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Agenda

• Data
• What is required in an EVALUATION?
• Language Difference vs. Language Disability
• Interventions and the Pre-referral process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>New York State</th>
<th>Buffalo</th>
<th>NYC</th>
<th>Rochester</th>
<th>Syracuse</th>
<th>Yonkers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcomers</td>
<td>177,078(65.4%)</td>
<td>3754(60.9%)</td>
<td>100940(62.1%)</td>
<td>2838(63.5%)</td>
<td>3040(74.8%)</td>
<td>2070 (57.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing ELLs</td>
<td>63,126(23.3%)</td>
<td>1581(25.6%)</td>
<td>41300(25.4%)</td>
<td>917(20.5%)</td>
<td>656(16.1%)</td>
<td>986(27.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term ELLs</td>
<td>30,577(11.3%)</td>
<td>833(13.5%)</td>
<td>2028(12.9%)</td>
<td>368(9.1%)</td>
<td>578(15.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Inconsistent/Interrupted Formal Education</td>
<td>12,211(4.5%)</td>
<td>83(0.5%)</td>
<td>70(0.1%)</td>
<td>390(9.6%)</td>
<td>48(1.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Students with Disabilities / Differently abled ELLs/MLLs</td>
<td>58,326(21.5%)</td>
<td>1069(17.3%)</td>
<td>40116(24.7%)</td>
<td>949(21.2%)</td>
<td>519(12.8%)</td>
<td>654(18.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disability Classifications

Most evaluations over identify ELLs with Learning Disabilities and Speech or Language Impairments.
What does the federal law say?

Under IDEA 2004, all students are entitled to an evaluation with evaluation materials that are free from cultural and racial biases.


(c) Crowley 2014-2018

AND

Under IDEA 2004, all students are entitled to an evaluation with evaluation materials that are able to distinguish a disability from:

Lack of adequate instruction in reading;
Lack of adequate instruction in math; or
Limited English proficiency.


(c) Crowley 2014-2018

How are students currently evaluated?

Standardized Assessments:

- Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI) (FSIQ)
- Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children – Fifth Edition (WISC-V) (FSIQ)
- Wechsler Individual Achievement Test – Third Edition (WIAT-III) (Academic Achievement)
- Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundaments-4 Spanish* (Language and Communication Skills)
- Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals-5 English* (Language and Communication Skills)
- Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test™ Fifth Edition (PPVT™-5) (Receptive Vocabulary)
Why are ELLs/MLLs over identified with disabilities?
What is the problem with standardized assessments?

Our students are not accurately represented in the sample population!
The WPPSI-III (Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence) Technical and Interpretive Manual, p. 122

- Recommends that neither the VIQ nor FSIQ be used as an estimate of intellectual ability or children with limited English proficiency
- Children in LEP* group have significantly lower scores than the matched control group of VIQ and FSIQ
- LEP* is defined to include English dominant bilingual children—these children are likely to also be incorrectly identified as “intellectually disabled” using the WPPSI-III
- Native Spanish speakers performed lower despite being fluent in English
Clinical Evaluation of Language fundamentals

CELF-5 Disclaimer

Due to cultural and linguistic biases (e.g. exposure to books, knowledge of SAE, syntactic and grammatical structures, low frequency vocabulary words, known questions) and assumptions about past knowledge and experiences, this test should only be used to probe for information and not to identify a disorder or disability or used in educational placement decisions. The Examiner’s Manual suggests variations in scoring and administration be made for students from culturally diverse backgrounds, with dialectal variations or motor, sensory or cognitive impairments. However, should modifications be made, the authors caution against the use of scaled scores, standard scores, percentile ranks or age equivalents (Examiner’s Manual, pg. 21).
Disclaimer within an Evaluation

PLEASE NOTE: According to the New York Board of Education Test Resource Guide, Vol. V (1997 Edition, p. 10) and in accordance with Federal IDEA (Individual with Disabilities Education Act) laws, specifically §300.532 “Test scores should not be reported for students for whom the normative sample is not representative. In these cases, qualitative and descriptive information about the student’s performance on the tasks covered by the test should take place of a score.” The Preschool Language Scale-5 Spanish Edition (PLS-5), Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation-2, and Assessment of Phonological Processes-Spanish (Hodson) have NOT been standardized on children of this student’s bilingual/bicultural background. Therefore, although these assessment tools were used as a guideline in assessing the student’s language skills, formal test scores will not be reported. Assessment results are presented in a descriptive, qualitative manner with reference to the literature to more accurately reflect the child’s current level of linguistic functioning. Stimuli were first presented in Spanish and when the student did not respond correctly in Spanish, the missed item was then presented in English.

https://www.esboces.org/cms/lib/NY01914091/Centricity/Domain/64/Bilingual%20Specialist/EISN%201-24-19/10.%20example%20of%20a%20culturally%20and%20linguistically%20diverse%20speech-language%20evaluation.pdf
Interpreting Evaluation Results and Use of Standardized Scores

Assessment scores of culturally and linguistically diverse students should only be reported if the tests are valid for the purposes for which they are intended and are determined not to be culturally, linguistically or racially discriminatory. It is inappropriate to use standard scores from tests that fail to assess an ELL student based upon norms reflective of the student's culture and linguistic background.

For translated tests and other tests that do not meet appropriate validity, discrimination and standardization criteria, personnel must analyze the information gathered during the assessment process and use clinical judgment to provide a qualitative analysis of the student's abilities, strengths, and needs. This qualitative analysis should be supported by examples and qualitative descriptions of the student's performance on the various skill sets assessed so that the reader of the evaluation can understand the basis for the quantitative and qualitative statements contained in the evaluation.

School districts and, in the case of preschool students, multidisciplinary evaluation programs approved pursuant to section 4410 of the Education Law must assure that the persons conducting evaluations understand how to review the documentation provided on assessments in order to determine their validity for children who are ELLs. When interpreting evaluation results, care must be taken that issues of language differences are not confused with language disorders and that patterns of performance related to the student’s socio-cultural background or interrupted schooling are not mistaken for signs of a disability.
“Diagnosing children as language disordered or delayed and placing them in a special education program when they may not require the services has many long lasting and detrimental consequences. These consequences may include a limited and less rigorous curriculum (Harry & Klingner, 2006), and lowered expectations which can lead to diminished academic and post-secondary opportunities (National Research Council, 2002; Harry & Klingner, 2006) and higher dropout rates (Hehir, 2005).
2013 Cohort
ELL/MLL Dropout by Subgroup

Alternative to standardized tests

- Dynamic Assessments (*less biased and more valid than the current commercially available static assessments*)
- Language samples (*one of the least biased assessment tools currently available for clinicians*)
- Interviews of parent (research validated to be highly correlated with accurate identification)
  - Teacher and student interviews
  - Observations in different settings

---


---

Dynamic Assessment *Example*

**Narratives**

- Narratives transcend cultures and are a bridge to literacy
- Skills targeted: Syntax, morphology, pragmatic function coherence, concept development
- Differences
  - Latino children do not follow a linear model; less emphasis on sequencing
  - African American children contain more description and subjective input
  - Hawaiian children: “Talk-story” (rambling personal narratives)
  - Chinese children: Emphasis on interdependence, social hierarchy, and personal humility
  - Gender styles
- Prompts for Narratives
  - Wordless picture books, new life experiences (vacations, new siblings), toys or pictures from home
  - SLAM cards
- Macrostructure vs. Microstructure

Rovalino, J. Acquiring Narratives [PDF document]. Retrieved from Teacher’s College Lecture Notes
Crowley and Baigorri SLAM (School-age Language Assessment Measures)

Bunny Preschool and Elementary Language Elicitation Cards

a. Can you put these in order?

b. Tell me the story of what happened? [Narrative and clausal density]

c. Why did the bunny jump out of the backpack? [Theory of mind and inferencing]

d. Why are some students afraid? Why are some laughing?

e. What would you do if a bunny started hopping around your classroom? [problem solving]

f. What was the boy’s idea? [Eliciting theory of mind]

g. How did the mom know she had to come to school? [Inferencing from teacher on phone.]

h. Why did she come to school? [Inferencing Mom’s role]

i. What do you think will happen when the boy goes home? [Predicting outcomes]

j. What is the teacher thinking now? [Theory of mind]
Language Sample *Example*

Strategies for Eliciting a Representative Language Sample from Preschoolers & Elementary School Students

- Use puppets and toys, guiding the conversation to create certain situations.

- Use a toy car and ask child to speculate where it might go. Then it has a flat; what would happen?

- Create a scene with a birthday party.

- Use a doll house and comment about what is happening.

- Use broken toys to enhance a dialogue.

- Ask the child what he or she did that same day or the day before; inquire about the child’s family, favorite pastimes, or toys.
Parent & Teacher Interviews

THE CRITICAL QUESTIONS
WITHOUT THE ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS WE CANNOT DISTINGUISH DISORDER FROM “SOMETHING ELSE.”

Parent Interview
Evaluator must personally interview parent to allow for reframing of questions, follow-up and clarification to collect the essential data. Parent interview best done before evaluator sees student so can know about language acquisitional history and what to expect re dialect/language/vocabulary/prior experiences/etc.

1. Language/dialect acquisitional history?
   a. Includes exposure over time to languages and dialects
   b. Often includes immigration patterns and acculturation
   c. If sequential bilingual important question is how was development of L1 (or D1) before introduction of L2 (or D2)
   d. Percent of day in the different languages
   e. Check whether the family speaks an indigenous language

2. Parent’s highest education level?

LEADERSproject.org Test reviews, model evaluations, important research, videos on preschool evaluation modules, etc., etc., etc.
Psychoeducational Evaluations

Profile A:
- Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children – Fifth Edition (WISC-V)
- Wechsler Individual Achievement Test – Third Edition (WIAT-III)
- Parent Interview
- Clinical Observation

Profile B:
- Student Interview
- Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Fourth Edition (WISC-IV)
- Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement (WJ-III)
- The Acculturation Quick Screen (AQS)
- Parent Interview

Profile C:
- Review of Records
- Parent Report
- Teacher Report
- Narrative Analysis
- Language Sample
- Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals-4 Spanish*
- Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals-5 English*
- School Aged Language Assessment Measures (SLAM)
- Lost Cell Phone (Crowley & Balgorri 2014)
- Subway Picture (Crowley & Balgorri 2014)
- Behavioral Observations
- Clinical Judgment
Clinical Judgement

Challenges with dynamic assessment? Evaluator must have *clinical judgment.*

If the task is too hard, it will be too hard for both the typically developing students and the students with language disorders (specificity).

If it is too easy, the students with language disorders will also pass and so it won’t separate the typically developing from the language disordered (sensitivity).
The key consideration in distinguishing between a difference and a disorder is whether the child’s performance differs significantly from peers with similar experiences.

(Wolfram, Adger & Christian 1999:105)
(c) Crowley 2014-2018
Language Difference or Disability? Or BOTH??

# Language Difference vs Language Disability

## TOOL #2
CONSIDERING THE INFLUENCE OF LANGUAGE DIFFERENCES AND DISABILITY ON LEARNING BEHAVIORS

Differentiating language and literacy acquisition from disability can be difficult for some educators. The following table illustrates learning behaviors that a student might exhibit in class, followed by corresponding indicators of whether that behavior could represent a language difficulty or a potential learning disability. By determining the root of each student’s difficulties, educators can select the most appropriate and effective teaching and learning strategies to use.

## COMPARISON OF LANGUAGE DIFFERENCES VERSUS DISABILITIES

This tool is taken from Meeting the Needs of English Learners with Disabilities: Resource Book by Jarice Butterfield, Ph. D., Santa Barbara County SELPA, on behalf of the SELPA Administrators of California Association. In the tool below, L1 refers to the student’s native language and L2 refers to the student’s second language (English). It is reprinted with permission of Dr. Butterfield.

### Oral Comprehension/Listening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Behavior Manifested</th>
<th>Indicators of a Language Difference due to 2nd Language Acquisition</th>
<th>Indicators of a Possible Learning Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student does not respond to verbal directions</td>
<td>Student lacks understanding of vocabulary in English but demonstrates understanding in L1</td>
<td>Student consistently demonstrates confusion when given verbal directions in L1 and L2; may be due to processing deficit or low cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student needs frequent repetition of oral directions and input</td>
<td>Student is able to understand verbal directions in L1 but not L2</td>
<td>Student often forgets directions or needs further explanation in L1 and L2 (home &amp; school); may be due to an auditory memory difficulty or low cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student delays responses to questions</td>
<td>Student may be translating question in mind before responding in L2; gradual improvement seen over time</td>
<td>Student consistently takes a longer time period to respond in L1 &amp; L2 and it does not change over time; may be due to a processing speed deficit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>BIO Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jing Li | - Seven-year-old girl  
- Family Immigrated to the US from Vietnam two years ago  
- Prof. level: Transitioning  
- Demonstrates motivation to learn and to improve her English  
- Imitates peers and attempts all assignments  
- Socializes in Vietnamese with other Vietnamese speakers  
- Struggles with listening and speaking skills, especially her pronunciation, in English  
- Difficulty following directions  
- Omits final consonants sounds such as -at, -et, -ea, -wa, this affects her writing  
- Grade level teacher suspects a hearing impairment |
| Miguel | - Twelve-year-old boy  
- Born in US  
- Family Immigrated to US from El Salvador  
- Prof. level: Expanding  
- Has trouble decoding words  
- Weak spelling and writing skills  
- Reading and writing skills in Spanish are also weak  
- Overall weak motivation  
- Able to recognize multiple meanings of vocabulary words  
- Becomes easily frustrated  
- Socially fluent in English  
- Has conversations with friends in both languages, code-switching |
| David | - Fourth-grade student  
- Family Immigrated to US from Dominican Republic one year ago  
- Speaks Spanish  
- Prof. level: Entering  
- Difficulty in early literacy skills and auditory processing  
- Below grade level in phonological-awareness, decoding, writing and listening/language skills  
- Independent writing tasks includes mostly random letters, unable to segment a simple word to write the sounds he hears  
- History of high anxiety, difficulty with change, low frustration-tolerance when engaging in academic tasks. |
| Latin | - 13-year-old boy  
- Family Immigrated from India two years ago  
- Speaks Punjabi and Hindi, family states that he reads and writes in Punjabi  
- Lives with extended family who speak English, parents do not speak any English  
- Prof. Level: Emerging (was transitioning last year)  
- Wants to be an engineer  
- Finds social studies to be most difficult subject  
- Rarely completes written assignments in class or at home  
- Does not vocalize a need for help  
- Teachers claim that he stares blankly when responding to questions  
- Highly concerned with grades and graded assignments in the school's online school data system  
- ENL teacher states that he is silent in core classes but disruptive during standalone ENL classes |
| Faha | - 15-year-old Somali girl  
- Born in refugee camp in Kenya  
- Speaks Somali, some Arabic, and some English  
- Immigrated to the US 1 year ago  
- Prof. level: Emerging  
- SIFE student  
- Unable to activate prior knowledge  
- Lack of fluency  
- Math teacher states “processing issue”  
- Slow to process challenging language |
Chapter 13
Spanish

GENERAL INFORMATION

- Number of speakers: More than 405 million speakers worldwide; 37 million speakers above the age of 5 in the United States (U.S. Census, 2010)
- Writing system: Roman script, 27 letters and 3 digraphs ("ch," "ll," and "rr")
- Language Family: Indo-European—Italic—Romance
- Official languages: Spain, Colombia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Cuba, Bolivia, Honduras, Paraguay, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Panama, Equatorial Guinea, Puerto Rico, Mexico, Chile, Argentina, Dominican Republic

DEVELOPMENTAL NORMS FOR SPEECH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>/m, b, p/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>/k, l, w, y, t, f, n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>/r, g, d, r, ʃ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>/x, s/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>/r/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This information is based on the age at which 90% mastery is expected. (Acevedo, 1992; Jimenez, 1987)

DIFFERENCE OR DISORDER?

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS FOR LANGUAGE: MORPHOSYNTAX

Note: Sentences marked with an asterisk (*) are awkward or not grammatical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Examples of Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word order</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Strict Subject-Verb-Object order's</td>
<td>The ball he threw.* / He threw the ball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessives</td>
<td>noun+of+person</td>
<td></td>
<td>The car of my mom is blue? My mom's car is blue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>Adjective follows noun</td>
<td>Adjective precedes noun</td>
<td>The ball big bounced.* / The big ball bounced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present tense verb inflection</td>
<td>5-6 forms, determined by subject: Yo como</td>
<td>2 forms: I eat</td>
<td>She talk to me.* / She talks to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tú comes</td>
<td>You eat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Él/Ella/Los, comemos</td>
<td>He eats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nosotros comemos</td>
<td>We eat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellos comen</td>
<td>You all eat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They eat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of subject pronouns</td>
<td>Pro-drop</td>
<td>Pronoun is always required</td>
<td>Looks for the frog* / He looks for the frog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular past tense</td>
<td>5-6 forms, determined by subject</td>
<td>She walk to the store* / She walked to the store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double object pronoun</td>
<td>Can be used</td>
<td>I saw him the man* / I saw the man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double negative</td>
<td>Cannot be used</td>
<td>I don't want to do nothing* / I don't want to do anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question formation</td>
<td>Questions marked by inflection or question words</td>
<td>Questions marked by word order inversion, question words, or addition of do</td>
<td>You give me a sticker?* / Will you give me a sticker?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What you think?* / What do you think?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose verbs</td>
<td>Verbs with multiple meanings that do not always correspond to English</td>
<td>Verbs with multiple meanings that do not always correspond to Spanish</td>
<td>We can go?* / Can we go? I have 4 years* / I am four years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you have hunger?* / Are you hungry?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Bedore, Peña, & Kester, 2007; Goldstein & Iglesias, 2006; Kester & Gorman, 2004; MacWhinney & Bates, 1989)
Importance of the Pre-referral Process

- Reduces unnecessary or unwarranted referrals to special education
- It is a multi-faceted process, which takes into consideration socio-cultural factors such as culture, experiences, language acquisition/development, learning style, and acculturation
- It is designed to identify presence of issues or not
- Documents student performance with the use of Pre-referral interventions
- It can assist educators in implementing alternative education strategies (RTI) for the student before a formal referral to special education
- Problems which appear to be indicators of a disability can actually be related to acculturation. (Collier, 1998).
Pre-referral Checklist for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) Students

STEP 1
Initiate the prereferral process using the Prereferral Process Checklist to guide the team through this process.
- Assign a person to coordinate the prereferral process for the CLD student who is referred
- Interview the person who made the referral to the prereferral team to find out more information about the reason for the referral

STEP 2
Conduct a comprehensive review of student academic records.
- Years of formal education
- Frequency of school attendance
- Number of schools attended in the past
- Learning difficulties noted in the native country
- Language of instruction in native country

STEP 3
Review family history including cultural and economic background.
- Collect information about socioeconomic background, family member(s) educational level, occupation
- Collect information about family cultural background including ethnic group, country, beliefs, language
- Collect medical history information from parent/guardian including vision/hearing evaluations
- Assess differences in school and home behavioral expectations, using family survey/interviews
- Conduct assessments for acculturation level and sociocultural factors
- Conduct ecological/environmental assessments of student in home and community settings

STEP 4
Gather information about language dominance and the student's motivation to learn English or to speak in his/her native language.
- Examine previous or current test information concerning dominant language
- Obtain information from a Home Language Survey (may have been conducted during school registration)
- Assess language dominance if no determination has been made

STEP 5
Gather initial information about a student's proficiency in the use of language (in English and native language).
- Basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS)
- Academic screenings
- Work samples
- Classroom observations

STEP 6
Review services, interventions, and strategies previously used by the student in most recent classroom environment. Conduct ecological/environmental assessments of classroom as needed.
- Identify the types of services used by the student
- Identify student's learning style
- Identify the dominant language that student receive instruction
- Identify types of classroom adaptations including accommodations and/or modifications used in the regular or bilingual classroom, when they were implemented, and their effectiveness

STEP 7
Decide on possible classroom interventions and strategies based on information collected and team discussion.

STEP 8
Document the effectiveness of prereferral interventions and strategies over a time period that is determined by the team.
- Use a form(s) to document the process

STEP 9
Decide whether or not a referral for special education is warranted, refer to other services (e.g., Chapter 1, ESL), or continue with the same interventions and strategies.
ELL INTERVENTION CHECKLIST

Student’s Name: __________________________ Date: __________________________
Teacher’s Name: __________________________ Grade: __________________________

Directions: Highlight interventions implemented; indicate approximate dates, data, and a description of evidence measuring student’s improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Modifications</th>
<th>From/To</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Description of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional literacy instruction from Reading Specialist (including T1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional ESL support from an ESL Tutor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional math instruction (including Title 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Community Volunteer support or tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary language support (peer/cross-age tutor, bilingual aide, parent/community volunteer) if available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials provided in native language supporting classroom themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Interventions</th>
<th>From/To</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Description of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Instruction Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications of assignments to academic level and language proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired with same language peer (peer tutor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired with English speaking peer (peer tutor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic regrouping, e.g., with group that has same-language peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent involvement through conferences, class visits, assistance at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior contract or Individual Behavior Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Take-A-Ways

• Language differences are different from language disabilities

• Patterns of performance related to socio-cultural background and interrupted schooling are not to be mistaken for sign of a disability.

• Assessment materials and procedures used to assess an ELL/MLL must be selected and administered to ensure that they measure the extent to which the student has a disability and needs special education, rather than measure the student's English language skills.

• Assessments and other evaluation materials used to assess a student must be provided and administered in the student's native language.

• Standardized assessments are not always reliable assessment materials for ELLs/MLLs

• The Committee on Special Education must include at least one individual who is knowledgeable about the student's English and home language development needs Part 154-2.3(a)(9)(i)

 Being an ELL is not a disability.
 Being bilingual is an asset.
 Appropriate services and assessments are key.