structured than that used with most other students
- Need for a program of instruction that is more structured than that used with most other students
- Difficulties affecting grammar and sentence structure
- Difficulties in the use of precise vocabulary and overuse of words such as stuff, things, you know, etc…
- Inappropriate social use of language (e.g., interrupts frequently, digresses from topic, is insensitive to the needs or communication goals of conversational partners, cannot stay on the topic of discussion, cannot take turns in conversation)
- Poor sequencing skills. Communication is disorganized, incoherent, and leaves listener confused
- Overall communication skills that are substantially poorer than those of peers

Questions to Help Determine How a Student Processes or Learns Information

*Use a Frame of Reference in Assessing Students*

- Does the student attempt to paraphrase information when having difficulty understanding information?
- Does the student use rehearsal of the information as a method of remembering information?
- Is the student frequently unaware of errors in understanding (processing) information?
- Does the student frequently ask questions when unsure?
- Does the student try to understand information when he/she is having difficulty processing it, or does he/she give up?
- Does the student ask the teacher for help? Ask more able classmates for help? Ask a less able classmate for help? Ask a friend for help?
- Is the student confused by long, complex, and/or embedded information?
- Does the student process information at a fast rate or require frequent repetitions in order to understand the material?
- Does the student have difficulty following multi-stage instructions?
- Does the student need additional cues (visual, manipulative, auditory, etc.) to understand the information?
- Does the student show irritability towards others when having difficulty?
- Does the student show frustration when learning new information?
The Warning Signs of Learning Disabilities

Susan Bergert, December 2000
ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education
(References included with original publication)

(Below are excerpts from Ms. Bergert’s Article)

I. Warning Signs in Preschool Children: Although growth patterns vary among individuals and within individuals, uneven development or significant delays in development can suggest characteristics of a learning disability. It is important to keep in mind that the behaviors listed below must persist over time to be considered warning signs. Any child may occasionally exhibit one or two of these behaviors during the course of normal development.

Language
- Slow development in speaking words or sentences
- Pronunciation problems
- Difficulty learning new words
- Difficulty following simple directions
- Difficulty understanding questions
- Difficulty expressing wants and desires
- Difficulty rhyming words
- Lack of interest in story telling

Motor Skills
- Clumsiness
- Poor balance
- Difficulty manipulating small objects
- Awkwardness with running, jumping, or climbing
- Trouble learning to tie shoes, button shirts, or perform other self-help activities
- Avoidance of drawing or tracing

Cognition
- Trouble memorizing the alphabet or days of the week
- Poor memory for what should be routine (everyday) procedures
- Difficulty with cause and effect, sequencing, and counting
- Difficulty with basic concepts such as size, shape, color
Attention
• High distractibility
• Impulsive behavior
• Unusual restlessness (hyperactivity)
• Difficulty staying on task
• Difficulty changing activities
• Constant repetition of an idea, inability to move on to a new idea (perseveration)

Social Behavior
• Trouble interacting with others, playing alone
• Prone to sudden and extreme mood changes
• Easily frustrated
• Hard to manage, has temper tantrums

II. Warning Signs in Elementary School Children: It is during the elementary school years that learning problems frequently become apparent as disabilities interfere with increasingly demanding and complex learning tasks. Difficulties in learning academic subjects and emotional and/or social skills may become a problem. Warning signs for this age group may include any of those listed above for the preschool children in addition to the following.

Language / Mathematics
• Slow learning of the correspondence of sound to letter
• Consistent errors in reading or spelling
• Difficulty remembering basic sight words
• Inability to retell a story in sequence
• Trouble learning to tell time or count money
• Confusion of math signs ( +,-,x, /, = )
• Transposition of number sequences
• Trouble memorizing math facts
• Trouble with place value
• Difficulty remembering the steps of mathematical operations such as long division

Motor Skills
• Poor coordination, or awkwardness
• Difficulty coping from the chalkboard
• Difficulty aligning columns (math)
• Poor handwriting

Attention / Organization
• Difficulty concentrating or focusing on a task
• Difficulty finishing work on time
• Inability to follow multiple directions
• Unusual sloppiness, carelessness
• Poor concept of direction (left, right)
• Rejection of new concepts, or changes in routine
Social Behavior
• Difficulty understanding facial expressions or gestures
• Difficulty understanding social situations
• Tendency to misinterpret behavior of peers and/or adults
• Apparent lack of “common sense”

III. Warning Signs in Secondary School Children: Some learning disabilities go undetected until secondary school. Physical changes occurring during adolescence and the increased demands of middle and senior high school may bring the disabilities to light. Previously satisfactory performance declines. Inappropriate social skills may lead to changes in peer relationships and discipline problems. Increased frustration and poor self-concepts can lead to depression and/or angry outbursts. Warning signs of learning disabilities in secondary school students include the following, which again, should occur as a pattern of behaviors, to a significant degree, and over time.

Language / Mathematics / Social Studies
• Avoidance of reading and writing
• Tendency to misread information
• Difficulty summarizing
• Poor reading comprehension
• Difficulty understanding subject area textbooks
• Trouble with open-ended questions
• Continued poor spelling
• Poor grasp of abstract concepts
• Poor skills in writing essays
• Difficulty learning a foreign language
• Poor ability to apply math skills

Attention / Organization
• Difficulty staying organized
• Trouble with test formats such as multiple choice
• Slow work pace in class and in testing situations
• Poor note taking skills
• Poor ability to proofread or double check work

Social Behavior
• Difficulty accepting criticism
• Difficulty seeking or giving feedback
• Problems negotiating or advancing for oneself
• Difficulty resisting peer pressure
• Difficulty understanding another person’s perspectives
Examples of Learning Styles

**Traditional Learner:**
- Attends to task with minimal need for redirection
- Responds to information through multiple modalities
- Makes age appropriate progress
- Has home support
- Compliant
- Retains information learned
- Responds to questions appropriately
- Engages in lessons
- Completes Assignments
- Able to self-monitor and self-regulate
- Acculturated
- Knows what to expect in regards to school expectations and lessons
- Learns efficiently
- Student has good attendance
- No special services

**Non-Traditional Learner:**
- May respond to a specific type of learning modality (e.g., visual over auditory)
- School may not be a priority (or grades)
- May be more social or engage in task avoidance behavior
- Typical verbal or intrinsic reinforcement systems may not work
- Due to alternative learning style, accommodation or modifications may be needed
- May have other creative skills (Musical vs. Academic)
- May not be competitive
- May struggle with attending to specific tasks and require redirection to stay focused
- Need more contexts enriched experiences to assist with processing and retention.
- Once concept is learned, retention is strong

**Student With Special Needs:**
- Lack of educational progress even with sustained support
- Requires repetition and redundancy to assist with learning, retention, and transfer
- May require learning through a specific modality
- Struggle with retaining information even with modifications and accommodations
- Test scores may reflect a scattered profile
- May reflect low motivation/frustration
- May engage in task avoidance behavior
- Struggles with self-monitoring and self-regulating
- May have poor self esteem
- Needs additional processing time
- Information may need to presented within a context enriched experience
- May need manipulatives to assist with comprehension
- Information may be needed to be scaffolded and differentiated to assist with learning
- De-contextualized information is difficult to learn, retain, and transfer
Dynamic Assessment Model
for Academic and Language Contexts

- Dynamic Assessment (DA) is a fluid evaluation process that changes with development and learning versus a static model that identifies knowledge previously learned.
- DA helps describe a student’s ability to learn, retain, and transfer learned information or concepts.
- DA can reflect the gap between the student’s actual development and the their developmental potential. This is referred to as the “Zone of Proximal Development” (ZPD).
- The size of the “zone” can be determined by using a “test-teach-retest” format. The number of prompts given in the teaching phase and the transfer effect helps determine the Zone of Proximal Development.
- DA can assist clinicians/educational staff in determining when and how to intervene. For example, children who show limited change during the assessment may require extensive assistance in order to facilitate changes in language or academic behavior. In contrast, children who show significant changes during the assessment, and who can maintain those changes, may not need specialized academic or language services.
- **One type of a DA approach: Test – Teach – Retest**
  Within this paradigm, the examiner first identifies deficient or emerging skills that may or may not be related to a lack of experiences with that skill. The examiner then provides an intervention or lesson designed to modify the child’s level of functioning in the targeted areas. By teaching the principles of the task, the test situation changes from an *evaluative* interaction (typical of traditional test situations) to a *teaching* interaction where the examiner maximizes the child’s feelings of competence. The performance on the posttest (retest phase) serves as an indicator of the child’s modifiability following training. It should be noted that this type of non-standardized approach has high face validity but reliability may be more difficult to establish due to different teaching approaches that may be employed by the examiner and the quality of prompts and cues that may be used.
- Clinicians/educational staff should also describe changes in the quality of the student’s responses as additional measures of change.
- A rating scales checklist can help staff identify differences that relate to limited educational opportunity (rather than disorder). The scales are also helpful to determine what it takes to effect change, such as the amount of effort/intensity, time, type of cue, and type of modification that may be needed for the student to complete the task. This scale can be developed using a Likert-type of rating scales (e.g., none of the time, some of the time, etc…) for a variety of variables. The data can also be noted anecdotally.
- When an appropriate teaching experience is provided, children who are different, but typical language learners, are capable of demonstrating significant changes. On the other hand, students with language-learning disabilities may benefit from a targeted teaching session, but will demonstrate little quantitative change or need significant accommodations and modifications to complete the task. Students with language-learning disabilities have a difficult time learning, retaining, and transferring new information.
- Conclusion: The measures of change, such as gain scores, ratings of modifiability, and qualitative changes, may be extremely useful for differentiating language differences from disorder and for determining appropriate educational decisions.

This document is made up of excerpts from the following sources

Steps in Dynamic Assessment
(Test – Teach – Retest Format)

I. Pretest

• Identify skill area deficits (this can be obtained from one or more of the following)
  o Observation
  o ESL test data
  o Teacher report
  o Work samples
  o Standardized or criterion-based measures
  o Curriculum-based measures
  o Language sample

• Set up mechanism to establish baseline data
  o Develop a criterion-based assessment tool
  o Use raw or standardized scores from language or academic instrument

II. Teaching Phase (i.e., Mediated Learning Experience)

• Ideally a minimum of 3 sessions
  o Can start after the pre-test
  o Minimum of 30-minute sessions
  o Sessions should be at least 1-2 days apart and not more than 1 week.
  o Session should be individual or in small group (note: when in small group, comparison to other students may assist in data collection)

• Pre-test items used during the teaching phase
  o It’s OK to use some of the items
  o The teach phase should include targeted concepts not listed in pre-test

• The focus of the teaching phase is to teach a targeted concept (e.g., labeling, verb tense, sound-symbol relationships, etc…) not to be content specific for the 3 sessions (e.g., only teach animal names).

• Be able to scaffold a concept to assist the student at their learning level and within their “Zone of Proximal Development”
  o Move from an expressive task to a receptive task
  o Use visuals or manipulatives
  o Break task down into discrete hierarchical parts

Over
• Lesson should include the main components of “mediation”
  o Intentionality: *Statement of goal and purpose of interaction*
  o Meaning: *Why concept is important and how it relates to student*
  o Transcendence: *Develop metacognitive skills – asking “what if questions”*
  o Panning/Competence: *Children think about what they have learned and how they will use that skill the next time they are asked to complete a similar task*
  o Transfer: *Summarize a lesson and help children think about how they will generalize the skill they have been learning to other situations*

• Dynamic assessment focuses on the cognitive functions and processes (e.g., attention, maintenance, impulse regulation, and strategy application).

• Following each teaching session, the clinician/educator rates the child on the Learning Strategies Checklist (LSC) and Modifiability Scale (MS).
  o On the LSC, the clinician notes the child’s responsivity and ability to apply learned strategies
  o Note accommodations, modifications, and scaffold techniques used in order for student to be successful
  o The MS is used to summarize the clinician’s judgment of overall student change (i.e., examiner effort, student response, transfer).

• Use the Dynamic Assessment Observational Checklist if needed for additional data

• Dynamic assessment can be used to target a communication concept (i.e., content, form, and use), a reading concept (i.e., phonemic awareness, word attack skills, comprehension skills, etc.), math skills (i.e., calculation & reasoning), and writing skills (i.e., orthographic, organization, etc.).

**III. Post-Test**

• It is recommended that no more than 2 days pass from the final teaching session to the post-test
• Use the same tool and items from pre-test to determine student growth

*Remember:* Transfer of knowledge from pre to post-test provides only one dimension of information. The multidimensional utility of Dynamic Assessment is to identify “how a student learns information, how they retain information, and how they transfer information.”
### Dynamic Assessment Scoring Sheet

**Student Name:**

**Examiner’s Name:**

**Content Target:**

| Teaching Session #:

| Date: |

### Learning Strategy Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Attention</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student exhibits an orienting response and focus to task-relevant stimuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Criteria (Circle One)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Task Specific Performance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student performs features of the target task (e.g., answer questions, describing, sequencing, use comparative relationships, summarizing, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Criteria (Circle One)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Planning</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student verbalizes or uses systematic strategy to task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Criteria (Circle One)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Self Regulation / Awareness</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student waits for instructions, seeks help when needed, corrects self, or rewards self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Criteria (Circle One)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Motivation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student shows enthusiasm for task &amp; persists in the face of frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Criteria (Circle One)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Interaction with Adults</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Seeks help when needed &amp; changes responses according to adult cues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Criteria (Circle One)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Learning Strategy Score**  (Use score for Analysis on Reverse Side)

### Modifiability Scale (Note: overall performance after each teaching session)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examiner Effort</th>
<th>Extreme (1)</th>
<th>High – Moderate (2)</th>
<th>Moderate-Slight (3)</th>
<th>Slight-None (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Responsivity</td>
<td>None (1)</td>
<td>Slight (2)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td>High (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>None (1)</td>
<td>Low (2)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td>High (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Modifiability Score**  (Use Score for Analysis on Reverse Side)

*Note: See Attached Scoring Criteria Description for Assistance*

Over
Differentiation Criteria

Learning Strategies Checklist:

6 Points  **Profound** Learning Challenges
7-12 Points **Severe** Learning Challenges
13-18 Points **Moderate** Learning Challenges
19-24 Points **Mild** Learning Challenges
25-30 Points **Typical** Learning Characteristics (i.e., Learn, Retain, & Transfer Information)

Modifiability Scale:

3 Points  Observed Learning Patterns - Atypical & **Severe**
4-6 Points  Observed Learning Patterns - Atypical & **Moderate**
7-9 Points  Observed Learning Patterns - Atypical & **Mild**
10-12 Points  Observed Learning Patterns - **Typical**

**Note:** To maximize the validity of the Dynamic Assessment results, the teaching lessons need to be within the student’s “zone of proximal development” (i.e., within their developmental range). If a targeted lesson is too easy or challenging, the results of the Dynamic Assessment can be compromised.

**Adapted from:**
Dynamic Assessment Scoring Criteria

Learning Strategies Checklist

Attention: The student exhibits an orienting response and focus to task-relevant stimuli (i.e., ignoring irrelevant stimuli), throughout length of task. Student who is distractible may need greater repetition of instruction and may require more mediation to learn.

5. Orienting response and on-task behavior without prompts.
4. Attentional prompts needed only at the beginning of mediation session.
3. Prompting / repetition needed less than 50% of the time.
2. Prompting / repetition needed more than 50% of the time
1. High distractibility and minimal attention.

Task Specific Performance: Teaching strategies are used to help a student develop metacognitive and metalinguistic skills related to a task. The examiner may engage the student with concepts pertaining to who, what, when, where, and why related questions. In addition, the examiner should introduce “what if” questions to facilitate thinking about alternative strategies and answers. Students may also discuss with the examiner the relative benefits of alternative scenarios or strategies. This type of teaching encourages independent, hypothetical thinking and learning.

5. Use of targeted features with minimal difficulty and prompting.
4. Use of targeted features between 50-90% of the time with prompting or use of responses that are close to the target but still inaccurate
3. Use of inaccurate responses between 25-50% of the time with prompting.
2. Use of guesses or irrelevant responses.
1. No response.

Planning: The student verbalizes or uses a systematic strategy to engage or complete targeted task.

5. Use or verbalization of systematic strategy to task with minimal difficulty or prompting.
4. Use or verbalization of systematic strategy to task between 50-90% of the time with prompting.
3. Use or verbalization of systematic strategy to task between 25-50% of the time with prompting.
2. Use or verbalization of systematic strategy to task less than 25% of the time with prompting.
1. No systematic strategy used for task.

Self-Regulation: The student demonstrates self-awareness and self-regulation skills. For example, the student waits for instructions, asks for assistance when task becomes difficult, responds to instruction with minimal prompts, is aware of correctness of own responses, and may use self-rewarding behavior.

4. Use of self-correction and self-reward between 50-90% of the time. Waits for instruction throughout the session.
2. Impulsivity and fidgety 50% of the time.
1. Impulsivity and fidgety throughout the session.

Over
Motivation: The student shows enthusiasm for the task and persists in the face of frustration.

5. High enthusiasm about task as noted by verbalization, body language, and/or facial expressions.
4. Willingness to try most tasks throughout the session, despite difficulty.
3. Occasional attempts to end mediation activities.
2. Frequent attempts to end mediation activities.
1. Refusal to participate in mediation activities.

Interaction with Adults: The student seeks help when the task becomes difficult. The student changes responses according to adult cues and feedback.

5. Consistent use of verbal / nonverbal requests for help when task becomes difficult. Response consistently changes based on adult input.
4. Use of requests for help most of the time. Occasional repetition of old errors in spite of adult input.
3. Inconsistent change in responses despite adult feedback (<50% of the time).
2. Frequent repetition of old errors despite adult feedback (> 50% of the time).
1. Minimal change in response to adult feedback.

Modifiability Scale

Examiner Effort: Using the data from the learning strategies checklist, identify the amount and intensity of effort required to induce change during the teaching session.

4. Slight - None
3. Moderate – Slight
2. High – Moderate
1. Extreme

Student’s Response to Teaching: Using the data from the learning strategies checklist, rate the student’s overall responsiveness to the examiner’s teaching during the lesson.

4. High
5. Moderate
2. Slight
1. None

Ability to Transfer: Using the data from the learning strategies checklist, rate how the student applies the learned strategies to a new task.

4. High
3. Moderate
2. Low
1. None

Adapted from:
Concepts of the Dynamic Assessment Teaching Session
(i.e., Mediated Learning Experience)

During the teaching session, the clinician/educator carefully support children’s learning at a level that is somewhat above what they are able to do without support. Examiners do this by pointing out:

- The learning goal
- Explaining why that goal is important
- Helping children develop and follow a plan for learning
- Helping children think about possible relationships between the learning goal and everyday situations and events.

During a teaching session, the examiners observe the strategies children use to meet the demands of the learning goal. Examiners ask four main questions:

- Are children able to form a more complete or more coherent answer with examiner support?
- Do children pay attention to and include more elements of the targeted concept when the examiner uses interactive teaching?
- How hard does the examiner have to work in order for children to make positive changes?
- Is learning quick and efficient or is it slow and labored?

The answers to these questions become the basis for determining whether initial low performance is a language-learning disorder, lack of experience, or a language difference.

5 Basic Components of the Teaching (i.e., Mediation) Phase

**Intentionality:** Strategies are used to explain the goal of the activity to the student. It is important for the student to understand the goal(s) of each teaching session. Understanding the goal helps the student maintain focus on the target task and ignore irrelevant stimuli. The examiner should periodically remind the student of the goal or ask if the student remembers the goal.

**Meaning:** Strategies are used to explain to the student why the task or goal is important. This helps the student attend to the important features of the task and understand task relevance.

**Transcendence:** Teaching strategies are used to help a student develop metacognitive and metalinguistic skills related to a task. The examiner may engage the student with concepts pertaining to who, what, when, where, and why related questions. In addition, the examiner should introduce “what if” questions to facilitate thinking about alternative strategies and answers. Students may also discuss with the examiner the relative benefits of alternative scenarios or strategies. This type of teaching encourages independent, hypothetical thinking and learning.

**Planning:** The student verbalizes or uses strategies to engage or complete a targeted task.

**Transfer:** A summary of the session is discussed to help the student think about using their new skills in related settings or situations (i.e., story time, creative writing, answering teacher questions, etc…).
Example Supports and Scaffolding Techniques the Examiner Can Use during the Teaching Session (or Mediated Learning Experience)

- Provide a model or example of the concept, idea, or linguistic structure the student needs to learn.
- Shorten the directions given to the student.
- Require the student to restate the directions.
- Give the student extra time to organize their thoughts.
- Give the student cues to assist in word retrieval.
- Provide a more elaborate explanation of questions and instructions.
- Use expansions of the student’s statements.
- Encourage elaboration by asking questions.
- Use simple terms when explaining concepts.
- Respond positively to the student’s verbal attempts.
- Teach the student some strategies for asking for assistance and/or clarification.
- Give instructions and examples on using descriptive language.
- Use questions to help the student make connections between old and new information.
- Use semantic maps of stories and expository texts.
- Pair pictures and objects with directions or explanations of concepts.
- Simplify the questions posed to the student.
Questions to Challenge Thinking

- What do you believe and why?
- What should be done next and why?
- Why do you think that’s the answer? Explain.
- How can we find out about ______?
- Why do you think that about ______?
- What would you do about ______ and why?
- What are some other ways?
- What is the most . . .
  - useful and why?
  - interesting and why?
  - effective and why?
  - logical and why?
  - creative and why?
- What are the possible causes of ______?
- What are the possible consequences or effects of ______?
- What conclusions could you draw of ______?
- How would you ______?
- How could you ______?
- How would you propose a plan to ______?
- How would you formulate a solution to ______?
- How would you defend ______?
- How would you state the problem?
- How would you support your conclusion?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Tolerance to frustration</th>
<th>Culturally Appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anxiety</strong></td>
<td>Enthusiastic, engages in tasks readily</td>
<td>Persistent, wants to continue despite difficulty</td>
<td>Calm, little to no smoothing required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidgety, but can be soothed</td>
<td>Curious, asks about tasks</td>
<td>Contrite, voices difficulty, but continues</td>
<td>Complteely understands tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable, breaks needed sooth</td>
<td>Ambivalent, unsure about tasks</td>
<td>Tentative, appears unsure about continuing</td>
<td>Mostly understands tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed, much soothing required</td>
<td>Guarded, seems fearful of tasks</td>
<td>Frustrated, continues under protest</td>
<td>Understands tasks some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraught, crying, cannot be soothed</td>
<td>Avoidant, does not want to engage</td>
<td>Rejecting, cannot continue</td>
<td>Doesn’t understand tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Task orientation</th>
<th>Metacognition</th>
<th>Self Reward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task orientation</strong></td>
<td>Completey understands tasks</td>
<td>Aware of all errors</td>
<td>Makes positive comments about performance, regardless of task difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly understands tasks</td>
<td>Aware of most errors</td>
<td>Makes positive comments about performance related to task difficulty</td>
<td>Makes positive comments about performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands tasks some</td>
<td>Aware of some errors</td>
<td>Makes ambivalent comments about performance, demonstrates insecurity in ability</td>
<td>Makes ambivalent comments about performance, demonstrates insecurity in ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudimentary understanding of tasks</td>
<td>Unaware of most errors</td>
<td>Makes negative comments about performance related to task difficulty</td>
<td>Makes negative comments about performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t understand tasks</td>
<td>Unaware of any errors</td>
<td>Makes negative comments about performance, regardless of task difficulty</td>
<td>Makes negative comments about performance, regardless of task difficulty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elaboration</th>
<th>Verbal mediation</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Solving</strong></td>
<td>Systematic and efficient</td>
<td>Uses multiple strategies readily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized, but inefficient</td>
<td>Elaborates plan clearly</td>
<td>Has preferred strategies, but can change when necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sketchy plan</td>
<td>Talks through problem</td>
<td>Some evidence of more than one strategy and occasionally utilizes them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganized, haphazard plan</td>
<td>Talks occasionally</td>
<td>Recognizes limitations of strategy, but cannot see alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No plan; trial and error</td>
<td>1-2 word utterances only</td>
<td>Persists with one strategy, regardless of outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsiveness to feedback</strong></td>
<td>Very positive, maintains enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive, but hesitant; requires some feedback</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative, disheartened; requires much feedback</td>
<td>Very negative, rejects feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attention</strong></td>
<td>Attentive and focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused, but distractible at times</td>
<td>Distractible, but can be refocused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracted, and difficult to refocus</td>
<td>Distracted and off task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance</strong></td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>Hesitant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative</td>
<td>Refusing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Interpretive Information

• RPI Scores
• MAMBI
• C-LIM Interpretative Guide
Interpretation of RPI Scores for ELL Students

Relative Proficiency Indexes (RPIs): The RPI allows statements to be generated about a subject’s expected level of proficiency on tasks similar to the ones tested. For the RPI, the constant term is the denominator. The subject’s proficiency level is used as the numerator and the average proficiency (90) of the comparison group is used in the denominator of the RPI.

Examples: 56, 90, 98
90 90 90

An RPI of 90/90 means that the subject would be predicted to demonstrate 90% proficiency with similar tasks that average individuals in the comparison group (age/grade) would also perform with 90% proficiency. Example: An oral language RPI of 56/90 (age) is interpreted to mean that when others at the subject’s age show 90% proficiency on a variety of oral language tasks, the subject is predicted to show 56% proficiency on the same tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPI</th>
<th>CALP Stage/Level</th>
<th>Approximate Time of Acquisition while in English School</th>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Developmental Level</th>
<th>Functional Level</th>
<th>Age-Grade Level Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97/90 to 100/90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 Years – 7+ Years</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-90 to 96/90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 Years – 5 Years</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Age Appropriate</td>
<td>WNL</td>
<td>Manageable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/90 to 74/90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 Year – 3 Years</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Mildly Delayed</td>
<td>Mildly Impaired</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/90 to 24/90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 months – 1 Year</td>
<td>Very Limited</td>
<td>Moderately Delayed</td>
<td>Moderately Impaired</td>
<td>Extremely Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/90 to 3/90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 – 6 months</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Extremely Delayed</td>
<td>Severely Impaired</td>
<td>Impossible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### OCHOA AND ORTIZ MULTIDIMENSIONAL ASSESSMENT MODEL FOR BILINGUAL INDIVIDUALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional program/history</th>
<th>Current grade</th>
<th>Assessment mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language profile 1 (L1 minimal/L2 minimal)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language profile 2 (L1 emergent/L2 minimal)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language profile 3 (L1 fluent/L2 minimal)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language profile 4 (L1 minimal/L2 emergent)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language profile 5 (L1 emergent/L2 emergent)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language profile 6 (L1 fluent/L2 emergent)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language profile 7 (L1 minimal/L2 fluent)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language profile 8 (L1 emergent/L2 fluent)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language profile 9 (L1 fluent/L2 fluent)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 11.1.** The Ochoa and Ortiz Multidimensional Assessment Model for Bilingual Individuals (MAMBI). Notes: CALP level 1-2 = minimal proficiency; CALP level 3 = emergent proficiency; CALP level 4-5 = fluent proficiency. See Chapter 9 for more information. NV, assessment conducted primarily in a nonverbal manner with English-language reduced/cultivation-reduced measures; L1, assessment conducted in the first language learned by the individual (i.e., native or primary language); L2, assessment conducted in the second language learned by the individual (i.e., the native language and English); □, combinations of language development and instruction that are improbable or due to other factors (e.g., Saturday school, foreign-born adoptees, delayed school entry); □, recommended mode of assessment that should take priority over other modes and which is more likely to be the most accurate estimate of the student's true abilities; □, secondary or optional mode of assessment that may provide additional valuable information but which will likely result in an underestimate of the student's true ability; □, mode of assessment not recommended for students in K-2, but may be informative in 3-4, although results will likely be an underestimate of true ability; □, mode of assessment not recommended for students in K-1, but may be informative in 2-4, although results will likely be an underestimate of true ability.
# General Guidelines for Expected Patterns of Test Performance for Diverse Individuals

## Degree of Linguistic Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Cultural Loading</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 1-2 points</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 3-4 points</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 5-7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different: 2-4 points</td>
<td>Different: 4-7 points</td>
<td>Different: 7-10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markedly Different: 5-7 points</td>
<td>Markedly Different: 7-10 points</td>
<td>Markedly Different: 10-15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 3-4 points</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 5-7 points</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 8-10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different: 4-7 points</td>
<td>Different: 7-10 points</td>
<td>Different: 10-14 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markedly Different: 7-10 points</td>
<td>Markedly Different: 10-15 points</td>
<td>Markedly Different: 15-25 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 5-7 points</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 8-10 points</td>
<td>Slightly Different: 11-13 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different: 7-10 points</td>
<td>Different: 10-15 points</td>
<td>Different: 15-20 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markedly Different: 10-15 points</td>
<td>Markedly Different: 15-25 points</td>
<td>Markedly Different: 25-35 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Slightly Different:** Includes individuals with high levels of English language proficiency (e.g., advanced BICS/emerging CALP) and high acculturation, but still not entirely comparable to mainstream U.S. English speakers. Examples include individuals who have resided in the U.S. for more than 7 years or who have parents with at least a high school education, and who demonstrate native-like proficiency in English language conversation and solid literacy skills.

**Different:** Includes individuals with moderate levels of English language proficiency (e.g., intermediate to advanced BICS) and moderate levels of acculturation. Examples include individuals who have resided in the U.S. for 3-7 years and who have learned English well enough to communicate, but whose parents are limited English speakers with only some formal schooling, and improving but below grade level literacy skills.

**Markedly Different:** Includes individuals with low to very low levels of English language proficiency (e.g., early BICS) and low or very low levels of acculturation. Examples include individuals who recently arrived in the U.S. or who may have been in the U.S. 3 years or less, with little or no prior formal education, who are just beginning to develop conversational abilities and whose literacy skills are also just emerging.
Sample Reports

• Examples of documenting ESL Testing Data

• Sample Report for Communication Disorder
Analysis of ESL Testing Data

Student: Elizabeth
Grade: 1st
Years in English Speaking School Setting: 1.8
School:
Person Requesting: Cathy

Data Summary for Woodcock-Munoz-English (Grade Equivalent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>RPI</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad English Ability</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>71/90</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language Ability</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62/90</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Vocab:</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>82/90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Analogies:</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37/90</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading-Writing Ability</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80/90</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter-Word Ident:</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>77/90</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>91/100</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) SS=Standard Score; Mean = 100, Standard Deviation +/- 15

2) A student that has been in an English-speaking school setting for 1.8 years should be performing at a level-3 (1-3 years for level 3 performance).

3) Levels refer to CALP levels (A continuum of Level 1-5, with 5 being mastery)

Data Summary for Woodcock-Munoz-Spanish (Grade Equivalent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>RPI</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Spanish Ability</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19/90</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language Ability</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>52/90</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Vocab:</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54/90</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Analogies:</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50/90</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading-Writing Ability</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5/90</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter-Word Ident:</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1/90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26/90</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The discrepancy between the student’s Spanish and English reading scores are most likely due to the fact that the student does not receive academic instruction (i.e., oral, reading, writing) in Spanish.

Data Summary for the IPT-English (Form E)

Level: E (Fluent English Speaker-Early Stage)

Error Pattern Analysis:

Total BICS Errors: 11
Total CALP Errors: 5

Total Errors: 16 / 83 (81% correct)
Jonathan scored below average in both Spanish and English when compared to second language acquisition skill development. However, the data suggests that Jonathan’s CALP-based skills are stronger in English than in Spanish. Below is a summary of Jonathan’s performance and the relationship to CALP-level development.

Data Summary for Woodcock-Munoz-English (Grade Equivalent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>RPI</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad English Ability</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34/90</td>
<td>(low) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language Ability</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22/90</td>
<td>(high) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Vocab</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22/90</td>
<td>(high) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Analogies</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21/90</td>
<td>(high) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading-Writing Ability</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50/90</td>
<td>(mid) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter-Word Ident</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>67/90</td>
<td>(mid) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32/90</td>
<td>(low) 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Summary for Woodcock-Munoz-Spanish (Grade Equivalent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>RPI</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Spanish Ability</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7/90</td>
<td>(low) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language Ability</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19/90</td>
<td>(mid) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Vocab</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15/90</td>
<td>(mid) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Analogies</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23/90</td>
<td>(high) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading-Writing Ability</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>(high) 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter-Word Ident</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4/90</td>
<td>(low) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2/90</td>
<td>(mid) 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
1. Standard score: Mean = 100; Standard Deviation - +/- 15
2. A student that has been in an English-speaking school setting for 5 years should have oral language skills at a high Level 4 (RPI: 75/90 to 96/90) to a low Level 5 (RPI: 97/90 to /90).
3. Levels for CALP range from 1 to 5 (with 5 being mastery).
4. The discrepancies between the student’s Spanish and English scores are most likely due to the student not receiving academic instruction (i.e., oral, reading, and writing) in Spanish.
SPEECH / LANGUAGE EVALUATION

Name: Yuri Memovic
Birthdate: 07-03-92
Chronological Age: 10-8
PPS ID: xxx-xxx-xxx
Grade: 4th
School: George Washington
Teacher: Mrs. Philips

Date of Report: 4-14-03
Parent(s): Mr. & Mrs. Memovic
Address: 1234 SW Hill St.
Telephone: 503-222-2223
Examiner: John Smith, MS, CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist

Referral Information:
Yuri was seen for a speech-language evaluation as part of a comprehensive special education evaluation to determine if he qualifies for special education services, and if so, what services would be most appropriate. Since Yuri has arrived at George Washington in the second grade, teachers have been concerned about his academic progress. His fourth grade teacher, Mrs. Philips, referred Yuri to the George Washington Building Screening (BSC) committee due to global concerns in the areas of language, reading, math, writing, learning ability, and orthopedics. The teacher also noted that there were concerns regarding Yuri’s school attendance.

It should also be noted that Yuri’s teachers have been concerned about his academic progress in both the second and third grade. However, due to Yuri’s status as an English language learner, with his primary language being Bosnian, a formal referral for a special education evaluation was deferred to allow Yuri to progress through the stages of acculturation and second language acquisition. After careful monitoring of Yuri’s development over the last 2 years, and due to Yuri’s documented delays in the acquisition of the English language, the George Washington BSC believed it was appropriate to refer Yuri for a comprehensive special education evaluation.

Background Information:
A developmental history was conducted with Mr. Memovic, by the school psychologist, and with the assistance of Mr. Igor Mastocovic, a Bosnian interpreter. In order to reduce the number of school personnel attending the meeting, the school psychologist also obtained information pertaining to speech and language development.

According to Mr. Memovic, Yuri’s parents moved to Germany from Bosnia just a few months after the war. When the Memovic’s moved to Germany, Yuri’s mother was 5 months...
pregnant with him and delivered 4 months later by cesarean. According to Mr. Memovic, there were postnatal difficulties. However, he also reported that Yuri was placed into an incubation chamber for 10-12 days following his birth due to a lack of oxygen. He also reported that Yuri was diagnosed with hydrocephalus.

In regards to development, Mr. Memovic reported that Yuri sat up at 16 months and started walking at 17 months. However, he did note that he began by walking backwards. Mr. Memovic and Yuri’s mother also observed that Yuri struggled with moving his left arm and leg. After taking him to a clinic, it was discovered that he had left side spastic hemiparesis. Currently, Yuri cannot use his left hand in a functional manner and his mobility is somewhat compromised. He receives physical therapy at Oregon Heath Sciences University (OHSU), but his orthopedic functioning does not preclude him from participating in gross motor activities at school or in his community (e.g., basketball, soccer, PE at school). However, Mr. Memovic reported that Yuri does not care for himself at home and that he receives assistance from his parents. It should also be noted that Yuri wears glasses and has difficulty seeing out of his left eye.

In regards to speech and language development, Mr. Memovic reported that Yuri’s home language is Bosnian but can also understand and speak some basic German. He noted that Yuri started using single words at approximately 1 year of age and simple sentences at about 2 years of age. Mr. Memovic also stated that Yuri suffered from recurring otitis media (i.e., ear infections) from infancy up to the age of 7. There was no mention of Yuri receiving pressure equalization tubes (PE tubes) to treat this problem. In regards to his language and communication, Mr. Memovic did not believe that Yuri struggled to communicate in Bosnian. However, when comparing Yuri to his younger brother, he reported that Yuri’s communication skills were delayed.

In regards to formalized schooling, Mr. Memovic noted that Yuri did attend first grade in Germany and exhibited educational struggles at that time. Yuri arrived at George Washington elementary in the second grade and currently participates in a regular 4th grade education class while also receiving ESL support. It should be noted that when completing a file review, this examiner discovered that Yuri was provided a 504 educational plan in March of 2001 related to his orthopedic issues. His accommodations targeted shortening the distance for running activities and modifying motor activities to Yuri’s ability level.

For further information pertaining to Yuri’s developmental history, academics, and behavioral performance, please refer to the current psycho-educational report found in the student’s cumulative file.

**Impressions and Observations During Testing:**

Yuri was somewhat cooperative during the testing period and appeared to try his best on all of the tasks presented. However, on more than one occasion Yuri engaged in task avoidance behavior by indicating that he wanted to go back and participate in the class project as well as ask off topic questions in order to redirect the discussion during testing.

Due to not having a Bosnian speech-language pathologist available or assessments tools in Bosnian, English assessments were used as a criterion measure to reflect Yuri’s abilities. Due to the inherent reliability and validity issues that encapsulate this type of evaluation process, standard scores from the ASSET (Assessing Semantic Skills through Everyday Themes) and the LPT (Language Processing Test-Revised) should not be interpreted as quantifiable measurements of this student’s ability. However, the standard and raw scores can be used in a criterion manner to reflect the student’s current English skill level. It should also be noted that
data obtained from English language proficiency tests would be used to help determine Yuri’s acquisition of English as compared to normal English language development for a student learning a secondary language. It is this examiner’s recommendation that individual testing results may not accurately reflect Yuri’s overall communication abilities and all data should be interpreted in a guarded fashion.

**Evaluation Procedures:**

- Stages of Second Language Acquisition Checklist 3-6-03
- BICS / CALP Checklist 3-6-03
- IDEA Proficiency Test-Oral (IPT-Oral) 2-13-03
- IDEA Proficiency Test-Reading (IPT-Reading) 3-4-03
- Subtests from the Language Processing Test-Revised (LTP-R) 3-17-03
- Assessing Semantic Skills through Everyday Themes (ASSET) 3-13-03
- Criterion Tasks Pertaining to Language Processing 3-3-03
- Dynamic Assessment 3-21-03
- Language Sample 4-14-03
- PPS Pragmatic Skills Checklist 4-14-03
- Audiometric Screening 4-14-03
- Red Flag Matrix 4-14-03

**Assessment Results:**

Mrs. Philips was provided a checklist reflecting the stages and characteristics of second language acquisition. Based upon Yuri’s time in an English-speaking school setting, coupled with his educational experience in Germany, Yuri should be functioning at the middle of Stage 3, speech emergence. This stage is characterized by some of the following skills: Participates in everyday conversations about familiar topics, elicits information and asks basic clarifying questions, responds to basic academic questions. According to Mrs. Philips, Yuri not only struggles with these skills, he continues to struggle with a significant amount of skills that are in Stages 1, 2, and 3. For example, he continues to struggle with the following: Displays limited comprehension (Stage 1), Does not know all of his letter sounds (Stage 2), Asks for the meaning of words (Stage 2), Participates in everyday conversations about familiar topics (Stage 3), Elicits information and asks basic clarification questions, including word meaning (Stage 3), Responds to academic questions with basic answers (Stage 3), Displays increasing comprehension of stories, shared reading, songs, and poems (Stage 3). It should be noted that for reasons of brevity, not all of the observed teacher concerns were noted in this report. Mrs. Philips identified additional concerns in stages 1, 2, and 3.

Mrs. Philips also completed a BICS and CALP checklist. This checklist reflected the teacher’s observations of Yuri’s development of Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). Research suggests that a student should have sufficient BICS skills after 2-3 years of participating in an English-speaking school setting. A student’s CALP skills begin emerging and developing after 4-7 years academic support.

The checklist reflected that Yuri continues to struggle with BICS-based language and reading tasks (e.g., appropriately engaging in a conversation, reciting his ABCs, participating in class discussion, and recognizing basic sight words). Mrs. Philips also reported that Yuri’s CALP skills do not appear to be emerging. He continues to struggle with academic-based
language and literacy skills (e.g., understanding and using academic vocabulary, expressing reason for opinion, understanding and using temporal and spatial concepts, using sound-symbol relationships, struggles with reading comprehension, and struggles with writing activities).

Due to Yuri’s continued struggle with the language and literacy skills that are at a BICS-based level, the data suggests that Yuri’s acquisition of English is delayed when compared to the characteristics of second language acquisition.

Over the last 2 years, Yuri has taken the IDEA proficiency Tests (IPT-oral, reading, and writing), which is administered by the English as a Second Language program (ESL), to identity his English proficiency and rate of acquisition. The IPT series is a standardized tool that allows for the analysis of BICS and CALP language acquisition and standardized reading comparisons to other ELL students. The following is an analysis for both the Oral and Reading proficiency tests:

**IPT-Oral:** Yuri scored at a level D, which places his in the limited English-speaking category. Yuri is also only accruing one level of growth per year (*Note: This test is leveled from A-F with an average growth rate of approximately 2 levels per year*). When completing an error-pattern analysis on the questions that Yuri answered incorrectly, the data revealed that he missed a total of 16 questions with 69% of them being BICS related. This also suggests that Yuri is delayed in the acquisition of BICS-based language skills.

**IPT-Reading:** The IPT-Reading test targets five different subtests to assist in reflecting the student’s reading ability. The subtests include the following: vocabulary, vocabulary in context, reading for understanding, reading for life skills, and language usage. Yuri’s full-scale reading score was 15, which placed him in the non-English reader category (score range for that category: 0-25). Below is a breakdown of Yuri’s score for each subtest as compared to the mean raw score and the standard deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Yuri’s Score</th>
<th>Mean Raw Score</th>
<th>Stand. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary in Context</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for Understanding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for Life Skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Usage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reading</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yuri’s total reading score, as well as four out of five subtests, reflects a performance that is below the 1st standard deviation. This data suggests that Yuri’s language and reading ability is significantly delayed when compared to other ELL students.
The Language Processing Test – Revised was used in a criterion-manner to assess Yuri’s understanding and use of English vocabulary and certain semantic concepts. Yuri scored significantly below average on the two subtests administered. The two subtests are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>8 out of 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorizations</td>
<td>5 out of 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining 4 subtests of similarities, differences, multiple meaning words, and attributes were not completed due to Yuri’s struggle with these language-based concepts. These results suggest that Yuri may have a difficult time understanding and following curriculum related activities.

The Assessment of Semantic Skills through Everyday Themes (ASSET) was used to evaluate Yuri’s English understanding and use of vocabulary and semantic concepts when a visual context was provided. Below are the noted areas and scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECEPTIVE</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Labels</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>b (3rd)</td>
<td>b (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Categories</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>b (3rd)</td>
<td>b (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Attributes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>b (1st)</td>
<td>b (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Functions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>b (1st)</td>
<td>b (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Definitions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>b (1st)</td>
<td>b (55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPRESSIVE</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stating Labels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>b (1st)</td>
<td>b (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stating Categories</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stating Attributes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stating Functions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stating Definitions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Test Score</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>b (1st)</td>
<td>b (55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: It should be noted that these scores should be used in a criterion manner and should not be used to determine eligibility for special education. The mean standard score = 100, standard deviation = +/- 15, and b = below the lowest standard score reported as denoted by the score within the ( ).
These overall scores suggest that Yuri has extreme difficulty in the area of English vocabulary and semantic concepts, even when a picture context is provided. However, the overall standard score and severity should be interpreted in a guarded fashion. When reviewing the subtests under receptive and expressive language, the data suggests that Yuri’s expressive language skills are better than his receptive language skills. Yuri had 2 subtests in the expressive section of the test that were in the 80s (i.e., stating categories and stating definitions). Based upon the expectation of second language acquisition, as well as the visual support provided within this assessment, it is believed that Yuri’s language skills targeted within this exercise should be more advanced.

This examiner attempted to judge Yuri’s language processing skills by administering a series of first and second grade criterion-based vocabulary and language processing questions. The following were the targeted concepts followed by Yuri’s score.

- Following a Sequence of Verbal Directions: 7 out of 12 correct
- Answer Qs Related to a Listening Experience: 3 out of 5 correct
- Retells a Story in Correct Sequence: 2 out of 7 details correct
- Predicts Conclusion to Story Read by Teacher: 2 attempts – incorrect
- Describes Absurdities: 4 out 8 correct
- Describes Main Idea in Listening Experience: Didn’t know
- Names Basic Body Parts: 8 out of 10
- Name Basic Colors: 9 out of 10
- Name Basic Shapes: 3 out of 5 (Wrong: Oval/Triangle)
- Use Appropriate Basic Spatial concepts: 4 out of 4 correct
- Associates Nouns with their Function: 7 out of 8 correct
- Relational Vocabulary: 8 out of 8 correct
- Classifying Labels: 7 out of 10 correct
- Classifying Nouns as Same and Different: 2 out of 10 correct
- Identifying Nouns from Verbal Clues: 10 out of 10 correct
- Compete Analogies: 6 out of 10 correct
- Associates Cause and Effect: 4 out of 4 correct
- Describes Causes for Problem Situations: 4 out of 4 correct
- Describes Solutions for Problem Situations: 4 out of 4 correct

This data suggests that Yuri does have some functional language skills at the first and second grade level. When information is provided to him in a contextual manner, he is able to answer questions appropriately. However, when he is required to process decontextualized information, his ability to identify salient and detailed information in order to comprehend and answer questions is significantly compromised.

A Dynamic Assessment was completed using three 30-minute sessions to identify how Yuri learns new information, retains that information, and transfers that information within and outside of the performed activities. Based upon data obtained from the IPT-Oral and from the criterion-based language processing tasks, it was determined that Yuri struggled with vocabulary and describing how items were the same and different. Using this language-objective to identify how Yuri learns, 6 cognitive-learning subscales were used to describe Yuri’s ability to
participate and be interactive within a learning activity. The following subscales are noted with brief a description of Yuri’s performance overtime:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Strategy Target</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>With a verbal cue, Yuri redirected to the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Specific Performance</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Yuri needed manipulatives and contextual cues to complete the targeted language tasks. He also struggled with remembering components of the task and required verbal reminders from the examiner during all 3 sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yuri could not retain strategies taught from prior sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Regulation &amp; Awareness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yuri could not recognize when he answered questions incorrectly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yuri was marginally motivated and repeatedly asked to end the session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Adults</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yuri would not ask for adult assistance when he struggled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Severe Learning Challenge</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Modifiability Scale:**
Examiner Effort: High Moderate (2)
Student Response: Slight-Moderate (2)
Transfer: Slight (1)

**Total Score:** 5

**Interpretation:** Yuri reflected an atypical learning pattern to a moderate degree

This profile suggests that Yuri struggles with learning new information provided at his comprehensible input level, retaining that information, and transferring that information.

An informal language sample was obtained to further analyze Yuri’s English language, content, form, and use. Yuri was asked to answer a series of questions and describe one of his favorite movies. From the language sample, it was noted that Yuri was able to appropriately use articles, pronouns, prepositions, regular past tense, copula, auxiliary verbs, present progressive form, conjunctions, possessives, plurals, simple sentences, spatial concepts, and the proper use of negation. He struggled with understanding or using irregular past tense verbs, temporal concepts (e.g., months of the year), sequencing of ideas, word recall, and the use of complex sentences. However, the data does suggest that these skills are emerging.

Mr. Igor Mastocovic, the Bosnian interpreter, also listened to Yuri speak in Bosnian to help identify his functional communication within his primary language. Mr. Mastocovic indicated that Yuri’s use of Bosnian was structurally appropriate and used conversational language in a basic and appropriate manner.
The Portland Public Schools Pragmatic Skills Checklist was utilized in order to assess Yuri’s ability to use language to communicate competently. Results from language sampling and observation indicate that Yuri demonstrated adequate skills for communicating in an English-speaking culture in two out of seven areas measured. The areas that were measured and appeared appropriate include: Functions of language (i.e., describing wants and needs) and conversational skill of quality (i.e., making factually accurate statements). The areas that Yuri struggles with within this cultural experience include: Para-linguistic behaviors (i.e., facial affect or expressions), conversational skill of manner (i.e., being clear), conversational skill of relation (i.e., providing relevant information to include topic control), conversational skill of quantity (i.e., saying enough to be understood), and interaction management (i.e., response and pause time in a conversation and feedback to the speaker). It should be noted that some differences in discourse and pragmatic skills could be due to acculturation factors. Differences in these areas should not be automatically characterized as a result of a disability.

Yuri’s voice and fluency were judged to be within normal limits at this time.

A Puretone Audiometric Screening has been attempted, but not been completed due to Yuri’s inconsistent attendance. A screening is scheduled before the end of April and results will be sent to Yuri’s parents and included in a report addendum.

**Conclusion & Recommendations**

Yuri is a 10-year, 8 month-old male student, in the 4th grade, at George Washington elementary school. Currently, Yuri is receiving his academic instruction in a regular education classroom while also receiving building support from the ESL program. Yuri’s classroom teacher indicates that he continues to struggle with academic concepts such as language acquisition, reading, math, and writing.

When reviewing all of the evaluation data, it suggests that even though Yuri may display BICS in his primary language, his acquisition of both BICS and CALP in English are delayed. Assessment results from teacher checklists and the IPT series reflect this atypical development. Assessment data from criterion-based language processing activities also suggest that Yuri’s language skills are stronger when he is provided a contextual framework. However, without that support, his ability to process and manipulate language is significantly compromised. The results from the Dynamic Assessment reflect that Yuri struggles with learning new information, retaining information, and transferring information. Mr. Memovic even noted that Yuri struggled in school in Germany and his younger brother seems to learn concepts easier.

Based upon this examiner’s observations and an analysis of the data, Yuri will struggle in the following academic areas: 1) Understanding and following teacher directions, 2) Understanding curriculum related vocabulary, 3) Reading comprehension, 4) Using appropriate vocabulary related to an academic task, 5) Expressing thoughts verbally or in a written context, 6) Understanding or interpreting decontextualized information, 7) Understanding abstract information, and 8) Understanding or interpreting inferences. Strategies that may assist Yuri include: 1) Provide visual cues for vocabulary items, 2) Provide phonemic or contextual cue when word retrieval difficulties are present, and 3) Reinforce vocabulary to Yuri by having him repeat the word or semantic concept that is being targeted, 4) Provide Yuri a context that will help him understand the target concept, and 5) Use semantic webbing or maps to improve understanding of vocabulary relationships.
Yuri may also struggle with information processing. This may also impact his success within the classroom. Strategies that may help Yuri include: 1) Keeping directions simple and concrete (i.e., 2-3 steps), 2) Provide him extra time to process information, 3) Check with Yuri to make sure he understands the instructions (e.g., have him repeat back the question or instructions), and 4) Provide him with visual cues when needed.

The Red Flag Matrix was used to synthesize the evaluation data and to identify if there were atypical developmental and/or learning patterns that were inconsistent with the acquisition of a second language. The data suggested that Yuri did present atypical patterns in development, language, and learning that couldn’t solely be accounted for by the variables associated with acculturation and the acquisition of a second language. The data suggests that there is high probability that Yuri has characteristics associated with a language-learning disability.

The George Washington Evaluation Team will consider these findings when determining Yuri’s special education eligibility and service recommendations.

John Smith, MS, CCC-SLP
Speech-Language Pathologist
George Washington Elementary School
Working with Interpreters
Team Responsibilities When Working with an Interpreter

- **Prepare the non-English speaking parent for a meeting.**
  - Let parent know exactly purpose, structure, sequence and who will be in attendance and why.
  - Be aware of the meaning that such meetings may carry for the parent in their home country.
  - Make sure parent feels like they have more than one advocate in the meeting, more than one person they know.
  - Empower parent to make requests and express dissatisfaction with the meeting pace, tone, or length.
  - Interview parent with just one team member and interpreter before meeting. Find out what other team members need to know from the parent before the interview. Make sure the team has information from this interview before the meeting.
  - Let the parent know that you will be checking in with them frequently to get their input and ascertain their understanding of what is being discussed.

- **Prepare the interpreter for the meeting.**
  - Familiarity with topic
    - Let the interpreter know exactly what you will be discussing.
    - Familiarize interpreter with more complex terms and concepts – don’t assume they will know how to interpret it.
  - Familiarity with culture
    - Let interpreter know where the family is coming from: geographically, politically, and economically.
    - Discuss discrepancies between interpreter’s background and family’s background.
    - Remember if the interpreter is making incorrect assumptions about the family’s culture this will affect the meaning they convey.
    - Don’t assume that if the family and interpreter are from the same country you won’t need this conversation.
    - Discuss possible difficulties with dialectical differences.
  - Empower the interpreter to make requests and ask for clarifications
    - Put the interpreter in charge of the pace in the meeting. Remind them to ask participants to slow down, repeat, clarify, and take turns.
    - Let them know that you don’t expect them to understand all the education vocabulary and terminology.
  - Familiarizing interpreter with confidentiality rules
    - Never assume the interpreter knows the meeting is confidential. If interpreter is someone known to family and school staff this is especially important.
  - Discuss the interpreter’s role
    - If the interpreter is an employ of the school, it will be especially important to discuss their role in the meeting.
If they know the child and family, they may be tempted to switch back and forth between interpreter and participant.

You may want to get the interpreters input before the meeting.

- **Debriefing with the interpreter**
  - Allow time after the meeting to talk with the interpreter.
  - Give the interpreter the option of saying no when they don’t feel competent with the task.
  - Encourage interpreter to be honest when they don’t understand vocabulary.

- **Look and speak directly to the parent not the interpreter**

- **Use simple concrete language and simple grammatical constructions.**
  - Avoid excessive use of prepositions, conjunctions, etc…
  - Avoid abstract words and idioms (small talk, catch up work,…)
  - Do not use professional jargon
    - Give examples
    - Explain in simple terms

- **Say only two or three sentences at a time, then pause for interpretation.**

- **Watch for cues that interpretation is incorrect.**
  - Body Language
    - Discrepancy between the number of words said and number translated
  - Response that does not coincide with the original question

- **Know the Types of Interpretation:**
  - *Consecutive Interpretation* is the most appropriate for education settings: An oral interpretation is made after a small unit is given and a short pause is allowed.
  - *Simultaneous and Whispered Interpretation* requires very high-level skills and it used in legal and political arenas.

- **Be aware of the extra time required for meetings with an interpreter**
  - Be prepared to hold the second half of the meeting on another day

- **Do not allow side conversations.**

- **Do not allow more than one person to speak at a time.**

- **Allow there to be silence for thinking and interpreting THIS MUST NOT BE A FAST PACED MEETING.**

- **DEBRIEF with the interpreter after the meeting. Summarize the meeting and go over important points. Clarify any confused or complicated information.**
Working with Interpreters

Conference Checklist

Check all areas where team has gathered information and demonstrated good practice

**Preparing the Parent**

- Parent understands the purpose of the meeting
- Parent knows who is attending
- Parent knows why each person is attending
- Parent has a team member who she knows and speaks for her interest
- Parent knows that they can make a request at any time during the meeting
- Parent knows meeting agenda (structure and sequence)

**Team knows the interpreter**

- Previous interpreter training
- Competency level in both languages
- Interpreter’s culture and how it differs from parent
- Interpreter’s knowledge of educational terminology and concepts
- Interpreter’s educational level

**Preparing the interpreter**

- Communicates with interpreter before the meetings
- Communicates topic of conference
- Discusses any complex terms or concepts
- Communicates the parent’s background
- Empowers interpreter to make requests during the conference
- Discusses confidentially
- Asks interpreter if they want to share their knowledge of the parent’s culture
During the conference

_____ The team has minimized attendees

_____ Interpreter is sitting next to the parent and clearly visible to entire team

_____ Team has allowed time for the second half of the meeting to be scheduled on another date if needed

_____ Team members look at the parent while they speak

_____ Team members use simple grammar

_____ Team members use simple and concrete vocabulary (no jargon)

_____ Team members pause for interpretation after two or three sentences

_____ There are no side conversations

_____ The pace of the conference is kept slower than normal

_____ Team members check with parent and interpreter to be sure the interpretation was accurate.

_____ Only one person is speaking at a time.
Detecting Interpreter Errors

To increase effective and accurate communication and avoid misunderstandings, it is essential to know the common errors in interpreting and how to detect them.

Four types of Errors

1. **Omissions**: Words, phrases, or ideas are left out of the interpretation.
   - Interpreter doesn’t attribute value to a certain piece of information
     - It is good practice to preface important info with “This is important”
   - Speakers have said too much or spoken too quickly
   - Interpreter doesn’t understand what was said

2. **Additions**: Extra words or phrases are added
   - Interpreter wishes to be more elaborate
   - Concept is difficult to translate
   - Interpreter is offering opinions or advice
   - Interpreter wants to soften or make more severe the information

3. **Substitutions**: What is said is replaced with something else.
   - Speakers have said too much for the interpreter to remember
   - The word used has a double meaning and the interpreter incorrectly chooses which meaning to translate
   - Interpreter doesn’t know the word or concept
   - Speaker uses a confusing idiom or complex grammatical structure

4. **Transformation**: When the word order is changed and the meaning is altered
   - A long sequence of events is given
   - The people involved are unfamiliar to the interpreter and the names get transposed

Detecting Errors

1. Listen for a discrepancy between the number of words said by the speaker and those said by the interpreter.
2. Look for incongruencies between questions and responses, comments and emotional reactions.
3. Watch closely for nonverbal cues of confusion or upset.

Suggestions for Practitioners to Consider when Working with Interpreters

The interpreting/translating process is a joint venture between the practitioner and the interpreter/translator. For this reason, Mikkelson (1996), Kayser (1995), Langdon (1992), and Fradd and Wilen (1990) have provided suggestions that will facilitate the interpretation/translation process and maximize the quality of information obtained during the interpretation interaction. These general recommendations for the practitioner apply to the time before, during, and after contact with the client.

Before Contact with the Client

1. Sessions that are interpreted require extra time. For this reason the clinician should plan on extra time for an interpreted session. All parties involved should be informed of the anticipated length of the session so that the session is not rushed and so that participants can plan their schedules accordingly.

2. Before contact with the client, the clinician should meet with the interpreter to brief him or her about the nature of the case, the purpose, format, and goals for the session, and potential challenges that might arise.

3. The clinician should obtain information about the pronunciation of the client’s name and the proper term of address (such as Mr., Mrs., Ms., Miss, for Dr.).

4. Jointly the clinician and the interpreter must decide whether to use simultaneous or consecutive interpreting. They will also need to agree on the best arrangement of the table and chairs and where each person will be seated.

5. A good rapport should be established between the practitioner and the interpreter, who should be encouraged to inform the practitioner of any communication problems that arise during the session. (When the interpreter is a volunteer, the practitioner should take care not to be overly critical and demanding of the individual who is giving freely of his or her time. The same consideration should be given to volunteer translators).

During Contact with Client

1. The practitioner should talk with the client as though the client could speak in English. Volume should not be raised. The practitioner should speak slowly and clearly, with frequent pauses so that the interpreter can keep up. However, the practitioner should not use an abnormally slow rate of speech.

2. The practitioner should avoid using technical language that will be unfamiliar to the interpreter and client. The practitioner should also avoid using slang, metaphors, and proverbs that may be unfamiliar to individuals for whom English is not the primary language.

3. The practitioner should address the client in the second person (for example “Tell me what brought you to the hospital,” rather than “ask them why they were brought to the hospital).”

4. The practitioner should introduce himself or herself to the client and explain the purpose of the interview. The interpreter should be introduced, and his or her role explained to the client. As a courtesy, the practitioner should obtain permission
Resources and References
The following are recommended resources for school teams to have available within their building when working with culturally and linguistically diverse student populations.

1. Culture Grams: 4-page abstracts of 182 different countries. For information about the product and purchasing, go to the following website: [http://www.culturegrams.com/](http://www.culturegrams.com/)

The center has books on certain refugee groups that can be helpful regarding cultural awareness (e.g., Bosnians, The Somalis, etc.). These books are about $5.00


6. Bilingual Children’s Books: You can purchase many children’s books that are written in English and in many other languages. Check your local book stores or [www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com).

7. The Oxford Picture Dictionary (Oxford University Press). This product comes in many different languages with the English translation. Because it is supported by pictures, it can be used in a variety of instructional ways by parents, paraprofessionals, bilingual teachers, ESL teachers, special education teachers, and general education teachers. These can be purchased at [www.Amazon.com](http://www.Amazon.com).


   a. Learning Two Languages (English & Spanish)
   b. How Does Your Child Hear & Talk? (English, Spanish, & Chinese)
   c. How Does Your Child Hear and Talk? Clipboard (English & Spanish)

10. Bilingual Resources from the Speech Bin. These items can be purchased at [www.speechbin.com](http://www.speechbin.com/)
    a. Childhood Developmental Chart: Birth to 7 (English)
    b. Childhood Developmental Chart: Birth to 7 (Spanish)
    c. Speech and Language Development Handouts (for teachers and parents): Ages 3 to 6 (English & Spanish)

11. National Information Center for Children and Youth Disabilities (NICHCY)
    a. Descriptions of disabilities in English/Spanish at [www.nichcy.org](http://www.nichcy.org)

12. Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services (CLAS): Early Childhood Research Institute
    a. Materials (e.g., developmental information) in multiple languages
    b. Links to other appropriate sites
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Additional Resources Used for this Presentation


