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LEARNING OBJECTIVES

• Understand the disparate impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on education
• Identify considerations for educational assessment during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond
DISPARATE IMPACT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC ON EDUCATION

Alexander Tan, Ph.D.

Los Angeles Times

15,000 L.A. high school students are AWOL online, 40,000 fail to check in daily amid coronavirus closures

About 15,000 Los Angeles high school students are absent online and have failed to do any schoolwork while more than 40,000 have not been in daily contact with their teachers since March 16, when the coronavirus forced campus shutdowns, district officials disclosed Monday.
DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON INDIVIDUALS OF RACIALLY AND ETHNICALLY MINORITIZED BACKGROUNDS

- Increased risk of contracting the virus (CDC, 2020b; Yip 2020)
- Higher rates of hospitalizations and deaths (CDC 2020b)
- Higher rates of unemployment (Galea & Abdalla, 2020)
- Less income, insurance, access to healthcare & mental health treatment (Song et al., 2020)
- Food insecurity (Leddy et al., 2020)
- Racist & xenophobic language, misplaced blame, Asian-Americans scapegoated (Gruber et al., 2020)
- Harm to LGBTQ communities who have intersected minoritized racial/ethnic identities due to exacerbation of social disadvantages and mental health disparities (Salerno et al, 2020)
- Lack of effective health and sanitary conditions for undocumented immigrants in detention centers (Obinna, 2021)

CHALLENGES OF VIRTUAL LEARNING

- Engagement and strong personal connection
- Decreased structure
- Social isolation and loss of social opportunities
- Sleep issues
- Mental health challenges
- Personal loss & grieving
- Online harassment
- Reduced instructional time
- Busy work instead of productive work
- Staffing challenges
- Disparities in academic opportunities
- Teacher burnout
- Fewer resources at home
- Low-income families lack technology and internet access
- Lack of childcare
- Older siblings in charge of younger students so parents can work
- Increased home stressors
- Exposure to differences in parental values and practices
CAREGIVER PERSPECTIVES ON SCHOOLING FROM HOME DURING THE SPRING 2020 COVID-19 CLOSURES

- Limited synchronous instruction
- Inconsistent home–school communication
- Lack of adequate supports for students requiring specialized services
- Caregiver limited time
- Caregiver content knowledge


Learning loss due to school closures during the COVID-19 pandemic

Per Engzell, Arun Frey, and Mark D. Verhagen

- Effect of school closures on primary school performance in the Netherlands
- National examinations took place before and after 8-week lockdown
- N = 350,000 primary school students
- Equitable system of school funding and the world’s highest rate of broadband access
- Learning loss equivalent to 1/5 of a school year
- Losses up to 60% larger among students from less-educated homes
Students exhibited slightly more learning lag in ELA than in Math. Students who are economically disadvantaged and English learners exhibited more learning lag. Black and Latinx students exhibited more learning lag in both subjects.

New data from Education Analytics (EA) highlights the changes in learning patterns experienced by students in grades 3–8 in California. Using results from winter 2020–21 interim assessments, EA provides an up-to-date picture of the learning lag students have experienced during the pandemic. As of winter 2020–21, California students were approximately 2.5 months behind in both ELA and Math, with students learning English and economically disadvantaged students most affected. EA also highlights findings from a well-being student survey collected during the 2020–21 school year.
KEY FINDINGS

AVERAGE LEARNING LAG ACROSS GRADES AND ASSESSMENTS

A BREAKDOWN OF LEARNING LAG BY ECONOMIC DISADVANTAGE AND ENGLISH LEARNER STATUS

KEY FINDINGS

BREAKDOWN OF LEARNING LAG BY GRADE
BREAKDOWN OF LEARNING LAG BY RACE/ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>3.9 months behind</td>
<td>2.4 months behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.3 months behind</td>
<td>0.7 months behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.6 months behind</td>
<td>2.1 months behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx</td>
<td>3.4 months behind</td>
<td>2.6 months behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.1 months behind</td>
<td>1.8 months behind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEARNING LAG BY DISABILITY, LOW PRIOR ACHIEVEMENT & HOMELESSNESS

BREAKDOWN OF LEARNING LAG BY DISABILITY STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Status</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with Dis.</td>
<td>3.0 months behind</td>
<td>2.8 months behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students without Dis.</td>
<td>2.8 months behind</td>
<td>2.6 months behind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BREAKDOWN OF LEARNING LAG BY LOW PRIOR ACH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Achievement</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Prior ACH.</td>
<td>3.1 months behind</td>
<td>2.7 months behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Prior ACH.</td>
<td>4.4 months behind</td>
<td>4.0 months behind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BREAKDOWN OF LEARNING LAG BY HOMELESSNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homelessness Status</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Experiencing Homelessness</td>
<td>3.7 months behind</td>
<td>3.4 months behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Experiencing Homelessness</td>
<td>4.8 months behind</td>
<td>4.8 months behind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDUCATIONAL DISPARITIES

- Widening pre-existing disparities in academic growth
- Technological barriers impacting engagement in virtual classrooms for low income families
- Increased challenge of mastering grade-level content for English learners
- Disruption of necessary services for students with disabilities
- Increased stress and loss of access to social support for LGBTQ+ students
- Loss of supports for students with mental health challenges
- Heightened risks of sexual harassment, abuse, and violence within household or online
- Increased identity-based harassment and violence (e.g., Asian American and Pacific Islander students)
- New barriers for entry and completion of postsecondary studies, particularly students of color, with disabilities, or students who are caregivers
- Declines in enrollment to institutions of higher education, particularly for students of color and from low-income backgrounds
- Decreased access to education for students with disabilities in higher education

CONSIDERATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC AND BEYOND

Monica Oganes, Ph.D.
LEARNING DISORDER VS. SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITY

MEDICAL MODEL

A. Difficulties learning and using academic skills, as indicated by the presence of at least one of the following symptoms that have persisted for at least 6 months, despite the provision of interventions that target those difficulties:
   • Inaccurate or slow and effortful word reading (e.g., reads single words aloud incorrectly or slowly and hesitantly, frequently guesses words, has difficulty sounding out words).
   • Difficulty understanding the meaning of what is read (e.g., may read text accurately but not understand the sequence, relationships, inferences, or deeper meanings of what is read).
   • Difficulties with spelling (e.g., may add, omit, or substitute vowels or consonants).
   • Difficulties with written expression (e.g., makes multiple grammatical or punctuation errors within sentences; employs poor paragraph organization; written expression of ideas lacks clarity).
   • Difficulties mastering number sense, number facts, or calculation (e.g., has poor understanding of numbers, their magnitude, and relationships; counts on fingers to add single-digit numbers instead of recalling the math fact as peers do; gets lost in the midst of arithmetic computation and may switch procedures).
   • Difficulties with mathematical reasoning (e.g., has severe difficulty applying mathematics concepts, facts, or procedures to solve quantitative problems).

B. The affected academic skills are substantially and quantifiably below those expected for the individual’s chronological age, and cause significant interference with academic or occupational performance, or with activities of daily living, as confirmed by individually administered standardized achievement measures and comprehensive clinical assessment. For individuals age 17 years and older, a documented history of impairing learning difficulties may be substituted for the standardized assessment.

C. The learning difficulties begin during school-age years but may not become fully manifest until the demands for those affected academic skills exceed the individual’s limited capacities (e.g., as in timed tests, reading or writing lengthy complex reports for a tight deadline, excessively heavy academic loads).

D. The learning difficulties are not better accounted for by intellectual disabilities, uncorrected visual or auditory acuity, other mental or neurological disorders, psychosocial adversity, lack of proficiency in the language of academic instruction, or inadequate education instruction.

Note: The four diagnostic criteria are to be met based on a clinical synthesis of the individual’s history (developmental, medical, family, educational), school reports, and psychoeducational assessment.

EDUCATIONAL MODEL

DSM-5 LEARNING DISORDER

A. Difficulties learning and using academic skills, as indicated by the presence of at least one of the following symptoms that have persisted for at least 6 months, despite the provision of interventions that target those difficulties:
   • Inaccurate or slow and effortful word reading (e.g., reads single words aloud incorrectly or slowly and hesitantly, frequently guesses words, has difficulty sounding out words).
   • Difficulty understanding the meaning of what is read (e.g., may read text accurately but not understand the sequence, relationships, inferences, or deeper meanings of what is read).
   • Difficulties with spelling (e.g., may add, omit, or substitute vowels or consonants).
   • Difficulties with written expression (e.g., makes multiple grammatical or punctuation errors within sentences; employs poor paragraph organization; written expression of ideas lacks clarity).
   • Difficulties mastering number sense, number facts, or calculation (e.g., has poor understanding of numbers, their magnitude, and relationships; counts on fingers to add single-digit numbers instead of recalling the math fact as peers do; gets lost in the midst of arithmetic computation and may switch procedures).
   • Difficulties with mathematical reasoning (e.g., has severe difficulty applying mathematics concepts, facts, or procedures to solve quantitative problems).

B. The affected academic skills are substantially and quantifiably below those expected for the individual’s chronological age, and cause significant interference with academic or occupational performance, or with activities of daily living, as confirmed by individually administered standardized achievement measures and comprehensive clinical assessment. For individuals age 17 years and older, a documented history of impairing learning difficulties may be substituted for the standardized assessment.

C. The learning difficulties begin during school-age years but may not become fully manifest until the demands for those affected academic skills exceed the individual’s limited capacities (e.g., as in timed tests, reading or writing lengthy complex reports for a tight deadline, excessively heavy academic loads).

D. The learning difficulties are not better accounted for by intellectual disabilities, uncorrected visual or auditory acuity, other mental or neurological disorders, psychosocial adversity, lack of proficiency in the language of academic instruction, or inadequate education instruction.

Note: The four diagnostic criteria are to be met based on a clinical synthesis of the individual’s history (developmental, medical, family, educational), school reports, and psychoeducational assessment.
IDEA: SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES

- Sec. 300.8 (c) (10)

Statute/Regs Main » Regulations » Part B » Subpart A » Section 300.8 » c » l

(10) Specific learning disability—

(i) General. Specific learning disability means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in the imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations, including conditions such as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia.

Last modified on May 25, 2018

SEC. 300.309 DETERMINING THE EXISTENCE OF A SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITY

Statute/Regs Main » Regulations » Part B » Subpart D » Section 300.309

(3) The group determines that its findings under paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) of this section are not primarily the result of—

(i) A visual, hearing, or motor disability;
(ii) An intellectual disability;
(iii) Emotional disturbance;
(iv) Cultural factors;
(v) Environmental or economic disadvantage; or
(vi) Limited English proficiency.
OVERVIEW OF SLD IDENTIFICATION AT SCHOOL

1. Failure to meet age- or grade-level State standards in one of eight areas:
   - oral expression
   - listening comprehension
   - written expression
   - basic reading skill
   - reading fluency skill
   - reading comprehension
   - mathematics calculation
   - mathematics problem solving

2. Discrepancy: Pattern of strengths & weaknesses in performance, achievement, or both, relative to age, State-approved grade-level standards, or intellectual development
   OR
   RTI: Lack of progress in response to scientifically based instruction

3. Rule out:
   - vision, hearing, or motor problems
   - intellectual disability
   - emotional disturbance
   - cultural and/or environmental issues
   - limited English proficiency

4. Rule out lack of instruction by documenting:
   - appropriate instruction by qualified personnel
   - repeated assessments

MULTI TierED SYSTEMS OF SUPPORT (MTSS)

MTSS are comprehensive systems of differentiated supports. Data-driven decisions regarding instruction and intervention are provided in increasing intensity (i.e., tiers) based on student need.

- Tier 1 typically refers to services available to all students (e.g., wellness/skills promotion and school-wide programs).
- Tier 2 services are available to some students identified as needing some additional services or supports.
- Tier 3 refers to more intensive services for individuals or small groups and is usually limited to only 5–10% of students.
LEVELS OF SUPPORT WITHIN PROBLEM SOLVING

**Academic Systems**
- Intensive, Individual Interventions
  - Individual Students
  - Assessment-based
  - High Intensity
  - Of longer duration
- Targeted Group Interventions
  - Some students (at-risk)
  - High efficiency
  - Rapid response
- Universal Interventions
  - All students
  - Preventive, proactive

**Behavioral Systems**
- Intensive, Individual Interventions
  - Individual Students
  - Assessment-based
  - Intense, durable procedures
- Targeted Group Interventions
  - Some students (at-risk)
  - High efficiency
  - Rapid response
- Universal Interventions
  - All settings, all students
  - Preventive, proactive

TIER 1 CRITICAL QUESTIONS

- Is the child in an appropriate ESL model for the identified language and learning needs?
- Is there an ESL model that has more appropriate language and learning conditions?
- Are the accommodations appropriate, effective, and offered consistently? Are there other relevant, valid, and feasible accommodations? Does the staff need coaching support for fidelity?
- Is the staff using research-validated strategies for English Learners’ oral and content language development? Does the staff need coaching support for fidelity?
- Are the most appropriate reading and writing strategies being used in a culturally responsive manner? Does the staff need coaching support for fidelity?
- Is the staff following culturally responsive practices to ensure the child receives social and emotional support that promotes positive acculturation and educational equity?
WERE SPECIFIC PHONICS CHALLENGES ADDRESSED?

Phonics Transfer Issues for Seven Languages

Sound Transfer (Phonology)
The symbol • identifies areas in which these primary language speakers may have some difficulty pronouncing and perceiving spoken English. The sound may not exist in the primary language, may exist but be pronounced somewhat differently, or may be confused with another sound. Sound production and perception issues impact phonics instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/bl/ as in hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/gl/ as in car and kite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/dr/ as in drag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/fr/ as in fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/gr/ as in goat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/mr/ as in men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nr/ as in needle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/rr/ as in lemon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WERE SPECIFIC GRAMMAR CHALLENGES ADDRESSED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF TRANSFER ERROR IN ENGLISH</th>
<th>LANGUAGE BACKGROUND</th>
<th>CAUSE OF TRANSFER DIFFICULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>omission of article</td>
<td>Cantonese,</td>
<td>Articles are either lacking, or the distinction between a and the is not paralleled in the primary language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He has job.</td>
<td>Haitian Creole,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His dream is to become lawyer, not teacher.</td>
<td>Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Russian, Tagalog, Vietnamese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omission of articles in certain contexts such as to identify a profession</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>The article is not used in Spanish in this context, but is needed in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overuse of articles</td>
<td>Arabic,</td>
<td>The article is used in the primary language in places where it isn't used in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The honesty is the best policy.</td>
<td>Haitian Creole,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This food is popular in the Japan</td>
<td>Hmong, Spanish,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the cats.</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of one for alan</td>
<td>Haitian Creole,</td>
<td>Learners sometimes confuse the articles alan with one since articles either do not exist in the primary language or serve a different function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is one engineer.</td>
<td>Hmong, Vietnamese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRESS MONITORING STUDENT GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Change Line</th>
<th>Instructional Change Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 only</td>
<td>T1 + T2 + Tier 3: Phonics Intervention + Fluency Intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1) Determine current level of performance (first dot)
- 2) Set goal or aim (end of year benchmark) and plot it
- 3) Determine instructional strategy or intervention
- 4) Collect data (weekly, biweekly) on student performance
- 5) Make decision regarding effectiveness of instruction

TIER 3 CRITICAL QUESTIONS

- Was the MTSS plan appropriate for this English Learner and implemented with fidelity?
- Was progress monitoring appropriately aligned to the content, conducted with fidelity?
- Was response to intervention data analyzed in light of all linguistic and cultural factors?
- Are exclusionary factors the primary reason for remaining achievement gaps?
- How does the English Learner's response compare to true peers (other ELs with similar background, language proficiency, academic experiences, and intervention plan)?
- Are there additional interventions that have not been tried but are appropriate for this English Learner need? Is the remaining gap an equity of access issue?
ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS AND INTERVENTIONS UPON RETURNING TO SCHOOL

New Screening Procedures

- Students will have received about a 75% dose of prior year’s instruction
- Screening must account for base rates
- The greater the prevalence of risk, the less accurate the screening for ruling students out of needing academic intervention


Use Class-Wide Intervention to Improve Decision Accuracy and Provide Learning Gains for Students

- Introduce instructional trials as rapidly as possible and measure students’ learning gains as the second screening gate.
- Class-wide intervention (e.g., PALS, class-wide peer tutoring, PRESS center reading, Spring Math class-wide intervention) lowers the base rate of risk to allow for academic screenings to function more accurately.

HOW TO DOCUMENT LACK OF ACHIEVEMENT

REVIEW EXISTING DATA
• Performance on ongoing progress monitoring measures
• Assessment of academic skills at tiers 2-3 (curriculum based)
• Performance on benchmark assessments
• Performance on statewide and districtwide assessments

OBTAIN NEW DATA
• Standardized norm-referenced tests of academic achievement
  ✓ Based on age or grade, not intellectual level
  ✓ Take into account state standards
  ✓ Student is significantly behind same age/grade peers

OBTAIN RATE OF IMPROVEMENT

INSTRUCTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
• Has the student been provided with targeted, evidence-based interventions in the regular classroom?
• Has the intervention been provided with fidelity?
• Has continued formative assessment and progress monitoring occurred in the classroom?
• Have the appropriate team members been consulted to design and monitor interventions?
• Have accommodations for virtual instruction been considered?
• Has the rate of improvement been measured?

Rate of improvement before & after COVID-19
IDEA PART B PROVISION OF SERVICES IN THE COVID-19 ENVIRONMENT

- IEP in effect
- IEP team members
- Extended school year (ESY)
- Initial evaluation: 60 days or State-adopted timeframe
- Initial (within 30-days* of disability determination) and annual IEP meetings with parents
- Reevaluation (every 3 years) can be administered remotely (through valid and reliable tools), based on personal observation (videoconferencing ok).

"LEAs should investigate all appropriate assessment instruments and tools to determine if some can be administered or completed remotely during the pandemic, provided that evaluation of the child is based on personal observation (whether in person or through videoconferencing).

LEAs should also work with the developers of their current assessment instruments to determine if the instruments can be administered or completed remotely, without significantly impacting the validity and reliability of the results. However, under 34 C.F.R. § 300.304(c)(1)(iii)-(v), tests and other evaluation materials must be used for the purposes for which the assessments or measures are valid and reliable, and must be administered by trained and knowledgeable personnel in accordance with any instructions provided by the producer of the assessments."

Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP): IDEA Part B Service Provision

FEASIBILITY OF TELE-ASSESSMENT

- Tele-assessment may affect the privacy, confidentiality, test integrity, reliability, and validity of assessment results (NASP 2017)
- Mode of administration did not impact examinees’ performance on cog/ach virtual & in-person among children and youth (Wright 2018a; Harder et al. 2020; Daniel & Wahlstrom, 2019)
- Higher Processing Speed Index scores from remote administration than in-person administration (Wright 2018b)
- Studies did not directly examine the core question of whether each examinee performs the same on both administration formats (Farmer et al., 2020a)
- If proctor not feasible, use Essential Nonmotor Components (Pearson, 2020)
- Parallel intellectual index scores across administration formats among 33 children with different reading disabilities (Hodges et al., 2019)
- High agreement between in-person and remote evaluations of cognitive test scores among four children and three with a neurodegenerative disease (Ragbeer et al., 2016)

CONSIDERATIONS:
- Access to technology/cultural & educational factors
- Limited research in tele-assessment, small sample
- Limited research with minoritized/culturally & linguistically diverse communities
- Lack of tele-assessment normed tools (Wright et al., 2020)

SOCIOCULTURAL FACTORS

- Native language
- Native literacy level
- Education Hx
- Developmental Hx
- Nutrition Hx
- Health Hx
- SES & Housing Hx
- Homelessness Hx
- Country of origin
- Immigration Hx
- Acculturation level
- Assimilation level
- Stress experiences Hx (ACEs)
- Racism & Social Inequities Hx
- Social Support/ Protective Factors
- Access to care/social services

Llorente (2008); Pontón & León Carrión (2001)
CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS

- **30 countries** in South, Central, and North America (USA), including the Caribbean
- Common root: Spanish language
- 480 million native Spanish speakers + 100 million speak Spanish as 2nd language worldwide
- Primarily a mixture of three cultural groups: European (primarily Spain), African, and American Indigenous
- Specific subgroups influenced by Arab, Jewish, Chinese, Japanese cultures

Heterogenous characteristics with **shared values**:

- focus on family and hierarchical relationships (extended family)
- value forgiveness, sacrifice for, and loyalty to their group (family, friends, regional group)
- value humility and acceptance of responsibility (guilt and punishments)
- value social time as very important, therefore, time schedules become flexible
- mainly Roman Catholic, with subgroups embracing Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, Indigenous, or African beliefs


SCHOOLING CHARACTERISTICS

Varies by country, with average schooling in Central and South America countries being:

- 7 – 10 years in urban areas; 5 years in rural areas
- 10% to 20% illiteracy rates (Guatemala has the highest illiteracy level)
- Women tend to have a higher level of education than men
- Hispanic immigrants age 25+: BA: 26% HS diplomas: 67%
- Hispanic long-term US residents 25+: BA: 12% HS diploma: 54%

- Countries of origin for Hispanics with BA degrees:
  - Spain 80%, Venezuela 65%, Argentina 64%, Colombia 41%, Peru 34%, Cuba 29%
- Countries of origin for Hispanics with the lowest level of BA degrees:
  - Dominican Republic 22%, Mexico 17%, Honduras 12%, El Salvador 8%, Guatemala 6%

(Ardila, 2020; Noe-Bustamante, 2020)
IDEA PART B EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

- Assessment material should not be racially or culturally discriminatory
- Assessment must be provided in English and native language, or mode of communication child uses, unless not feasible
- Evaluation materials need to be administered in “the form most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally”
- A child must not be considered eligible for services if the determinant factor is lack of appropriate ESL instruction or limited English proficiency
- Families are entitled to interpreters at meetings to ensure informed consent and full understanding of the child's needs and the plan being proposed
- English proficiency needs must be considered as they relate to IEP goals


THREATS TO ASSESSMENT VALIDITY

- The most pervasive bias in testing is incorrect interpretation, which introduces faulty evaluative judgment to tests that may not be biased.
- Acculturative knowledge: the diverse child’s cultural background experiences are different from those in the normative sample
- Developmental language proficiency: the linguistically diverse child’s level of second language acquisition and academic language proficiency
- The use of assessment procedures that decrease validity of derived score

Ochoa and Ortiz (2015)
ASSESSMENT COMPONENTS

Oral Language Proficiency
- Native Receptive/Expressive Skills
- English Receptive/Expressive Skills

Academic Language
- Native CALP Level
- English CALP Level

Literacy Skills
- Native reading and writing
- English reading and writing

ASSESSMENT ANSWERS QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Questions</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Who is at risk?</td>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>First Alert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Who needs close monitoring?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Who needs extra support?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How should groups be formed?</td>
<td>Progress Monitoring</td>
<td>Growth Charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Which skills need to be emphasized?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the strengths/needs?</td>
<td>Diagnostics</td>
<td>In-Depth Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Have we met the goals for a student?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A class? A district?</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Reaching our Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What needs to change next year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What should be continued?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSESSING ENGLISH LEARNERS

Subjective Measures
- Records Review – Exclusionary factors and relevant history
- Questionnaires (Parent, Teacher, Learner) - linguistic preferences/needs
- Acculturation measures
- Spontaneous language samples
- Academic work samples
- Classroom observations
- Clinical interview - ACEs, SEL needs

Objective Measures
- WIDA ACCESS Profile
- Ortiz PVAT
- WMLS-III
- WJ-IV Oral Language
- WJ-IV - COG & ACH
- BATERIA - IV - COG & ACH

SPECIALLY-DESIGNED INSTRUCTION (ESE)

- Adapts content, methodology and/or delivery of instruction to address the unique needs of a child with a disability (707 KAR 1:002)
- Incorporates UDL strategies that build on strengths and address academic needs
- May include:
  ✓ explicit instruction, scaffolding, and modeling strategies to facilitate comprehension
  ✓ auditory strategies to facilitate language learning and phonemic awareness
  ✓ orthographic strategies to facilitate phonics and spelling instruction
  ✓ visual strategies for word recognition and memorization to facilitate reading fluency
  ✓ multi-sensory strategies to accommodate processing, response, and engagement
  ✓ small group and individual instruction with formative practice and corrective feedback
