ELL Critical Data Process
Training Layout

- Pop Quiz
- Setting the Stage
- History of this Process
- Training on the 16 Critical Data Points and the Matrix
If a student has an issue (presenting problem), and we provide an intervention that works, is it possible that they have a disability?
From question 1, would that student meet the criteria for qualification under Special Education?
We are in exciting times...

- The times of collecting data to “look” at it are changing to the times of understanding and applying our data.
- Utilizing data to impact positive changes for our students.
Special Education Started

- It started before 94–142, but 94–142 brought it to the next level.
- The focus was on providing access.
Then.....

- The lawsuits started to redefine special education, and
- PAPERWORK, lot of paperwork....
- Procedural Safeguards since I started...
Reasons Why Addressing Disproportionality are Crucial

- Moral Issues
- Funding Issues
- Sometimes leadership needs to see both to create urgency, given the overload of challenges faced.
What happens when you place a student into special education that does not need it???
Coworkers older brother story
What happens when you do not place a student into special education who needs it???
Funding Issue

- Igrant Report, Addressing Disproportionality, and what is likely to occur...
President’s Report for IDEA Re-authorization

- Carnine’s Report to Senate (70–90%)
- General research on SLD students (80%)
- Special Education has “no measurable benefit…” See next slide
- What if 50% of all special education students are not disabled?
- What if special education only served students who are truly disabled???? What would the results be???
- Places that have done this have not reduced their ESA staffing.
In summary, research does not support assertions such as those in *The Wall Street Journal* or *U.S. News and World Report* that special education is cheating students academically or socially or that it costs more than adequately educating students with disabilities in general education settings. Instead, research supports the continuation of efforts to improve academic and social outcomes for students with disabilities in both special and general education settings and indicates that instruction, not setting, is the key to achievement of success as measured by student outcomes.

Source – Princeton Education
SLD numbers may have dropped due to the proliferation of Response to Intervention (RTI)—a method of providing targeted assistance to young children who have difficulty learning—and other early-reading interventions (see *Response to Intervention*). Lastly, the identification of SLDs, though strictly outlined in policy, appears more subjective and prone to human error than the identification of most other disabilities; thus, SLD identification is perhaps more affected by related changes in policy, budget, personnel, etc.

Source --- Fordham Institute Article on Trends
RTI and ELLs

- ELL students in schools that do not have an “RTI” model in place are 3 times as likely to be identified for special education.
- Source --- Rhodes, Ochoa, Ortiz
Special Education is a GREAT THING

- For students with disabilities who NEED service, as related to the adverse impact on their education.
This Process

- Is also a tool to help with staff training and language development awareness.
- Language development and Targeted Intervention are core issues.
A little about me...

- Teacher 2\textsuperscript{nd} through grad school
- School Psychologist
- Tacoma... and the doctor
- Bilingual and Bi–Literate --- Stephen Krashen
- Tukwila and the little girl/Twilight
- ELL graduate level certification process Heritage University
- Cultural Awareness...
Working on ELL Cert and started this work...
Looking over KSD data– 17% ELL, 17% of Sped population ELL, So….
ELL/Latino Student/SPED 17% versus 52%
ELL/Asian Student/Sped 20% versus 20%
Over and Under ID and categories.
Yes/No Processes (Yes can have many meanings if 6 months and 6 years both mean the answer is yes).
How This Started, continued

- Reviewed work by Bender, Collier, OSPI and others.
- Triangulated for the 16 Critical Data Points
- Drafted new process
- Trial Period and Discovered a “guide” was needed.
- Created the Matrix and the “guide”
- Had it reviewed by Dr. Collier, then came WABE, then came a lot of trainings...
Data Collection Forms

- This needs to be done by a team.
- Better data leads to better decisions.
- We are making potentially life changing decisions.
Now, the Core of the Training

- The 16 Critical Data Points, and
- The Matrix
The Matrix, Blank

Analysis Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data supports referral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Neutral and Supports Referral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Neutral and More Interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data supports more intervention(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red Flag Areas

All Rights Reserved by Steve Gill
Differences in Languages and the impacts. This is deeper than just phonics or phonemes (yet those areas create a unique problem).

Wikipedia, not just phonics (German example).

The research is strongest for Spanish and Spanish is roughly 75% of all ELL’s nationwide. Washington indicated 67% and California indicated 85% of their ELL students are Spanish speakers (at the time this was written). The research for other languages varies on this point.
Luci and Ricky

- http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kMZsDaTxaKo
Other languages spoken by the student (2)---

- Multiple languages learned should mean English learning rate is positive.
- Proven Language Learner or not?
- If they are a proven language learner and they are not learning English, what are the possible issues/barriers? This is critical to designing interventions.
- For example, we have many Refuge children recovering from Trauma, and this recovery time (the impact) can make them appear to have a disability.
Multiple languages spoken in the home (3),

- Multiple languages spoken at home has more of an impact prior to 6 years of age, in the form of language confusion, then reduces with age.
- Confusion or Not?
  - Below 6 years of age, it is normal. Between 6 and 8 it should fade. After the age of 8 continued language confusion over a long period of time is unusual.
  - For example, a teenager with ongoing language confusion and confusion in L1 is unusual and this confusion may support a referral/evaluation.
Structures of language (Transfer of skills).
Knowing that language has specific parts (nouns, verbs etc…) and each language has set patterns in which these occur. This knowledge (or lack thereof) impacts rates of learning.

School Experience (norms). If they have not been in school (or don’t have the expected number of years), they are learning how to be a student and learning content at the same time (the two are competing with each other for learning time/energy, which slows the development).

Formal Education —— Do they know any of the vocabulary of education from their past experience that they can transfer to their current experience?

At this stage, is learning the norms and the language competing with learning to read and do math, or the reverse?
Parental education in primary language (5)

- Parental education and literacy – English or not, impacts school preparedness and structure of language.
- Illiteracy does NOT have a direct correlation with intelligence, especially in countries where education can be difficult to access.
- This is to be approached with some caution. But, it is very important information to know in order to understand the student’s first learning environment – the home.
- Some staff can obtain this information from the majority of parents without ever upsetting them, some staff struggle to obtain this information or any information. Know your staff and their strengths/challenges.
- Students who come from homes in which the parents are not literate and/or have limited literacy/education frequently come to school with very limited vocabularies.
- Learning needed vocabulary is slowing learning rate, while it competes for learning time and energy.
Studies indicate that the vocabularies of the average kindergartners can/do vary by as much as a factor of 4 (the student with the largest vocabularies have 4 times as many words as those with the lowest vocabularies, and this is NOT including students with disabilities). Is there a “competitive” disadvantage for learning that the student is facing?

High/Low languages in history – Structure is different – So children don’t have key skills to transfer to learning English.

Missing just one word per sentence (vocabulary) can make the sentence meaningless, if it happens to be a key word and a word the student has not yet learned.
Teaching reading while teaching English, the two are competing for time and learning energy.

Literacy in L1 is best predictor of literacy in L? (noting that English might not be L2)

L1 Versus Primary L --- For some students their L1 and Primary L are not the same. How is this impacting progress?

Is their academic language their maternal language?

Each competing factor is likely to slow the rate of learning new material, and the team needs to discuss this.
Years learning English (7)

- Years learning English
  - Cummins 5–7 year research
  - The average performance of students who “were” ELL students is still at 32\textsuperscript{nd}–38\textsuperscript{th} percentile (on state and federal level testing), when compared to the group as a whole.
  - Harlan Coben/MA example
  - Bilinguals in the group, how hard is it to function at a professional level in your weaker language?
  - This does not mean no sped testing, but instead it means better/more documentation of targeted interventions that are sufficient to help the team better understand whether or not they are looking at a disability or language learning issue.
  - Better documentation, better decision making.
  - “Were” versus “are.” Is someone, who is being asked to perform in their non–native or non–primary language, ever not a language learner in that “new” language?
Attendance History (8)

- Poor attendance high predictor of dropout rate.
- Can’t be expected to learn if not at school.
- Why aren’t they coming to school? This is critical knowledge. Without it, interventions are just random efforts.
- **Bench press 400 pounds each day story.** “If I were to take you into the gym each day and place 400 pounds on the bench press, how long would it take you to be avoidant? How unpleasant would this be for you? Some of our students experience this when asked to come to school and they naturally want to avoid the painful and unsuccessful experience.” What can we do to alleviate this?
- Have we made their education accessible???
Approach taken with regards to ELL services (9)

- Dual Language – Done correctly, is the best.
- If not, then SIOP/GLAD well implemented is critical.
  - Consistency?
  - Accommodations/Modifications?
  - The critical question to ask here is whether or not the student has been provided a true opportunity to learn. If we cannot say yes to this without reservation, then how can we answer the question regarding whether or not the student has a disability that adversely impacts their learning???
  - Someone has to have the courage to raise the “bs” flag when a student who has not had an "accessible" or “comprehensible” education is being considered for a disability in learning.
  - Have we made their education accessible???
Rate of growth on the WELPA (10).

- Rate of Growth on WELPA (WLPT-II / LAS-Links)
- Peer comparisons --- You need to have 3–4 students with similar backgrounds (language, school history, etc) in order to make comparisons regarding rates of growth.
- Is the student of concern making the same, similar, or less progress when compared to peers (on this and everything that you can use as comparative data)?
Intervention Description (11)---

- Intervention is TARGETED.
- How do you know that your intervention is what the child actually needs? Reading makes up 80% of special education referrals, but reading has 5 (or more depending upon your training) key areas: sight words, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Have you done what you need to do to know which area(s) need the intervention? If a student has problems with letter sounds, do you know whether or not those sounds exist in their L1?
- Reading Example TSD
During interventions, you need comparison students (language, school history, etc) in which to compare growth rates. Also, note that progress must be measured on an ongoing basis so that one data point (beginning or end) cannot destroy the meaning.
Just one data point at the end could be meaningless, like if the student’s dog died before they came to school and you based your intervention results (success or failure) on the tear stained test results. Or, of course, something less dramatic.
Graphs created by....

- The student who made the graphs is a young lady with very high levels of special education support....
Middle School Example

The students need to have the expectation to complete work like other students from day 1. If they can only draw a picture on day one, that is fine. Then, move to labeling the pictures, then to writing short sentences, etc…

Example: Bench press 60% of maximum, and increase each time set of 10 becomes “easy.” It is all about meeting someone at their skill/ability/developmental level and providing the opportunity for them to grow and the path on which they can travel to make the growth.
Classroom Observation

This will either tell you nothing or provide information that is indicative of a student who should be referred. That is, a student who is sitting and doing nothing does not provide information. They could be doing nothing for a variety of reasons. In contrast, a student who is in a well-run classroom who is attempting all activities and showing little or no growth is a student of concern.
This, as described earlier, is a key to answering the difficult questions. As many areas in which you can make real comparisons, make these comparisons, this is vital to making good decisions. And, be creative.

For example, a student who is non-ambulatory and blind and a team is trying to understand whether or not he has an intellectual disability. If Steven Hawking didn’t have assistive technology, would we say that he is intellectually disabled??

Find comparisons to increase the likelihood that you know what decision/intervention is the appropriate action for the student.
The parent interview (15)

- Parent Interview — environment, educational history, parent history, etc...
- A) Middle School student inherited from CA example.
- B) SPED/ELL students passing MSP/HSPE???? It is not uncommon for a large district to have an ELL qualified student in a self-contained special education program pass portions or all of the state testing. Think about the ramifications associated with this. Also, it happens in smaller districts, but just not as often.
- C) This is all about making sure there isn’t “another” reason for what you are seeing as the presenting concerns and/or learning what needs to be addressed via intervention.
Developmental History --- siblings, health, illnesses, injuries, milestones....

This is critical to knowing whether or not there is another explanation to the difficulties that you are seeing or if there is a medical problem related to a possible disability.

Use caution with parent statements of things like normal or slow, make sure to ask questions to understand what they are expressing. Parent’s whose other children are all in highly capable student programs (except this student) would possibly call the student in question slow even though they are “normal” and parents who have children with disabilities may call a student with obvious issues normal.
The Matrix

- Are there more marks above or below the line?
  Above being indicative of the need to make a referral for the possibility of a special education evaluation and below being indicative of needing to design and deliver more targeted interventions.

- Is the difference a large difference, in other words is it a clear case of choosing either the referral or targeted interventions?
- If not, then the team should be examining and discussing the impact of the Red Flag Items.
- Upon discussing the Red Flag items, is the team now able to make a decision?
- If not, I recommend defaulting to more targeted interventions. This is based upon the legal requirement that special education services are “need” based services and the results of the data collection are not demonstrating the likelihood of a need.
- It is critical, though, that the teams have these tough discussions and make their decisions based upon their discussions.
# Analysis Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data supports referral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Neutral and Supports Referral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Neutral and More Interventions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data supports more intervention(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Red Flag Areas

### Directions

1) Complete the matrix by placing the marks into the appropriate squares as the discussion occurs.
2) As the team discusses each of the 16 points of data, they need to place a check mark into the appropriate section of the matrix (e.g., if for factor one the team determined the data supports more intervention(s), place a check mark in the corresponding square).
3) Then, analyze the matrix as a whole. That is, do the majority of the check marks appear to be above or below the neutral line (above supporting a referral and below supporting more intervention(s)). If it is unclear, discuss the red flag items and use them as a “tie” breaker.
### Analysis Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data supports referral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Neutral and Supports Referral</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Neutral and More Interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data supports more intervention(s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Red Flag Areas

### Directions

1. Complete the matrix by placing the marks into the appropriate squares as the discussion occurs.
2. As the team discusses each of the 16 points of data, they need to place a check mark into the appropriate section of the matrix (e.g., if for factor one the team determined the data supports more intervention(s), place a check mark into the corresponding square).
3. Then, analyze the matrix as a whole. That is, do the majority of the check marks appear to be above or below the neutral line (above supporting a referral and below supporting more intervention(s)). If it is unclear, discuss the red flag items and use them as a “tie” breaker.
Available online through Amazon.com

Has all of the materials and information for creating the PowerPoints.

- ELL Critical Data Process K–12, ELL Critical Data Process Preschool, Train the Trainer document, Data Gathering example and more.
Questions

- Thank You for all your hard work for children!!!