New Rule Effective August 1, 2021

Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams must use the new criteria to identify a speech or language impairment for referrals for special education dated on or after August 01, 2021.

- Summary of Changes for SLI Rule
- Revisions to SLI Identification
- Videos of SLI Criteria Overview
- SLI Criteria: Digging Deeper Webinar Videos
- WI DPI Speech or Language Impairment Assessment Tools page

Why are there so many different terms for students who are currently learning English?

- English Learner: federal term
- Dual Language Learner
- Bilingual Learner
- Student who is bilingual or multilingual
- Multilingual Learners: current preferred term by WIDA
Dual Language Learners (DLLs) in Schools

- Hispanic students make up 77.6% of overall DLL student enrollment in 2018.
- Spanish was reported to be the home language of nearly 3.8 million DLL students, representing 75.2% of all DLL students.

Over Identification of DLL in Special Education

- The rate of identification of DLLs for specific learning disability (50%) is well above the rate for the general population of students identified as having specific learning disability (39%).
- Between 2015-2018, Wisconsin had identified an average of 35 districts with disproportionality in special education.

Collaborating on Behalf of DLLs

"It is the responsibility of a district to correctly identify both an English Learner’s disability and their language skills in both languages, and provide appropriate support in both areas. This requires clear communication and cooperation between staff on both the Special Education and ESL teams."

WIDA 2017 & WI FACTS 2018

DPI EL Policy Handbook, Ch. 11
Collaborating on Behalf of DLLs

“It is essential that the IEP team include educators who have knowledge of the student’s language needs and expertise in second language acquisition.”

“For ELs, IEP teams must include a qualified language educator, such as an ESL teacher or speech and language pathologist, who has foundational knowledge about language development and acquisition.”

DPI EL Policy Handbook, Ch. 11

Comprehensive Assessment Model

4 Part Model for Comprehensive Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Activities:</th>
<th>Speech-Language Probes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Artifact analysis</td>
<td>● Case history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Curriculum-based assessment</td>
<td>● Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Observations in school (natural) settings</td>
<td>● Language/Narrative samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Educational records</td>
<td>● Stimulability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextualized Tests:</th>
<th>Decontextualized Tests:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Norm-referenced measures of academic achievement</td>
<td>● Norm-referenced speech-language tests (parsed skills: articulation, semantics, syntax, morphology, fluency, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Curriculum benchmarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Session 1 Objectives

Participants will:
1. Review red flags for language disorders in the DLL population.
2. Receive the first item in a “toolkit” to support assessment of a DLL student.
   a. Stages of Language Acquisition
   b. ACCESS Scores
3. Complete a guided reflection based on a DLL student from your school/district.
Structured Approach: Difference Versus Disorder

Objective 1: Red Flags

1. Slow L2 learning + Rapid L1 loss
2. Parent concern
3. Positive family history for communication disorder
4. Informed teacher (e.g., ESL) concern
**Typical Bilingual Language Development**

- **Expressive Vocabulary**
- **Receptive Vocabulary**

**Red Flag 1**
- Slow L2 learning + Rapid L1 loss
- L2 “creeps” while L1 stagnates or declines

**Red Flag 2**

**Parent Concern:**
- “Knows the child best”
- Holistic view of child’s development
- Likely understands L1 or bilingual language development
- Often has opportunities to compare child’s development to other children in the family
“When a parent expresses a concern about their child who is a DLL...the “wait and see” option is no longer appropriate because it is not evidence-based.”

-Coulis and Kosta 2011

Red Flag 3

Family History Positive for Communication Disorder

- 50% to 70% of children with SLI have at least one other family member with the disorder.

National Institute on Deafness & Other Communication Disorders NIDCD 2019

Red Flag 4

Informed Teacher Concern:

- In the schools, ESL teachers have the most extensive training in the area of bilingual development.
- Innately aware of the cultural impacts/differences that may be perceived as disordered
- Able to identify aberrant language development (students who do not seem to follow the typical pattern of DLLs)
Objective 3: Guided Reflection

1) Identify a “case study” student in your district.
2) Determine how many of the red flags apply to your case study student.

Is there more you need to know?

Objective 2: Toolkit

• Stages of Language Acquisition (Day 1)
• ACCESS Scores (Day 1)
• Can Do Descriptors
• Dynamic Assessment
  Rapid Automatic Naming
  Nonword Repetition

BICS VS CALP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS)</th>
<th>Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Required for social communication</td>
<td>• Required for academic learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Type of communication acquired first</td>
<td>• New and unfamiliar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rich in context of the situation</td>
<td>• Less information derived from context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social situation</td>
<td>• Learned exclusively from the language, not situational cues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Usually acquired within 2 years</td>
<td>• May take 5-7 years or longer to achieve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Stages of Second Language Acquisition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>No speech</th>
<th>Minimal comprehension BICS</th>
<th>2 weeks to 2 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage I Pre-functional</td>
<td>No speech</td>
<td>Minimal comprehension BICS</td>
<td>2 weeks to 2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage II Beginning</td>
<td>1-2 word responses</td>
<td>Mispronounces words BICS</td>
<td>2-4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage III Intermediate</td>
<td>Simple sentences</td>
<td>Grammar errors BICS</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IV Advanced</td>
<td>Complex sentences</td>
<td>Discourse BICS/CALP</td>
<td>3-10 years to approach peer-appropriate proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V Full English Proficiency</td>
<td>Native-like vocabulary</td>
<td>Complex narration BICS/CALP</td>
<td>3-10 years to approach peer-appropriate proficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 3: Guided Reflection**

1. Inquire if a standard form is already being used by your ESL staff to describe the stages of language acquisition.
2. Predict which stage of language acquisition your case study child may align with based on the knowledge you have now.

**ACCESS Scores**

- **English** language proficiency test.
- Taken annually by DLLs in grades K-12.
- Assesses speaking, reading, writing, and listening.
- 2.1 million children across 36 states take the ACCESS test annually.

WIDA Assessment (2021)
Interpreting ACCESS Scores

- GOLD MINE of information!
- Information that already exists (you don't have to spend time testing, observing, interviewing)!
- Compares bilingual students to other bilingual students (versus monolingual expectations)!
- Consider pre-referral!

Comparing DLL to Monolingual Peers

- Speaking
- Writing
- Reading
- Listening

This is our jam as SLPs! These areas are PERFECT to consider prior to a speech or language evaluation!
Interpreting ACCESS Scores

What do the numbers mean?
1. Entering
2. Emerging
3. Developing
4. Expanding
5. Bridging
6. Reaching

Proficiency Level Descriptors Provided per Area

**SPARKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Students at this level generally can...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Communicate connected ideas in a variety of situations using language appropriately and taking into account language in new and creative ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Communicate details about ideas or stories on topics using language specific to the topic or situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communicate ideas using a series of sentences related to the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communicate ideas using short sentences related to routines and familiar situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communicate ideas using words and phrases related to everyday routines or situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communicate using familiar words, gestures, or body language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How can we analyze the data?
- **Individual Student Report**
  Detailed report for a student, shows progress. Relative growth, in comparison to one’s self.
- **Student Roster Report**
  Overview for a group of students (by school, grade, tier). Comparison to similar bilingual peers.
Interpreting ACCESS Scores

- Collaborate with ESL staff to understand, discuss, and present scores to stakeholders.

Incorporating ACCESS Scores to the Comprehensive Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection on ACCESS scores:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite: 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading: 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing: 2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These ACCESS scores support the student areas of concern.

- She has stronger listening comprehension skills than expressive language skills (this was seen in both languages).
- Speaking is reliably and consistently higher than writing and reading in typically developing DLL students (not seen here).

Appropriate Comparisons for DLL

- ACCESS scores provide us with a zone of proximal development for DLLs.
- If educated in English, this is the expected performance range for these students in the classroom.
- **Why would we expect a child to perform ABOVE their English language proficiency level?**
- This requires us to reframe our expectations in a way that results in appropriate expectations of DLL (e.g., grade or age level expectations meant for English speakers).
Objective 3: Guided Reflection

1. Look up the ACCESS scores for your case study student.

   Be sure to obtain scores in each area, rather than only the composite score.

This Work Requires...

Do the best you can until you know better. Then when you know better, do better.

-Maya Angelou
Courtney’s Upcoming CESA Trainings

**CESA 5: In Person Trainings** (Portage, WI)
- October 15, 2021
  9:00am-3:00pm
- October 29, 2021
  9:00am-3:00pm
- November 12, 2021
  9:00am-3:00pm

Register:
http://www.cesa5.org/events

**CESA 1: Virtual Trainings**
- November 10, 2021 - 9:00am-12:00pm
- November 17, 2021 - 12:00pm-3:00pm

Register:
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DPI Resources

Assessment Tools for Speech or Language Impairment website
- Evaluation of Speech: New Considerations
- Dynamic Assessment
- Comprehensive Special Education

Resources to Come

Wednesday, November 3, 2021 - 3:30-5:00pm
Best Practices When Assessing English Learners II with Courtney Seidel

Wednesday, December 1, 2021- 3:30-5:00 pm
Dynamic Assessment Part 2

Wednesday, February 2, 2022 – 3:30-5:00pm
Language Assessment

Wednesday, March 2, 2022 – 3:30-5:00pm
Assessment of Voice