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SOCIAL JUSTICE
NASP AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

• Social Justice is one of five NASP Strategic Goals

• In September 2017, a definition for school psychologists was adopted by the Board of Directors and Leadership Assembly
SOCIAL JUSTICE: A DEFINITION

• Social justice is both a process and a goal that requires action.

• School psychologists work to ensure the protection of the educational rights, opportunities, and well-being of all children, especially those whose voices have been muted, identities obscured, or needs ignored.

• Social justice requires promoting non-discriminatory practices and the empowerment of families and communities.

• School psychologists enact social justice through culturally-responsive professional practice and...
Ensure that all children and youth are valued and that their rights and opportunities are protected in schools and communities.
NASP AND SOCIAL JUSTICE
SOCIAL JUSTICE

• To some, social justice may be a fad
  • The next hot topic or buzz word in psychology and education
• Social justice is a way of thinking and practicing
  • Similar to various schools of thought or psychological perspectives, it is a framework that informs the manner in which we conceptualize and approach serving students, families, schools, and communities

If we are genuinely serious about embracing social justice, we must transform our thinking. Social justice is not a condiment that is added to a sandwich or dressing that is placed over a salad; it is not something that gives flavor to our work after it’s complete, but it is the work itself. Social justice is an essential ingredient that is baked into the process of whatever we are preparing for children.
NASP EXPOSURE PROJECT

We need YOU to present to high school students or undergraduates about school psychology.
We need every school psychology graduate student, faculty member, and practitioner to present to high school students and/or undergraduates at least once each semester.

- [https://tinyurl.com/NASP-ExposureProject](https://tinyurl.com/NASP-ExposureProject)
BEST PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ASSESSING CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE STUDENTS: KEEPING THE MAIN THING THE MAIN THING
ENCOURAGE THE PEOPLE

CHALLENGE THE SYSTEM
LEARNER OBJECTIVES...

• Attendees will develop the necessary skills to make data-based decisions in order to more effectively serve diverse students and families
• Attendees will be exposed to a comprehensive, evidence-based, and practitioner friendly assessment model that effectively differentiates between language difference and disability (particularly Specific Learning Disability) for English Learner (EL) students
• Additionally, participants will develop the skills necessary to effectively design culturally sensitive assessment batteries to validly assess diverse students’ cognitive abilities and academic skills
• Implications for influencing practice and policy decisions in local school divisions related to serving diverse students and families will
KEEP CALM AND COLLECT DATA
RISK RATIOS: WHERE WE WERE...
MATHEMATICAL CORRECTIONS VS. PARADIGM SHIFT

• While each year discipline disproportionality data resets, addressing special education overidentification is a multi-year process

• MATHEMATICAL CORRECTIONS
  • Identify more students in other groups
  • Stop identifying ELs with SLD*
  • Both approaches are artificial, ineffective, and temporary because they don’t address the underlying causes of disproportionality
LIKE RESEARCH, ASSESSMENT ALWAYS BEGINS WITH A QUESTION
ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTIONS

• QUESTIONS ABOUT STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT
  • Why is [student] not reading?
  • Why is [student] not demonstrating expected progress in a variety of academic areas?

• QUESTIONS FOR SYSTEMS
  • Are there aspects of our systemic policies and practices that contribute to negative outcomes, especially for certain students?
Individual student performance isn’t the only variable worth evaluating.

As educators, we must ask different questions to better understand our students’ underachievement and subsequent qualification for special education support services.

Asking the wrong questions, leads to incomplete assessments and inaccurate conclusions.
We must critically examine the manner in which we evaluate culturally and linguistically diverse students for SLD.
HOW > WHAT
A CHANGING DEMOGRAPHIC

• In August 2014, a *Washington Post* article reported that ethnic minorities would comprise the majority of students attending public schools

• United States Department of Education
  • By 2022, 54.7% of public school students

• Loudoun County Public Schools
  • 165+ countries
  • 138+ languages
A CHANGING DEMOGRAPHIC

- Growing non-majority population
  - 1998 = 19.44%
  - 2012 = 44%
  - 2017 = 51%
  - 2018 = 52%
A CHANGING DEMOGRAPHIC

• In light of these data, all educators need to develop the necessary competencies to effectively serve all students

• For school psychologists and other evaluators, how should we approach assessing CLD students’ cognitive abilities and academic achievement skills?
Loudoun County Public Schools Co-Evaluation Model
Today, we’ll walk through an assessment model that has been designed for practitioners by practitioners.

Since implementing it, we’ve been successful in making more informed decisions about whether Hispanic students’ underachievement is a function of a disability (SLD), language difference, or both.

Although the co-evaluation model involves bilingual evaluators, it also includes helpful principles for individuals, schools, and school systems who don’t have access to bilingual staff.
LCPS CO-EVALUATION MODEL

Child Study/Pre-Referral Process
Dual Language Evaluation
Language Proficiency/Dominance Testing
Educational Evaluation
Psychological Evaluation
Sociocultural Assessment
Eligibility
PRE-REFERRAL PROCESS: CHILD STUDY
A multidisciplinary, student-centered intervention team that engages in collaborative problem solving for general education students experiencing a variety of difficulties:

- Academic
- Behavioral
- Social
- Emotional
- Speech/language
### Child Study Team and CLD Students

#### Developmental History
- Where was the student born?
- How long has the student lived in the US?
- How long has the student lived outside of the US?
- Prenatal care?
- Have there been significant illnesses or hospitalizations?
- Were developmental milestones reached within normal limits?
- How has the child developed compared to siblings/other family members?

#### Language History
- What is the child’s native language?
- Is there a history of speech/language delays?
- What is the primary language spoken at home?
- Which language is primarily understood by the child?
- Are there concerns about the child’s language in L1?
- BICS
- CALP

#### Academic History
- When did the student begin attending school?
- What is the student’s enrollment history?
- In which language(s) has the child received academic?
- Have there been gaps in the student’s instruction?
- Is there evidence of academic difficulties?

#### Family/Cultural Factors
- Is there a family history of academic difficulties?
- What is the parent’s level of acculturation?
- What is the parent’s education level?
- How much homework support is available at home?
EL PRE-CST REFERRAL FORM

EDUCATIONAL AND LANGUAGE BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Completing the Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent or Guardian Providing the Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LANGUAGE BACKGROUND

- Where was the student born?
- How many years has the student lived in the United States?
- Has the student been outside of the United States for an extended period of time?
- If so, where and for how long?
- What languages does the student speak?
- What languages does the student understand?
- What is the student’s first language?
- If the student speaks English, at what age did this begin?
- Which languages are spoken at home?
- Which language is most often used to socialize (talking with family members, watching television/videos)?

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

- Before moving to the United States, did the student attend school?
- If so, how many years per week?
- If so, how many hours per day?
- Since beginning school, have there been any interruptions in the student’s education (not attending school for several weeks, months, or years)?
- What type of school did the student attend while in a different country?
- At what age did the student start school?
- In what language(s) was the education provided?
- What were the students’ grades or outcomes?
- Did your child learn to read in school before coming to the United States?
Required for ALL Dual Language Assessment Requests
Current HOME LANGUAGE Questionnaire
(Please print clearly)

Please obtain the following information by reviewing records and speaking directly with the student’s family.

Name of Student ____________________________
Date ____________________ Age ____________________
School ____________________________ Grade __________

This questionnaire was completed by _______________________

❖ Was the student born in the U.S.? ______ If not, what is the date of entry into the United States? ____________________________

❖ Which language(s) did the student learn when he/she first began to talk? ____________________________

❖ What language(s) does the student currently use most often at home? ____________________________

❖ What language(s) do the parents currently use most often to speak to their child? ____________________________

Educational History

How long has the student attended school(s) with English as the primary language of instruction? ____________________________

How long has the student attended school(s) with a language other than English as the primary language of instruction? ____________________________

What other language(s) has the student received academic instruction in? ____________________________

Has the student received English Language Learner (ELL) services? _______

Additional information/comments: Please use the back of the form.
DUAL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT
DUAL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT

- Completed when a language other than English is indicated on a K-12 EL students’ registration form to...
  - Determine home language proficiency and skills
  - Establish English proficiency and skills
  - Identify the dominant language(s), if any, for further evaluations
DLA: POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessments should be completed in L2
2. Assessments should be completed in L1 by an evaluator fluent in the child’s native language
3. Assessments should be completed in L1 and L2 by an examiner that is either fluent in both languages or using a co-evaluation method
LOUDOUN COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (LCPS)

English Language Learner (ELL)

Dual Language Assessment (DLA)

March 16 and 28, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: [Redacted]</th>
<th>Student ID: [Redacted]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School: Forest Grove Elementary</td>
<td>Date of Birth: [Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade: F</td>
<td>Chronological age: 9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Proficiency Level: 2.9 (out of 6)*</td>
<td>Home Language: Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Entry Date: Birth</td>
<td>Time in primarily English schools: 2 years**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCPS Entry Date: Mar. 20, 2014**</td>
<td>Time in Spanish Schools: 2 years**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*The English Overall Proficiency Level is based on the spring, 2015 administration of the WIDA (World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment) ACCESS for ELLs. **Prior to LCPS, [Redacted] attended school in Peru.</td>
<td>Dual Language Assessors: Linda Mejia, Victor Yager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prior Written Notice** indicates:
“The Child Study Teams suspects that [Redacted] may have an educational disability.”

*The purpose of the dual language assessment is to identify the dominant language(s) for possible further evaluation and assessment when requested by a committee in Loudoun County Public Schools (LCPS).*
It is recommended that further evaluations be administered in Spanish and English, preferably by a bilingual test administrator. However, if one is not available, then a trained interpreter may be utilized. Evaluators should also consider nonverbal testing, observation, and testing in English, using an interpretation system that helps to systematically identify and account for the effects of language and culture (i.e., Cultural-Language Interpretation Matrix-CLIM) for ELL students. This recommendation is based on:

- **Results of the administration of the dual language assessment instrument:** Which indicate that [student name] has developed an early intermediate level of speaking and an above proficient level of listening in English, while maintaining a proficient level of speaking and an above proficient level of listening in Spanish.

**Language Assessment System (LAS) Form A:** Links English Language Proficiency Assessment is an NCLB-compliant instrument that is used in Grades K-12 as a formal, standardized method of determining language proficiency. A combination of correct or incorrect responses, constructed response and multiple-choice items are used to provide the student with a variety of opportunities to demonstrate language proficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Scores</th>
<th>Spanish Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak in Words</td>
<td>Speak in Sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 out of 10</td>
<td>8 out of 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 out of 12</td>
<td>3 out of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 out of 4</td>
<td>22 out of 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 out of 5 Early Intermediate</td>
<td>37 out of 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 out of 20</td>
<td>10 out of 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 out of 5 Above Proficient</td>
<td>5 out of 5 Above Proficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TEST
In 2002, an Enhanced Assessment Instrument Grant provided initial funding for the organization that would become WIDA.

- Wisconsin (WI), Delaware (D), and Arkansas (A) were involved in the grant: WIDA, which led to the acronym.

- After Arkansas declined participation, World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment was created to fit the acronym.

- WIDA advances academic language development and academic achievement for children and youth who are culturally and linguistically diverse through high quality standards, assessments, research, and professional learning for educators.
States and schools use annual WIDA data to measure EL students’ language acquisition in the following domains:

- Listening
- Speaking
- Reading
- Writing

WIDA data monitor student progress, establish when ELs have attained English language proficiency according to state criteria, inform classroom instruction and assessment, and aid in programmatic decision-making:

- Raw Scores
- Domain Scores
- Composite Scores
- Scale Scores
- Proficiency Levels
# ACCESS for ELLs 2.0

**Sample Student**
- Birth Date: mm/dd/yyyy
- Grade: sample grade
- Tier: sample tier
- District ID: XXXXXXXXXXXXX
- State ID: XXXXXXXXXXXXX
- School: sample school
- District: sample district
- State: sample state

## Individual Student Report 2017

This report provides information about the student’s scores on the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 English language proficiency test. This test is based on the WIDA English Language Development Standards and is used to measure student progress in learning English. Scores are reported as Language Proficiency Levels and as Scale Scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Domain</th>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Scale Score (100–600)</th>
<th>Confidence Band</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4 (4.0)</td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3 (3.4)</td>
<td>250-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2.2</td>
<td>220-250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3.4</td>
<td>250-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3.5</td>
<td>250-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3.2</td>
<td>220-250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3.5</td>
<td>250-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3.7</td>
<td>250-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3.4</td>
<td>250-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Overall score is calculated only when all four domains have been assessed. NA: Not available.

## Domain | Proficiency Level | Students at this level generally can...

| **Listening** | 4          | understand oral language in English related to specific topics in school and can participate in class discussions, for example:  
|              |            | - Exchange information and ideas with others  
|              |            | - Connect people and events based on oral information  
|              |            | apply key information about processes or concepts presented orally  
|              |            | identify positions or points of view on issues in oral discussions  
| **Speaking** | 2          | communicate ideas and information orally in English using language that contains short sentences and everyday words and phrases, for example:  
|              |            | - Share about what, when, or where something happened  
|              |            | - Compare objects, people, pictures, events  
|              |            | - Describe steps in cycles or processes  
|              |            | - Express opinions  
| **Reading**  | 3          | understand written language related to common topics in school and can participate in class discussions, for example:  
|              |            | - Classify main ideas and examples in written information  
|              |            | - Identify steps in written processes and procedures  

---

This image includes a table and a diagram, which are not directly translatable into plain text. However, the table details the student’s scores across various language proficiency domains, and the diagram illustrates the scale scores and confidence bands for each domain. The table outlines the proficiency levels and scale scores for Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, Oral Language, Literacy, and Comprehension, each with corresponding confidence bands. The domain-specific abilities for each proficiency level are also provided.
• Scale scores take into account differences in item difficulty between test administrations
  • They can be compared over time and monitor a student’s growth within specific domains (i.e., Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing)
  • Although within-student comparisons are appropriate, educators should exercise caution in making between-student comparisons
    • Many factors impact individual students’ performance
  • Range = 100 to 600 (K = 100 to 400)
  • Note: because each domain has a separate scale, a 300 scale score in Listening is not equivalent to a 300 scale score in Speaking
Proficiency Level scores are socially-derived interpretations of the ACCESS for ELLs scale scores in terms of the 6 proficiency levels defined in the WIDA Standards:

- 1 = Entering
- 2 = Emerging
- 3 = Developing
- 4 = Expanding
- 5 = Bridging
- 6 = Reaching

They include a whole number and a decimal (e.g., 2.5)

To monitor a student’s growth over time, practitioners should use scale scores, not proficiency level scores, within each domain.
Students do not typically acquire proficiency in Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing at the same rate

- Depending on students’ L1 background, Oral Language proficiency (Listening + Speaking) can develop faster than Literacy (Reading + Writing)

- Similarly, Receptive Language proficiency (Listening + Reading) can develop faster than Productive (Expressive) Language (Speaking + Writing)

- Students’ foundation in their native language is a significant predictor of their English language development

- Those who have strong literacy backgrounds in their native language will most likely acquire literacy in English faster than
The Overall Score (Proficiency Level) is a summary of students’ performance in different areas

- **EL Level**

- Because it is *compensatory*, a particularly high score in one domain can raise a lower score in another domain
  
  - Note: similar overall scores can mask different strengths and weaknesses in specific domains between students
  
  - A review of permanent product and local assessment data should also be considered as evidence of a student’s English language development
WIDA: EXPECTED PROGRESS

• When considering language growth: lower is faster, higher is slower
  • WIDA research (Cook, 2007) showed that students at lower proficiency levels demonstrate faster growth than students at higher proficiency levels
  • Also, students in lower grades grow at a faster rate than students in higher grades.
  • Students **are not** necessarily expected to gain one proficiency level each school year
Figure 1: Percent of Students Gaining One or More Proficiency Levels in One Year by Grade Band and Proficiency Level
**Grade 2:**
If the student is an English Learner (EL), compare the student's ACCESS score from last year to this year using the table below. Did the student meet the progress requirement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level from previous year's assessment (17-18)</th>
<th>1.0-2.4</th>
<th>2.5-3.4</th>
<th>3.5-4.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Proficiency Level Gains (18-19)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grades 3-5:**
If the student is an English Learner (EL), compare the student's ACCESS score from last year to this year using the table below. Did the student meet the progress requirement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level from previous year's assessment (17-18)</th>
<th>1.0-2.4</th>
<th>2.5-3.4</th>
<th>3.5-4.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Proficiency Level Gains (18-19)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grades 6-8:**
If the student is an English Learner (EL), compare the student's ACCESS score from last year to this year using the table below. Did the student meet the progress requirement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level from previous year's assessment (17-18)</th>
<th>1.0-2.4</th>
<th>2.5-3.4</th>
<th>3.5-4.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Proficiency Level Gains (18-19)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
what do you think?
STUDENT A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaled Score</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Scaled Score</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Scaled Score</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaled Score</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Scaled Score</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Scaled Score</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WIDA: CAN DO DESCRIPTORS

**CAN DO Descriptors: Grade Level Cluster 1-2**

For the given level of English language proficiency and with visual, graphic, or interactive support through Level 4, English language learners can process and produce the language needed to:

**Level 1: Entering**
- Follow modeled, one-step oral directions (e.g., “Hold a pencil.”)
- Identify pictures of everyday objects as stated orally (e.g., “book”)
- Point to real-life objects as stated orally (e.g., “This is my pencil.”)
- Music gestures or movement associated with statements (e.g., “This is my left hand.”)

**Level 2: Beginning**
- Match oral reading of stories to illustrations
- Match two-step oral commands (e.g., “Take out your science book. Now turn to page 25.”)
- Sequence a series of oral statements using real objects or pictures
- Locate objects described orally

**Level 3: Developing**
- Follow modeled multi-step oral directions
- Sequence pictures of stories read aloud (e.g., beginning, middle, and end)
- Match people with jobs or objects with functions based on oral descriptions
- Classify objects according to descriptive oral statements

**Level 4: Expanding**
- Compare/contrast objects according to physical attributes (e.g., size, shape, color)
- Find details in illustrated, narrative, or expository text read aloud
- Identify illustrated activities from oral descriptions
- Locate objects, figures, places or details based on visuals and detailed oral descriptions

**Level 5: Bridging**
- Use context clues to gain meaning from grade-level text read orally
- Apply ideas from oral discussions to new situations
- Interpret information from oral reading of narrative or expository text
- Identify ideas/concepts expressed with grade-level content-specific language

**Listening**
- Repeat simple words, phrases, and memorized chunks of language
- Respond to visually-supported (e.g., calendar) questions about academic content with one word or phrase
- Identify and name everyday objects
- Participate in whole group chants and songs
- Use first language to fill in gaps in oral English (e.g., “I want a pencil.”)
- Restate facts or statements (e.g., “Jobs of community workers”)
- Compare real-life objects (e.g., “smaller,” “bigger”)
- Use basic social skills (e.g., “I need help.”)
- Express feelings (e.g., “I’m happy because…”)
- Explain an action picture (e.g., “Jobs of our community workers”)
- Compare the details of objects (e.g., “short” vs. “tall”)
- Make predictions or inferences
- Distinguish features of content-based phenomena (e.g., “caterpillar,” “butterfly”)
- Ask questions of a social nature
- Express feelings and opinions (e.g., “I’m happy because…”)
- Participate in class discussions on familiar social and academic topics
- Tell stories from pictures (e.g., “how and why they feel that way”)
- Participate in class discussions on familiar social and academic topics
- Compare the details of objects (e.g., “short” vs. “tall”)
- Make predictions or inferences
- Distinguish features of content-based phenomena (e.g., “caterpillar,” “butterfly”)
- Ask questions of a social nature
- Express feelings and opinions (e.g., “I’m happy because…”)
- Participate in class discussions on familiar social and academic topics
- Tell stories from pictures (e.g., “how and why they feel that way”)
- Ask questions for social and academic purposes
- Participate in class discussions on familiar social and academic topics
- Tell stories with details
- Sequence stories with transitions
- Use academic vocabulary in class discussions
- Express and support ideas with examples
- Give oral presentations on content-based topics
- Initiate conversations with peers and teachers

The CAN DO Descriptors work in conjunction with the WIDA Performance Definitions of the English language proficiency standards. The Performance Definitions use three criteria (1. linguistic complexity; 2. vocabulary usage; and 3. language control) to describe the increasing quality and quantity of students’ language processing and use across the levels of language proficiency.
CLD students are not monolithic.
TYPES OF BILINGUAL STUDENTS

SEQUENTIAL BILINGUALS
- Learn L1 before L2
- Often are immigrant students

SIMULTANEOUS BILINGUALS
- Learn L1 and L2 at the same time
- Majority of ELs in the United States
- 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} generation ELs
TYPES OF ELs

**SIMULTANEOUS**
- Born in the United States, but grew up in homes in which another language was spoken
- Live in communities where L1 is primarily used to communicate
- Oral proficiency in L1, but may not have learned to read and write in L1

**LONG-TERM**
- Have attended US schools for at least 5 years
- May be orally bilingual (social language), but have limited literacy and academic language in both L1 and L2
- Literacy skills fall below grade level expectations, which could be the result of inconsistent schooling and/or EL support
- Require substantial and ongoing language and literacy support
- Can have negative attitudes toward school due to lack of academic success
TYPES OF ELs

NEWCOMERS WITH ADEQUATE FORMAL SCHOOLING

• Have been in the US for up to 5 years
• Parents are educated speakers in L1
• Have a strong foundation in L1
• Adequate schooling in L1
• Able to transfer academic concepts quickly
• Perform low on standardized tests
• Easy to catch up to monolingual peers after a few years of English language support

NEWCOMERS WITH LIMITED FORMAL SCHOOLING

• Have been in the US for up to 5 years
• Parents may have low literacy levels
• Limited L1 and literacy skills
• Interrupted schooling or no previous formal education
• Perform poorly on achievement tasks
• Could have difficulty learning
BILINGUALISM: LEVELS OF PROFICIENCY

Dominant Bilingual
Equilingual
Semilingual*
LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT
Oral language proficiency assessments include a 2-step process:

- Assess students’ oral language proficiency in L1 and L2
- Compare their proficiency levels to determine language dominance

Note: although using parallel oral language assessments is not necessary, it can be helpful as some oral language assessments measure different aspects of oral language.

It is generally accepted that students must have oral language proficiency (CALP) levels between 4.0 and 6.0 in order to adequately manage grade level instructional demands.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Development</td>
<td>An individual at the Initial Development level is at the preproduction or silent stage of academic language learning, requiring substantial instructional scaffolding in the classroom environment for effective learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Development</td>
<td>An individual at the Early Development level is in the early stages of academic language learning, requiring moderate to substantial instructional scaffolding in the classroom environment for effective learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Development</td>
<td>An individual at the Continuing Development level has sufficient conversational proficiency to interact with others in day-to-day situations and is beginning to grasp academic language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Proficiency</td>
<td>An individual at the Emerging Proficiency level demonstrates understanding of the specialized academic language required in the school setting but still requires some instructional scaffolding in the classroom environment for effective learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>An individual at the Proficient level has achieved language proficiency comparable to that of average native-language speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Proficient</td>
<td>An individual at the Advanced Proficient level has achieved proficiency at a level above that of average native-language speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION SKILLS</td>
<td>COGNITIVE ACADEMIC LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students are able to communicate their basic needs and wants and have social conversations</td>
<td>• Students are able to communicate thoughts and ideas with clarity and efficiency and have more advanced social conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1-3 years to develop</td>
<td>• Studies cite 5-7 or 7-10 years to develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insufficient to facilitate academic success</td>
<td>• Necessary for academic success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research shows that students with a CALP Level of ____ will find the language demands of learning grade level academic material...

- 6.0: Very Advanced = Extremely Easy
- 5.0: Advanced = Very Easy
- 4.5: Fluent to Advanced = Easy
- 4.0: Fluent = Manageable
- 3.5: Limited to Fluent = Difficult
- 3.0: Limited = Very Difficult
- 2.0: Very Limited = Extremely Difficult
- 1.0: Negligible = Impossible
A language proficiency evaluation should be completed under the following circumstances:

• The DLA indicates that further assessments should be completed in **Spanish and English** (the order is significant)

• The student has recently received primary core academic instruction in Spanish **and** has limited skills in English (see DLA)

• The student’s overall WIDA Proficiency Level is 1 (Entering) or 2 (Beginning)

• The evaluator suspects that language difference may be affecting the student’s academic performance
After language dominance and proficiency have been established, the evaluation team may recommend the following:

- Academic skills and cognitive abilities should be evaluated in the dominant language (L1 or L2)
- Academic skills and cognitive abilities should be evaluated in L1 and L2 (e.g., co-evaluation); particularly important if the student has received formal instruction in L1 and L2
A monolingual evaluator completes academic skills and/or cognitive ability assessments in English.

A bilingual evaluator completes follow-up assessments in areas that fell below normative expectations and/or on subtests that contain high levels of linguistic loading.
Based on the information presented, in which language(s) should the student be evaluated?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBTEST</th>
<th>ENGLISH STANDARD SCORE</th>
<th>CALP LEVEL</th>
<th>SPANISH STANDARD SCORE</th>
<th>CALP LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Analogies</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Directions</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Expression</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Vocabulary</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Recall</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT: WMLS-R
EVALUATE THE STUDENT IN ENGLISH
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBTEST</th>
<th>ENGLISH STANDARD SCORE</th>
<th>CALP LEVEL</th>
<th>SPANISH STANDARD SCORE</th>
<th>CALP LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Analogies</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Directions</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Expression</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Vocabulary</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Recall</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT: WMLS-R
EVALUATE THE STUDENT IN ENGLISH AND SPANISH
EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
When assessing CLD students’ academic skills and interpreting their performance, evaluators should consider the following:

- Years of academic instruction in L1 and L2
- Age of initial exposure to the language of current academic instruction
- Opportunities to learn
- Quality and consistency of education—including instructional gaps
- Oral language skills
- SES and other cultural factors that could impact learning
EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION: INSTRUMENTS

- The following academic achievement batteries were reviewed by a panel of monolingual and bilingual (Spanish-speaking) educational diagnosticians to determine their degree of linguistic demand and cultural loading.
- Additionally, each assessment was compared in terms of the test directions’ linguistic complexity.
- Considering these characteristics, each assessment was ranked from least (1) to most (3) complex for CLD students.
1. Bracken School Readiness Assessment, Third Edition
BASIC READING SKILLS: WORD RECOGNITION


BASIC READING SKILLS: DECODING

1. KTEA-3: Nonsense Word Decoding

2. WJ-4: Word Attack

3. WIAT-3: Pseudoword Decoding
SENTENCE READING FLUENCY
1. KTEA-3: Silent Reading Fluency
2. WJ-4: Sentence Reading Fluency

ORAL READING FLUENCY
1. WIAT-3: Oral Reading Fluency
3. WJ-4: Oral Reading

READING COMPREHENSION
1. KTEA-3: Reading Comprehension
2. K-2: Passage Comprehension: WJ-4
3rd grade and ↑: Reading Comprehension: WIAT-3
3rd grade and ↑: Passage Comprehension: WJ-4

READING VOCABULARY
1. KTEA-3: Reading Vocabulary
2. WJ-4: Reading Vocabulary
MATHEMATICS

MATH COMPUTATION
1. KTEA-3: Math Computation
2. WIAT-3: Numerical Operations
3. WJ-4: Calculation

MATH FLUENCY
1. KTEA-3: Math Fluency
2. WIAT-3: Math Fluency
3. WJ-4: Math Facts Fluency

MATH PROBLEM SOLVING
1. KTEA-3: Math Concepts and Applications
2. WIAT-3: Math Problem Solving
3. WJ-4: Applied Problems
WRITING

SPELLING
1. KTEA-3: Spelling; WIAT-3: Spelling
2. WJ-4: Spelling

WRITING FLUENCY
1. KTEA-3: Writing Fluency; WIAT-3: Alphabet Writing Fluency (K-3)
2. WJ-4: Writing Fluency

WRITTEN EXPRESSION
1. KTEA-3: Written Expression
2. WJ-4: Writing Samples
3. WIAT-3: Sentence Composition
ORAL LANGUAGE

ORAL EXPRESSION

1. KTEA-3: Oral Expression

2. WIAT-3: Oral Expression

LISTENING COMPREHENSION

1. KTEA-3: Listening Comprehension

2. WIAT-3: Oral Discourse Comprehension
PHONOLOGICAL PROCESSING

1. KTEA-3: Phonological Processing
2. CTOPP-2: Phonological Awareness
PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION
THE STATE OF THE FIELD

- Fluent, bilingual school psychologists are not common in United States public school systems.
- There is no universally accepted standard of what degree of language proficiency is required to function as a bilingual school psychologist.
• The mere possession of the capacity to communicate in an individual’s language does not ensure the use of appropriate, nondiscriminatory procedures
• All evaluators require training in nondiscriminatory procedures
• It is possible to effectively assess and work with CLD students without being bilingual
NON-DISCRIMINATORY ASSESSMENT

• **CONTEXTUAL: MULTI-INFORMANT**
  • Those who know the child are invited to make meaningful contributions to better understand the child’s development within a broader ecological context

• **CONTEXTUAL: MULTI-METHOD**
  • Quantitative and qualitative data are collected through standardized assessments, structured and unstructured interviews, and structured/unstructured observations
  • RIOT (Hass & Kennedy, 2014)
  • Record Reviews, Interviews, Observations, Test
STANDARDIZED TESTS
Because all children are different, school psychologists select the best instruments to assess their abilities and effectively answer referral questions.

- There is no perfect instrument.
- Even when clinicians use the best instruments to evaluate CLD students, we can still reach the wrong diagnostic and eligibility decisions.
- Because people, not instruments, make decisions, the instrument is only as good as the clinician using it.
School psychologists need to question the validity of the tests that they administer to ELs as those students are typically left out of standardization samples.

Figueroa and Newsome (2006) reported that the school psychologists surveyed in their study deemed that neither language nor cultural background issues played primary roles in the students’ academic difficulties, despite the fact that 68% of the students were not tested in their native language nor was language proficiency assessed. School psychologists sometimes engage in poor practices when evaluating ELs, thereby increasing the likelihood of these students being inappropriately placed in special education.
Consider the following data, and share your impressions of the student.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHC Ability</th>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluid Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Series</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concept Formation</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystallized Intelligence</td>
<td>Oral Vocabulary</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Information</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Storage and Retrieval</td>
<td>Story Recall</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Borderline Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Auditory Learning</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Working Memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Attention</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers Reversed</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memory for Words*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Processing</td>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picture Recognition</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phonological Processing</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonword Repetition</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter-Pattern Matching</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pair Cancellation</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Intellectual Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td>Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Cultural Loading</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WJ 4 Visualization 118</td>
<td>WJ 4 Letter Pattern Matching 72</td>
<td>WJ 4 Concept Formation 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WJ 4 Number Series 84</td>
<td>WJ 4 Numbers Reversed 82</td>
<td>WJ 4 Verbal Attention 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Level</td>
<td>93-95</td>
<td>90-93</td>
<td>85-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WJ 4 Picture Recognition 86</td>
<td>WJ 4 Visual-Auditory Learning 95</td>
<td>WJ 4 Phonological Processing 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WJ 4 Pair Cancellation 91</td>
<td></td>
<td>WJ 4 Nonword Repetition 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Level</td>
<td>90-93</td>
<td>85-90</td>
<td>80-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WJ 4 Oral Vocabulary 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WJ 4 General Information 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WJ 4 Story Recall 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80-85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values are average scores and expected levels for different tests under different degrees of linguistic demand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest/CHC Broad Ability Area</th>
<th>Scaled Score</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story Completion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern Reasoning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluid Reasoning</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Knowledge</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crystallized Intelligence</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Borderline Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-Term Retrieval</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Borderline Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Recall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Borderline Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Order</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short-Term Memory</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Borderline Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rover</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Processing</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid-Crystallized Index</td>
<td>78</td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Degree of Linguistic Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KABC-II Triangles</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>KABC-II Number Recall</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>KABC-II Rebus</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KABC-II Pattern Reasoning</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KABC-II Atlantis</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Level</strong></td>
<td>93-95</td>
<td><strong>Expected Level</strong></td>
<td>90-93</td>
<td><strong>Expected Level</strong></td>
<td>85-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Level</strong></td>
<td>93-95</td>
<td><strong>Expected Level</strong></td>
<td>85-90</td>
<td><strong>Expected Level</strong></td>
<td>80-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Level</strong></td>
<td>85-90</td>
<td><strong>Expected Level</strong></td>
<td>80-85</td>
<td><strong>Expected Level</strong></td>
<td>70-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Level</strong></td>
<td>80-85</td>
<td><strong>Expected Level</strong></td>
<td>70-80</td>
<td><strong>Expected Level</strong></td>
<td>70-80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...the knowledge required to answer the verbal questions, for example, gets in the way of measuring the child’s ability to think (intelligence)...

Jack Naglieri
I was taught that cognitive ability tests measure attainment, the sum of formal and informal learning experiences and opportunities.

Mark Shinn
FACT

TRUTH
FACT < TRUTH
SOCIOCULTURAL ASSESSMENT
ELIGIBILITY
Eligibility Committee

- Parent
- Teacher
- Administrator
- School Psychologist
- Educational Diagnostician
- Eligibility Coordinator
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Visual, hearing, or motor disability</strong></th>
<th><strong>Intellectual Disability</strong></th>
<th><strong>Emotional Disability</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Limited English proficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lack of appropriate instruction in reading and math</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AN ANALOGY FROM THE JUSTICE SYSTEM
AN ANALOGY FROM THE JUSTICE SYSTEM
RISK RATIOS: WHERE WE WERE...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Risk Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HISPANIC AND SLD: PERCENTAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPLICATIONS FOR ETHICAL PRACTICE AND POLICY
PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

- Continually talk about issues related to disproportionality with supervisors, directors, colleagues, teachers, and school-based administrators
- Continually seek professional development opportunities
- Loudoun County Public Schools Office of Diagnostic and Prevention Services English Learner Assessment Guidelines (October 2018)
Fundamentally, some of our students are not being adequately served through general education programming.

As a result, a disproportionate amount are referred to pre-referral teams. We identified more Hispanic students because we were prematurely evaluating more Hispanic students.
WE MUST IMPLEMENT GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMMING, PRACTICES, AND POLICIES THAT ARE DESIGNED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS
...if we believe that all students can learn, but some are not, we must critically examine why this is happening and correct our professional practice.
When a significant number of students are not making sufficient progress in the curriculum, the main thing is not our ability to design clever interventions and monitor progress. The main thing is redirecting our energy and resources to understand why this is happening. The main thing is addressing systemic barriers to ensure that all students have access to the highest quality educational experiences.

...more than universally screening and placing students in different tiers, which we do quite well, increased attention should be given to ensuring that all teachers are equipped to meet the needs of students who have diverse backgrounds and lived experiences.
For school psychologists who are invested in improving outcomes for young people, seeking to understand why before suggesting what is more than a semantic difference but fundamentally necessary in order to keep the main thing the main thing.
Bilingual Education and Second-Language Acquisition

Results aggregated from a series of 4- to 8-year longitudinal studies from well-implemented, mature programs in five school districts. Program 1: two-way developmental bilingual education (BE); Program 2: one-way developmental BE, including ESL taught through academic content; Program 3: transitional BE, including ESL taught through academic content; Program 4: transitional BE, including ESL, both taught traditionally; Program 5: ESL taught through academic content using current approaches; Program 6: ESL pullout taught traditionally.

![Graph showing Patterns of K-12 English learners' long-term achievement in NCEs on standardized tests in English reading compared across six program models. From Thomas and Collier (1997, p. 53). Copyright 1997 by Wayne P. Thomas and Virginia P. Collier. Reprinted by permission from Wayne P. Thomas and Virginia P. Collier.](image-url)
BETHLEHEM AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT
Scientific research has shown how children learn to read and how they should be taught. But many educators don’t know the science and, in some cases, actively resist it. As a result, millions of kids are being set up to fail.
In 2015, 56 percent of BASD 3rd graders scored proficient on the state reading test.

Although some wanted to use poverty as an excuse, data showed that students in the district’s wealthier schools were not reading very well either.

According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, since the 1990s, 60+ percent of the nations’ 4th graders are not proficient readers.
EVIDENCED-BASED INSTRUCTION

...virtually all kids can learn to read — if they are taught the right way. The problem is that many American elementary schools aren't doing that... Kids must be explicitly taught how to connect sounds with letters — phonics.

The battle between whole language and phonics got so heated that the U.S. Congress eventually got involved, convening a National Reading Panel to review all the research on reading... The sum of the research showed that explicitly teaching children the relationship between sounds and letters improved reading achievement. The panel concluded that phonics lessons help kids become better readers.
They decided the first step would be a series of training sessions over the course of a school year for all the principals at the district's 16 elementary schools. The district leaders reasoned that the principals needed to be convinced of the science if they were going to convince their teachers to change the way they taught reading.

The Bethlehem schools now use a curriculum in the early elementary grades that mixes teacher-directed whole-class phonics lessons with small-group activities to meet the needs of children at different points in the process of learning to read.
In 2015... more than half of the kindergartners in the district tested below the benchmark score... At the end of the 2018 school year... 84 percent of kindergarteners met or exceeded the benchmark score. At three schools, it was 100 percent.
DATA: 2015 VS. 2018
WHAT ABOUT HISPANIC STUDENTS?
WHAT ABOUT POOR STUDENTS?
SCHOOL A

- Percent Hispanic = 77
- Percent Poverty = 97
- 2015 Percent Proficiency = 30
- 2018 Percent Proficiency = 69
- Percent Progress = +39
SCHOOL B

- Percent Hispanic = 65
- Percent Poverty = 90
- 2015 Percent Proficiency = 28
- 2018 Percent Proficiency = 60
- Percent Progress = +32
SCHOOL C

- Percent Hispanic = 61
- Percent Poverty = 83
- 2015 Percent Proficiency = 51
- 2018 Percent Proficiency = 93
- Percent Progress = +42
SCHOOL D

- Percent Hispanic = 62
- Percent Poverty = 78
- 2015 Percent Proficiency = 32
- 2018 Percent Proficiency = 83
- Percent Progress = +51
Percent Hispanic = 77
Percent Poverty = 94
2015 Percent Proficiency = 40
2018 Percent Proficiency = 72
Percent Progress = +32
SCHOOL F

- Percent Hispanic = 51
- Percent Poverty = 73
- 2015 Percent Proficiency = 75
- 2018 Percent Proficiency = 92
- Percent Progress = +17
...if we believe that all students can learn, but some are not, we must critically examine why this is happening and correct our professional practice.
Because disproportionality is an outcome, school psychologists must critically examine the manner in which we assess diverse students that contributes to disproportionate outcomes.

- What instruments were used to assess ELL students (Ortiz, 2017)?
- Do they provide valid data about ELL students’ abilities and skills?
- Was my clinical interpretation of standard scores appropriate?
- Was the manner in which I made decisions appropriate?
Equality:
The assumption is that everyone benefits from the same supports. This is equal treatment.

Equity:
Everyone gets the supports they need (this is the concept of “affirmative action”), thus producing equity.

Justice:
All 3 can see the game without supports or accommodations because the cause(s) of the inequity was addressed. The systemic barrier has been removed.

EQUALITY   EQUITY   LIBERATION
6 CONSIDERATIONS FOR UNDERSTANDING ENGLISH LEARNERS: PRE-REFERRAL IMPLICATIONS
EL STUDENTS ARE FACED WITH THE CHALLENGING TASK OF SIMULTANEOUSLY LEARNING ENGLISH AND ACADEMIC INFORMATION
Dearest creature in creation,
Study English pronunciation.
I will teach you in my verse
Sounds like corpse, corps, horse, and worse.
I will keep you, Suzy, busy,
Make your head with heat grow dizzy.
Tear in eye, your dress will tear.
So shall I! Oh hear my prayer.
Just compare heart, beard, and heard,
Dies and diet, lord and word,
Sword and sward, retain and Britain.
(Mind the latter, how it's written.)
Now I surely will not plague you
With such words as plaque and ague.
But be careful how you speak:
Say break and steak, but bleak and streak;
Cloven, oven, how and low,
Script, receipt, show, poem, and toe.
Hear me say, devoid of trickery,
Daughter, laughter, and Terpsichore,
Typhoid, measles, topsails, aisles,
THE PROCESS OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREPRODUCTION</td>
<td>Develop receptive vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not yet speak their second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY PRODUCTION</td>
<td>Able to speak in short phrases of one or two words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can memorize portions of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEECH EMERGENCE</td>
<td>Vocabulary (approximately 3,000 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can communicate using simple questions and phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERMEDIATE FLUENCY</td>
<td>Vocabulary (approximately 6,000 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can use more complicated sentence structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can share their thoughts and opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May make frequent errors with more complicated sentence structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED FLUENCY</td>
<td>Reached after 5-10 years of learning the language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can function at a level that is comparable to native speakers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICALLY EXAMINE STUDENTS’ RATE OF PROGRESS RATHER THAN THEIR BENCHMARK PERFORMANCE
• Although applicable to all students, this is especially important for ELs
• School teams should consider EL students’ rate of progress by using various progress monitoring tools
• Although they may not be meeting benchmark expectations, if they have demonstrated one year’s progress within one year, despite continuing to perform below grade level expectations, this is typically not indicative of a disability
• Concerns should arise when a student is not only performing below grade level expectations but their rate of progress is also slower than typically developing peers
SOME EL STUDENTS’ WRITTEN EXPRESSION ABILITIES WILL LIKELY BE THE LAST TO DEVELOP—THEY ARE AN INTEGRATION OF READING AND SPELLING SKILLS
IN ADDITION TO WHAT IS BEING PRESENTLY OBSERVED IN ENGLISH-SPEAKING/US SCHOOLS, GATHER INFORMATION ABOUT STUDENTS’ PERFORMANCE IN THEIR NATIVE LANGUAGE/COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
HISTORICAL INFORMATION

- Can be obtained through school records (when applicable and/or available) from the native country.
- Parent/family interviews can also provide rich contextual information about similarities and differences between students’ performance in L1 and L2.
- Are speech and language concerns also evident in the native language?
- Did the child experience difficulty learning to read in the native language?
LANGUAGE DIFFERENCE IS NOT SYNONYMOUS WITH DISABILITY
• If a child is legitimately disabled, there should also be evidence of this in the native language
• However, if disabling characteristics are not reported in the native language, the team should critically examine whether the child’s academic performance (e.g., underachievement) is better explained as a function of language difference and its associated implications
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