

“Using CBM to Progress Monitor English Language Learners”
Presented by Dr. Laura Sáenz

March 11, 2008

Hi. We will be getting started in just a few moments but before we hear from our presenter. We would like to review technical details about offer suggestions and guidelines. Logging in to the technology, if you encounter any difficulties, contact a live meeting support staff at 1-866-493-2825. We will post that phone number in the Q&A window for your convenience. Please use the Q&A window for posting content. Winch you open the tab in order to type in a question place your cursor in the smaller box in the type, type your question and click ask. Please note that your anonymity is protected and your name does not appear in the box. Dr. Sáenz based on your question. Posted on our website shortly after the Webinar. Live meeting Webinar has recently been updated. You cannot type more than one question unless your previous question has been answered. There is no way to fix this now, we are working with live meeting an hope it will be fixed soon. We are pleased to have our event captioned by a captioner joining us online. You will be able to access the captioning transcript. You were prompted to enter your name and organization. Resize the captioning window to a size that suits your needs. You may also move it to a more vent location and drag it with your mouse. If you prefer to not view the captioning, you close out of the window and it will disappear from your view. The audio portion of this session, will be recorded so that it will be available online later. In order to produce the best quality, we have muted for all the background noise. Please use the question and answer tab at the top of the screen. At this point we will begin recording.

Good afternoon, I am pleased to welcome you to the Webinar on behalf of the student progress monitoring. Is a technical assistance center funded by the office of special education programs. Proven to work in different content areas through grades K-5. We are fortunate to have Dr. Sáenz of special education at the university of UT-Pan American. On using English language learnings. Has over ten years experience working in the field of special education. Her latest research in an peer assisted strategies. It is my pleasure to turn things over to Dr. Sáenz.

Can you hear me Rebecca?

If you would move closer to the phone, that would help.

Could you hear me now?

Not too much better.

Okay. Then I will -- can you hear me now?

I will use the receiver. Good afternoon everyone. I'm going to start with just going -- giving you on overview of today's presentation. As Rebecca said if you have any questions, I know we're going to have limited time to respond to those. I will try to get back to you with a response or Rebecca will help you to help you with things in general. What the presentation will look like today. If you look at the second slide, in part one of the presentation, I will tell you a little bit

about myself because it's relevant to today's discussion. The region of the country I teach and where schools are struggling to understand what changes in specific learning disability determination means for them. I'm also going to introduce some basic ELL terminology and programming. In the second part of 2 presentation, I will provide a definition of progress monitoring and curriculum-based measurement. I'll give background on CBM where the emphasis is discussing what I see as perceived benefits and limitation or English language learners. CBM type materials for English/Spanish learners. RTI model. Might afully to English language learners. Much of this is based on my perception of working with school of English language learners. I will walk you through the process of using CBM in an RTI model. I will share again what I consider to be some potential advantages and unique challenges of the RTM model for English language learners. As we move along here, you have a picture of what it looks like so you have a mental image of that. I give a little background on the part of the state of Texas where I'm at. I know we have people from Texas on the line who know a lot about the region. I think it's relevant to my experience. A special education located in the southern most tip of Texas. The population statistics are about 600,000 and 80% of residents identify themselves as Hispanic of course. Other than English is spoken and 99% of those homes Spanish is the other language spoken. It might be different from some of you might be experiencing in your part of the country. We are the poorest county in the nation. Perhaps not outside of our state. I did grow up in this region of Texas and was a special ed teacher here before working on advanced and returning back here to teach to people who are from Texas this part of the state is refer today as the rei owe brandy valley. Had continue the work with schools who are trying to understand what responsiveness to intervention means because we haven't begun to implement it in this part of the state and how CBM might reflect in the model. On going challenges for schools in this region of the state is how to make appropriate decisions about children who are struggling academically and might be attributable to factors other than LD, such as limited first language and/or second language. As I move on through the presentation today, I start with a disclaimer, I want to make a statement that I'm not a school psychologist. I am what I consider an interventionist, what is happening in the classroom and the instruction that is provided that perhaps children play not be responding to. We're trying to understand how that might fit in to our various sort of approaches to teaching English language learners in this part of the state. A common definition of the English language learners is very definitions that might exist. When we're talking today about students who speak a linkage other than English and in the process of learning English. These are students who could benefit from ELL support services, may be receiving the services or may have met the state criteria but could benefit from the services. This does not include fluent bilingual students. Demographics about English language learners that we see this increase in the number of earnings LL students across the country with tremendous ethnic and academic diversity among this population. We know the largest and fastest growing is the His pannish Spanish speakers. Regions of the country in many different ways so that in some places may have a few ELL, small pockets of English language learners from different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. You may have many ELL from the same ethnic and linguistic background like here and in places like California. The types of programs that they kids might find themselves in and you may have in parts of your country is English emergence programs by define or by default. Or what I consider by default happens in the legion of the state where I'm from bilingual denials. Unfortunately some instances of bilingual classrooms for ten tire population is ELL. We have a bilingual certified teacher but it's not taking place as it should. We have English emerging programs with ELL pull out or pull in services. Maintenance goal is to

teach English while preserving the first language. Instruction in their first language and are transitioned at some point. We also have two way or dual language programs that is sort of emerging in this part of the state as well. Instructed in both languages and the goal is to become fully literate in both the first and second language. Ideally you have a child who is English dominant paired with a child who is dominant in the other language. The reality in south Texas don't have a lot of progressive parents in dual language parents so we have classrooms of all English or Spanish dominant children. That may be different in other places. Some of the issues that we're facing include the following. One, increasing accountable in ELL with no child left behind. This is not led to improved practices. One very common thing that we see here is a lot of teaching to the test and that is sort of our high stakes test. We have not successfully closed the gap between minorities including ELL kids and other children. Non-ELL. What we see and we see in more and more reports of this happening where ELL students are meeting state standards but when the same population is tested on national standards they are not meeting the standards. Not making academic progress who are ELL.

Another on going challenge with this particular population is that we've had a lot of research that has really focused on debates of the language of instruction, not so much the substance of instruction. In other words the non-ELL population, we have this knowledge base of effective practices. We do have an emerging base of effective practices but nowhere near the non-ELL children. And sort of some background to kind of begin our discussion of what RTI and progress monitoring might look like progress monitoring from curriculum-based measurement. Some of you who may have a lot of background on CBM and others who may not. Extensive background to what CBM is and kind of guide you in the direction of finding additional sources where you can read more about it. I will pause at this part of the presentation to answer any questions. Progress monitoring is conducted frequently and focuses on individualized decision-making and general ed and special education with respect to academic. We then can make build more effective programs for children who are not making the progress we would expect. Finally it helps us compare different approaches and curricula and design for effective instructional programs. Working definition of what progress monitoring is. As we go through the presentation, CBM is one form of progress monitoring we will be discussing but there will other forms of progress monitoring. If you are interested in the progress monitoring tools, see the national center website where a technical review committee has reviewed progress monitoring tools. CBM is a procedure where a child's standing is in a particular academic domain and assess the ongoing competence or growth over time in an academic domain, the two most commonly CBM procedures. What we have with CBM is a yield a score, doesn't tell us everything a child is able to do in mathematics and reading. But -reading what is the competence in that domain. In reading we use words read correctly from a grade level package. Math example, we use number of digits correct. There are online Webinars that have been done before as well as online training materials to see specifically about the other CBM approaches and how to use those. CBM research has been researched for almost 30 years and the research has demonstrated when the teachers use CBM, use the data it helps to instruct the informational making. More aware of their own performance. CBM is something a lot of special educators know about, less general educators know about it. Responsiveness to intervention models. It's not something that's just been recently been developed. Over the course of this 30 years, CBM has been established as reliable and valid. You can do a very simple literature search and find hundreds of studies on CBM. The -- just to make our discussion easier today, I put examples of the CBM tasks in

reading. The CBM tasks in reading that exist are presented on the table in front of you, however what you will find is that of these, some of them are more commonly used than others. For example in kindergarten the sound fluency is most commonly used. In second and third grade the passage reading fluency task is used and in 4th and 5th grade the maze fluency task is used. Find that information. If you're interested in looking at the specific reading tasks and understanding how to administer, how to score, how to set goals and make decisions you can turn to a self-based online module. I provided the website there for you. One of the distinguishing features of curriculum-based measurement. With CBM, each test is an alternate form of across the academic year. It gets the generalization. The measures are given at regular intervals. That frequency is determined by student needs. Students who are most at risk are assessed more often. Another distinguishing feature of CBM is that the data is used to determine goals and progress towards those goals. So what we have are the end of the year goals that are established. Those are based on national norms for expected weekly rate of growth or benchmarks. On going evaluation, progress toward meeting those goals. With CBM we have an important feature that we play the data graphically. Some of the current uses then the screening data are organized to allow for comparison of both groups. That is a class and individual performance. It tells us again, in this way it inform school leadership about a particular classroom or teachers who need additional support. Who are potentially at risk for not acquiring the academic skill. Establishment of cut scores which are either based on national norms or local norms for predicting performance on criterion measures and students who are falling below these cut stores are students that we might watch. The second common use of curriculum base measured is monitor student to determine the appropriateness of instruction in general ed classroom. Assess struggling students. Are still not CBM can be used to help IEP goals and objectives and determine whether kids are meeting those goals and objectives. We have increased accountability in special education. So the basic idea is we sort of conduct an initial assessment using CBM, assess students regularly, perform establish goal. Use CBM graph to determine if goal needs to be increased. CBM trend line, what is the child's trend look like versus the goal line. Are they working toward meeting that goal. What is their rate of both look like? People use the term slope to rate of growth. How much are they improving over time? We use the CBM for point method to determine more on going and frequent instructional changes. I'm going to sort of -- you can look at the progress monitoring online. You will find manuals that will walk you step by step through how to look at each one of the following, the graphs, how to calculate trends and stuff like that. The slopes. Want to walk through them to give you Aponte of reference with ELL kids. One thing we look at is the trend. You'll see this is a child's graph CBM graph. Broken line is a child's goal line and pointing to the goal line. Where we expect the child to be at the end of the 14 weeks of the instruction. This particular child is not making -- based on the trend line, the progress that we would hope that they would be making. That would indicate it's time to make an instructional change. You see the dark vertical line, instructional change is going to be made.

This is a little more, give people brain cramps, I guess. When we look at slope. This is a slope and it's really as simple as looking at rate of growth over time. Progress monitoring tools refer it to rate of improvement, ROI as well. Over this nine weeks of instruction, what did we see for this particular child? What was their rate of improvement or rate of growth over that time period? For this particular child, we see it was .5. We're looking at points correct. It would be digits correct, points correct. Who should have had a slope of .70. This indicate this child is not responding to the instructional program. Slope is just a way of looking at rate of improvement or

growth over time. We'll come over to examples if time permits today. We have this rule of if we have 4 consecutive data points where do they fall? If they fall above the goal line, obviously the child is making progress and want to increase the goal for that child. Four data points that are below the data goal line, time for an instructional change. Those were all examples using when it might be necessary to make an instructional change.

When we consider curriculum-based measurement, again we're focused to is English language learners. Again, much of this is my perceived benefits because we have very limited research for English language learners. How this is going to fit in their model of RTI. What are the potential benefits of using curriculum based measurements? ELL kids, we have informed instructional decisions. So teachers can use CBM data to determine when it is necessary to adjust instruction for all ELL kids so they can look at class performance. It may be a class that consists of all kids who are ELL, some who are ELL. We can use that data to determine overall, are all ELL kids making progress in general education. Most ELL kids are making progress and only a few are not. Question use CBM da to to adjust instruction for those ELL kids who may be struggling. More information and better information to help us make those instruction decisions at the class level as well as at the student level.

Another potential benefit of progress monitoring with curriculum-based school leaders might be able to use the data to identify teachers who might need additional support. I want to emphasize additional support. For teachers for some reason who may need additional support. In schools that serve high numbers of at-risk children including ELL kids. Research seems to suggest that those types of schools have the least qualified or prepared teachers. Again it helps to focus on those teachers who might need the most support. Another potential benefit of progress monitoring, with CBMEELL kids, we have reduced subjectivity of making statements of adequate progress. A reduction of the statements that this child has been here as listening as this other child has, and they're not making sufficient progress and so what is sufficient progress mean? We have some data to indicate that a child is really indeed not making progress and not just making progress but when we're looking at a child who is similar to that child in many, many different ways.

It also changes the emphasis from identifying low performing students to finding what works for those students. Fine tune the instruction to meet the unique needs of English language learners. For those who have been special educators for many years, this is not a unique idea. It is a unique idea sometimes to again ed teachers -- general ed teachers and bilingual teachers.

What are the limitations of curriculum-based benefit. Limitation is we have very few studies of CBM with ELL. I think they are all of four studies. If you are interested in those studies, email me with those and I will respond with the citations. Among those few studies, some suggest that some measures may be more or less sensitive to growth for English language learners depending on the measure you are using. In a study done by baker and good with second grade Hispanic kids, compared to English only groups reliable and valid as it is for English only students. However in another study a first graders Greeffs and found again that for two other measures oral reeding fluency for first graders were consistent with previous findings however English language were below benchmarks. If we're looking for benchmarking for study, that's important to understand. The rate of growth among in that age group, significantly lower than non-ELL

kids. In general classrooms. They did find however that growth approved across the grades with 5th graders showing the most consistent. Their conclusion was this is consistent of what we know about cognitive academic proefficiency taking longer to develop. Some may be sensitive and how it may be dependent upon age. Very few studies of this. It's a significant limitation with ELL kids. A need to continue to do that research and schools may need to engage in the research themselves.

CBM with ELL. I'd like to move onto talking about one of the common questions, do we have measures that exist for ELL kids? Obviously given the large number of Spanish speaking children in schools we do have unique learners. Pannish reading CBM. I've given you those websites that you can turn to. Some of you may be using those. Again, on this table you'll find the various measures for Spanish speaking English language learners. There's a column for the IDEL and the MIDE measures. That we also have in English. All of those in you look at the description they're exactly what you would see in English so kids are expected to say letter names or non-sense words. What is unique to the Spanish language is kids are taught to read using the syllable. So I provided examples so we can see what they might look like. I apologize if those are very small.

One unique measure that is put out by the Ames web folks for early literacy. With syllable segmentation fluency, this requires opportunity toos to pronounce or repronounce words presented orally for a clear separation between syllables so you have words with two, three and four syllabled included. This is syllable segmentation. Credit is given for each read correctly. Some unique syllabled including in there well. With a Q and with a C. We have syllable and word spelling. Unique again, this is from MIDE measures Ames web. Require students to write orally presented words or syllable. At first grade it would be words. They've given credit for correct word and letter sequence for this.

I'm going to go ahead and this is a good time to stop for questions.

Doesn't face the same sort of or doesn't come from the same sort of background that child does. Relevant point of comparison if we have some local norms to work with. We can also look at where the schools within a district is campus or making enclose rooms within a campus are making sufficient progress.

One of the questions is what are primary level -- the biggest herd l we have is what language do we conduct the assessment in? Do they receive been. Marking in that whatever the language of instruction is is what we should be assessing children. Instructed in Spanish and throughout the academic year, they should be benchmarked in Spanish and we should also -- progress monitor throughout the academic year. That doesn't go to say you cannot consider English. But the important question is the Spanish or what they're being instructed in.

For the 140 languages, those kids obviously the best that we have to go with are existing CBM measures, we have limited research on the reliability and validity of the measures for that

population. Maybe beginning to do what I call action research in collecting data at the district level to establish some norms for those ELL populations.

(Captioner: please type in your questions in the Q&A post box through the website. My line is on mute.).

One question should all identified English range badge learners progress monitoring in their home language. I think it's important, it would be important to determine what is happening with the child. Obviously this child's home language is Spanish. That if the child's home language is Spanish, it would be important to see are they losing their first language as they are acquiring the second language. So that would be ideal if we're able to do that.

I'm going to move onto the next part of the presentation. There are a lot of questions that have to do with general questions like CBM slope and things of that nature. I'll go ahead and move on. Go and try to get to them as soon as we possibly can, either at the end of the presentation or later in written form and the answers will be posted on the progress monitoring website.

Again, lots of talk about what is responsive to intervention. I know there might be quite a few of you who are school psychologists who have talked about what is responsiveness to intervention. There is a possibility on the line we may have people who are from bilingual ed or who are ELO coordinators. This is a relatively new idea. Spend time defining responsive to intervention. I won't spend too much time doing that. What is responsiveness to intervention. This is the definition that is provided by mallard and Johnson. It is a process of instruction assessment and intervention that allows schools to identify struggling students early, provide appropriate interventions and increase the likelihood that students can be successful and maintain their class placement. This is a definition that was afterred by these particular authors who are at the university of Kansas. This is where I see it promising for ELL students. If we can begin to see that this is not a special education issue. It is an even's issue. It is a general -- everyone's issue. With responsiveness to intervention we can enhance instruction and outcomes for kids. With RTI we have an emphasis in eliminating inadequate or appropriate instruction as sort of an explanation of why kids might be struggling academically. We also see an emphasis on early intervention. Providing and not waiting for children to fall behind their peers before waiting to get services. Eventually the services are in the form of special education. We wanted to catch kids before that happens. The three general purposes of responsiveness to intervention is number one, screening and prevention of academic failure. Number two, early intervention. So we have again, idea allows for 15% of part B funds to be allocated to intervening services and the third, general peropus of RTI is evaluation and diagnosis for special education. The emphasis really here should be it serves as one component for determination. It is not the component or determination of whether the child will be identified as the child who needs special services.

Why responsiveness to intervention? The national -- this is -- comment from the national joint commission on learning disabilities. To those who are special educators, this is something we are well aware of, we have concerns about the inadequacy of the inability IQ discrepancy model. What we often see is that special education is used as a service or as a way to provide additional

support and services to struggling learners who don't necessarily have a learning disability or other disability. Some times what we see is a method to provide support for English language learners, minority students and so on. Increasingly special education population is looking more and more disproportionately who are ELL and so on backgrounds. Why responsiveness to intervention for English language learners? Again, the national commission on LD addressed these issues and specifically addresses kids from minority groups and disadvantage groups and so on. One reason is the increased accountability for all learners including ELL within the general education environment. That's one reason why we should consider RTI for ELL kids. It's also intended to promote collaboration and shared responsibility. We sort of are hopeful that it will eliminate those are your students, these are my students mentality for children who might be struggling. We have the reduction of inappropriate referrals. Progress monitoring and more precise definition of English language learners. Depending on the region of the country and depending on the category of disability. In spite of these benefits or positive things about RTI for ELL the national joint commission on LD also identified and specifically taken this quote from the national joint commission on LD report, specifically identified RTI and the potential limitations or pitfalls of RTI for ELL. That is -- there are students that are underachievers and who do not respond for intervention for reasons other than LD. This includes environmentally disadvantaged, minority and English language learners who are overrepresented within the population of underachieving students and students who are at risk and need specialized instruction but not necessary special ed for certain reasons. We've got to understand that there may be other reasons or we need to stop and think about what might be the other reasons as to why the child may or may not be responding to the intervention. So I think really what the national joint commission on learning disabilities is addressing. It's going to stay with the challenge of applying the and limited English proficiency. However, research suggests that eligibility teams either neglect to apply the exclusion clause or find it so very difficult to do because so many factors are interrelated such as cultural differences and poverty. Why in spite of maybe being perceived as experts on bilingual programming we still struggle. We see an overrepresentation. LEP kids in our special ed classrooms. We have the on going challenge. While it can be promising we still see the word of caution. What are the assumptions of the RTI model?

The first assumption is that student capacity varies therefore outcomes are going to vary. RTI considers the fact that educational outcomes differ. Ultimately perform less well than his or her peers. All students do not achieve the same degree of academic competence just because reading or math growth is low, it doesn't mean the student should automatically receive special education services. We do want to see progress from all children. General education must be effective and we must have evidence that most students are thriving in general ed classroom. This is where progress monitoring using CBM could be beneficial. It puts the focus on looking at the environment. What we're doing is working for most kids and most kids are thriving in that environment. A third assumption of the LTI model is that we should continue to try alternate methods for who are not thriving. We have -- thriving. May not be thriving and we should test alternate methods. Students are teachable and instruction may need to be modified to meet students needs. When most are not thriving, general education instruction could be ineffective or inappropriate. If we have evidence that tells us the good majority of kids are not making the expected progress, then it indicates that something needs to change depending on whether that is a campus-wide problem or a class-wide problem. Considers that as well.

What I'd like to do is talk a little bit about what the assumptions might mean, of the RTI model might mean by English language learners. Outcomes will vary. This is not meant to suggest, I think for English language learners that we lower expectations because I think that's my biggest concern about this particular assumption is we will lower expectations for particular groups such as English language learners or we will explain their low achievements because of their backgrounds. So being from at risk or disadvantage backgrounds does not mean reduce capacity to learn. It shouldn't translate to that at all. Eligibility teams will still need to consider whether low academic outcomes can be attributed to limited English proficiency or other disadvantage and the eligibility teams should work to seek evidence of capacity to learn before suspecting a disability.

Again the second assumption of the RTI model and kind of considerations for English language learners, the second should be students should be thriving in that general environment. We have to have evidence that establishes that. Those who are not may need intervention. Most includes ELL kids. Appropriateness of instruction should include ELL students. And that might mean specifically looking at subgroup analysis and so we have our monitoring data. We look specifically at kids who are from different populations. Not just ELL kids but in this case to determine whether they are thriving in the general ed environment. So we might need to do some sort of a break down by populations or by subgroups to determine whether the general ed environment is effective for ELL kids. We need to sort of eliminate the statements of most students are doing well except our ELL and excusing it these kids are not done well, they come from that particular school or that particular part of the district and eliminating the notion. We should have evidence that most kids in most environments are working and making progress. The data that teachers should collect should help improve teacher instruction for all kids including ELL students. Specialized interventions started ELL should begin in the general ed environment. Especially when it's clear that the school is not making enough progress to meet the needs or is failing to meet the needs of most ELL students. The third assumption of the RTI model is that if a student is not thriving but all the other students are thriving then we should try alternative methods. Again, this assumption is based on data indicating the efficacy of existing interventions for most ELL students. In this case we're looking now at the individual student. That student who in spite of everything is working well for most ELL kids this student is struggles. When we try alternative methods they should be validate with English language learners. A test teach test modified model. If you think of the graphs that I showed earlier in the presentation today, this is something again that special educators have been doing all along. It's hard however with ELL kids because we don't have the research-base to turn to for practices. Alternative methods be based on theories of ELL. But at least they are based on what we know about teaching kids who are from ELL backgrounds. You provided evidence of that as well.

We should only turn to alternative methods when it's been demonstrated that most ELL kids are making progress with the exception of the students in question or the student in question. Then finally, the 4th assumption of the RTI model of ELL students and again considering what this might mean for them is that if most are not thriving, then it's very possible -- the general ed environment needs to be campenned. -- examined. Very narrow, the classroom or it could be the school. It could be the district depending again on the population of the ELL kids. What we're saying here most includes ELL students. So we have the specifically examine the quality and

effectiveness of instruction for ELL kids. We should only consider an evaluation for special education after we have demonstrated that this child is not responding to high quality effective instructions. So we've got that evidence to support that. We've eliminated poor instructional quality as an explanation of poor performance for ELL kids. I think the bottom line is that we can't just say what we're doing is working and it's working for most kids but we have to go beyond that. What we're doing and it's working for these particular groups and we have evidence to support those claims of what we're doing is working. Because what may work for non-ELL students may not have the same sort of effect for kids who are ELLs. So we can't make those generalizations about practices.

The RTI assumptions and the models that sort of followed after these RTI assumptions are based on two central ideas. Adequate or appropriate instruction and the second is responsiveness. I'd like to introduce some considerations for these two central ideas. I want to start with talking about adequate instruction. Obviously we've got to begin with the scientific evidence about what works, but there are researchers who have specifically looked at sort of cultural consideration for ELL students and instruction. So Klinge are what works with whom and under what circumstances. What they say is we go beyond looking at the what works from just an outcomes or quantitative perspective and ask us to consider the social context in which the interventions will be applied. Incurred qualitatively or the how of best practices. We can probably -- these authors suggest that we can learn as much from non-responders as we can from responders about the what works with whom and what context and under what circumstances. When we look at adequate instruction for ELL kids, we shouldn't just be satisfied with a statement of yes we are providing quality instruction or not. It should be followed with treatments of validity. Classrooms should be observed so that we know we selected best practices and are implemented with fidelity. And finally, when we're talking about adequate instruction, usually we're also looking at culturally responsive instruction. Again, turning back to Klinger and the education systems and they put out a position statement on RTI. They pretty much suggested it's too simplistic to look at student factors and explain lack of progress with certain interventions without looking at and considering additional factors. They suggested that it's not just a matter of looking at does the child have access to key resources, but what is the nature and implementation of school activities? They ask us to consider classroom and school culture. So for some of us and me included, this is harder for me to think about because it's a lot more subjective about what is culturally sensitive. Manage coming from the special ed background, how can I objectively measure that. Culturally responsive instruction is something that's difficult for us to measure and put our finger on. Some of the things -- facets of culturally responsive concerns and hopes are of the parents, try to gain cross cultural skills. Collaboration with parents and other interested parties. We have an environment where there's a request for opportunities and a -- respect for students. A lot of this has to do with sort of trying to examine our personal biases and considering and working through the biases and putting systems in place so we are able to collaborate with communities and parents and so on. It's not just about whether this particular intervention works because it may be ineffective intervention. But have we made sure we're being culturally responsive? That's particularly important for kids who are from ELL backgrounds, where the dynamic is happening to what is happening to the child. The next consideration is responsiveness. One of my specific concerns is what do we do when ELL kids are consistently not making progress? It's very likely that our ELL kids are going to be in that population of kids we consider to be at risk for many, many reasons. But what are we going to do

if an ELL child is not making progress? That's something I think, in this particular part of the state, I know the schools are going to consider looking at that more closely. Specifically just population that is not making progress and that means we need to have a systems change. Something needs to change about what we're doing. Finally with respect to responsiveness, when we're looking at the responsiveness of ELL kids, schools will need to consider whether responsiveness for a particular child or group of children is going to be based on published norms, local norms, norms just for ELL students and what those different comparisons might -- what kind of information might be yielded from those different comparisons. I'm going to make an attempt to try to get to some of the questions.

(Captioner:if you have questions, please submit them to the Q&A box in the website. My line is on mute.).

Learn their vowels with consonants reflect that skill rather than isolated letters. All of the syllable skills, I think the one I would turn to specifically is the syllable reading skill that can be applies to kids who are being taught at the syllable level. Syllable reading fluency. I think this question sort of was brought up earlier.

If instruction is only in English is it also important to as is Spanish? Look at whether instruction is working. So yes, the English asisesment is going to be important but the Spanish assessment would be important just to see and explain -- particularly for those kids who are struggling what's going on with the first language. What is the baseline literacy level and are they gaining or losing their first language as they are acquiring the second language. Might help to provide an explanation for what you might be seeing in a child's performance. Whatever the language of instruction is should be what we're assessing for progress monitoring purposes.

An important question is if you only have one or two students who speak the same language can you create norms for the ELL population as a whole? Obviously with the limited number of when you have the small areas of one or two students who are English language learners who are only one or two who speak the sane language it would be challenges to create the norm. More feasible to create local norms like in Texas where we have the large groups of English language learners, who all speak the first language, that will present some challenges for us because we have ELL kids who come from various different backgrounds. Some who come from very affluent backgrounds who had the student to go to school in their home country and come here. Who receive dual language instruction in their own language. You have not acquired ac nemmic language in the first. High concentrations of kids will need to consider in terms of looking at responsiveness. Who are we comparing. What kinds of kids are we comparing and sit important that they be similar kids with similar backgrounds? Or can we just use our norms for ELL kids, northerly norms and so on. What might be the out somes and decisions made from that? I have three, 11 so -- 3:11. It seems like there's a lot of questions we won't be able to get to. I'll go through sort of looking at one model. I need to emphasize that, looking at one model of RTI. How CBMs can sort of pull the discussion back to CBM and how curriculum based measurement can be used in that model. Considerations about CBM and ELL kids and what that might mean at the different stages of the RTI process. This is a flowchart of the commonly sited three tiers of intervention. To most RTI is prevention system. Within each tier prevention research-based instruction and support and you'll see a lot of literature on academic plus behave

rale support. Sort of plus language support, sort of services as well. So as students move through the tiers the intensity of support increases. Increasing support as they go through each tier.

This flow chart represents the three tier. You may have more than three in your particular model. In tier one primary prevention represents the general ed setting. Research-based instruction and progress monitoring is used to identify students who are at risk for difficulties. Unresponsive to primary prevention move in to tier two where they receive research-based tutoring and monitor student responsiveness. Who are responsive to secondary move back in to tier one. Students who are unresponsive move to tier three. Takes place in the special ed setting and tier two serves as a more tier or rounds of tiers in your model. One method of operationallizing responsiveness to intervention is the dual discrepancy model. As a child who has significantly low achievement. Remember that notion of capacity to learn varies. A child not only who is below level, because that's the child we typically tend to refer for special ed. We go beyond that and add not only is the child below level but not makes satisfactory progress. We may have a child who's below level, who's someone in the bottom of the class but is making progress with peers. An understand responsive child who is below level but in addition to being low level and again the assumption of high quality effective instruction taking place, in addition to being low level, that child is not responding to that high quality instruction. So we have that assumption that we're examining in the general ed environment and we have most kids thriving in that environment. The statements of most, I think are easier to do when you have larger numbers of ELL kids. For those who are working in more rural areas that's going to present a significant challenge to be quite frank. So where does CBM fit in to the dual discrepancy model? It can be used for screening. CBM growth can be used to confirm or disconfirm risk status in tier one. CBM rate of growth and level or benchmark can be used to define responsiveness in intervention of tier two. Establish IEP goals. Think about the special ed programs and tailor instruction to meet the kids who are in tier three. There are other measures that may also be used for screening and progress monitoring. I encourage you to look at what's available at the website. Let's begin with looking at tier one primary prevention. We have all students who are screened. Those students who are suspect today be at risk remain in primary prevention with progress monitoring. This is something that not all models do. It's a suggestion that has been offered by Compton Fuchs & Fuchss and brei quantity. We progress monitor those kids and helps to reduce the kids that are false positives. We examine what's happening over six to ten weeks in the classroom. Those who were not only below the benchmark but did not make the expected rate of growth over that period of time would be kids that we confirmed as being unresponsive to tier one and moving onto supportive and intentions in tier two. Tier one, what we see are looking at the class, what's the average class performance, changes in the instruction level and individual student level, CBM cut scores and at its of progress -- rates of progress who need tier two. Consideration for ELL kids because we have to determine whether we're going to use and really that's all we have to go with right now are CBM cut scores for ELL -- or non-ELL kids and rates of progress. As you begin to implement models with ELL kids we can begin to collect local norms as well and see how kids are responding.

I want to turn to this particular slide, this sort of shows some of the things we're looking at. This is a child who was below level. For eight weeks we followed the child whether he was making add Kuwait progress. We see that this particular student's rate of growth is nothing. The child is not making progress. The decision would be made to provide tier two instruction for that child.

In tier two, we have again, this is the child has not responded during that six to ten weeks period. Confirmed at risk and provided secondary prevention. Different approaches to that small group instruction. But we're looking again at responsiveness as the child's CBM level. What their score is, their standing is as well as their CBM rate of growth. So again, those things are based on cut scores and so on and where a child should be. The tier two decisions are if the student's performance matches his grade level peers, grade level peers but is making adequate progress can remain in tier two. If the student's performance is below that of his peers, the student may need tier three intervention. Again, here's an example of we would expect to see a rate of improvement at .75 for 2 third grade -- third grade child. Responding to what's happening in tier two but still below level we want to provide more tier two. But does not need tier three instruction. We have a child who is below the slope cut off of .70 and again they're not making the expected rate of improvement over time and may need tier three.

Finally, obviously for kids who have not responded to tier one, tier two interventions these are kids who may consider moving through a comprehensive evaluation, possibly special ed services using CBM to set IEP goals, designed individualized programs can't to monitor their progress. So then teachers would use that more frequently to make changes.

I have like nine minutes left. Wrap it up with the advantages of RTI for ELL. Number one increases accountability for all ELL including those who are struggling. Reduces subjectivity in makes referrals for special education. Emphasizes the identification of the appropriate instruction. De-emphasizes the unique challenges of the RTI child of what works with ELL kids. The demotion of culturally responsive instruction is still unclear to most of us. Isn't that just good practice but it goes beyond that. Another unique challenge for ELL kids will be identifying the comparison group. Benchmarks and rates of improvement are limited to English speakers as they stand right now. We also have the idea that the rate of growth may be affected by variables other than instruction and we saw that idea shared by the national joint commission on learns disabilities. Another important one is the model conflicts with ESL bilingual philosophy. Moving kids through all these scripted types of what they consider to be scripted programs and to many it's perceived as a method of tracking English language learners. We have to do something to change that perception. See it as a way of improving instruction for ELL kids. School sort of have a general lack of knowledge about ELL issues. Another unique challenge about the RTI model is that it might be used sort of as ammunition of evidence of one program over another. You may see different things across the grades with respect to the performance that kids make so that it may be a way to support, for example, in materially grades you might see a steep trend like, slower rates of progress. What can be gleaned from all of this? It's not as simple as it -- simple as it would seem. That's the case with all the issues. Likely a one size fits all will not suffice. We have been given start of not we'll have to consider the local context and also important to say that RTI should only be one component of a comprehensive I valuation for English language learners. If I can take some questions.

Are the Spanish assessments for fluency and sounds for use with the palms? I think they are. The AMES web has a hand held that can be used. You can go to that AMES website.

Someone comments.

(Captioner: please state questions in to the Q&A posting section in the Webinar web page. My line is on mute. And if they don't get to your question today, they can reply back to you by email. Thanks).

Region one which is in my back guard. General ed setting up port system with an intensive level of support. Until after these efforts have been proven. I think this is just a question of the number of tiers. Certainly, a model that is sufficient, so you could have four tiers, you could have a first tier that's general ed, second tier, small group instruction, a third tier more intensive one on one that can be used for kids who are in a process of comprehensive evaluation. Don't think there's a right or wrong answer about that particular question.

Somebody asks me about the third one on the slide that ADEL measures and the AMES web Spanish reading CBM. EDEL includes all grade levels K-3. MIDE is early learning Spanish. Are passages I believe through the first two 5th great level. They are still from AMES web. You can go to the same website for those.

My general concern about these questions. I which I could turn to a particular body of knowledge or research and look at these article and this article. So much of this is sort of unknown. When we should do what. I think these are decisions that have to be made at local level. When do weswitch from assessing in one language to another and so on?

I think I'm going to close the Q&A.

Are you okay if I wrap up the Webinar now?

That's fine.

We would like to thank Laura to come to our Webinar today. We'll keep you informed about the detail by emails and website. If you'd like to present if they can get access to the slides, you can print them by clicking on the small printer icon on the bottom side of your screen. This will allow you to present to PDF. We will be posting the question and answer document this week, we'll be posting that on our website as well. You can email Dr. Sáenz directly for any questions she hasn't answered. Put CBMELL if you want to email Laura with a question. Your email is on the second slide, right?

Yes.

Finally we would appreciate your feedback about today's session. We value your feedback and your suggestions assist us in making decisions fora future Webinars. We would love to hear from you. Thank you all for participating today.
