The purpose of this paper is to describe current practices in various states used to identify linguistically different students, provide a review of literature regarding recommended practices, and offer alternative practices for identifying linguistically different students. The paper provides an information base regarding current identification practices; suggests a way to systematically identify limited English proficient student using multiple criteria; and offers a paradigm that will allow the U.S. Department of Education and the various state departments of education to collect consistent data regarding the students in need of English language assistance. Two responses to the paper, one by Julia Lara, the other by Robert Rueda, are provided. (VWL)
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The development of the paper was rather like *deja vu*. Since 1974, when I entered the public school system as a recent graduate of a Speech Pathology program, I had all the answers...until I started working with children in a Chapter 1 identified campus in a border town school district. Each year, teachers would refer entire classes to me, and I realized quickly that I did not have the slightest idea how to tell the difference between those in need of Speech Pathology services and those in need of English language development services.

Two decades later, we still wrestle with the same issues, and I submit to you that, given the background of the students now entering the public school system, more and more students will be in need of English language development/Speech Pathology services related to articulation and language disorders, regardless of their ethnic or linguistic background.

Thus, the purpose of this paper is to describe current practices in various states used to identify linguistically different students, provide a review of the literature regarding recommended practices, and offer alternative practices for identifying linguistically different students. The expectation is that the information contained herein can serve multi-fold purposes:

1. provide an information base regarding current identification practices
2. suggest a way to systematically identify limited English proficient students using multiple criteria; and
3. offer a paradigm that will allow the United States Department of Education and the various state departments of education to collect consistent data regarding the students in need of English language assistance.

**Methodology**

To this end, in addition to a review of the literature, surveys were mailed to 17 states that provided a geographical representation of the eastern, heartland, and western regions as well as a multilingual and multicultural representation of the 17 states surveyed, 9 responded. These states graciously responded within a two-week time frame which is most deeply appreciated and acknowledged.
The recommendations in the section entitled “Paradigm for Determining English Language Assessment Needs” seeks to incorporate yet expand current practices extant in the various states. The intent is to make the modification of traditional practices more palatable and pragmatic which will enable practitioners to move toward the use of multiple criteria for identification and assessment of linguistically different students.

**Review of Language Assessment Practices in Selected States**

The purpose of the survey was to obtain data on the LEP population and the English speaking population by grade level with respect to ethnicity, language(s) spoken, and program offerings and to examine these data for any relational patterns between the size and the type of the LEP population versus the identification and assessment practices in the various states.

The limited information received as a result of the survey precluded making any generalizable observations. An attempt to utilize data provided by another national study (Olsen, 1991) yielded some discrepancies between data provided in the report and data provided by some of the states surveyed. Thus, efforts to address the intent of the survey were not very successful.

Sufficient information was provided, however, regarding the identification and assessment practices utilized to make the following observations:

**Home Language Surveys (HLS)** are used by each of the responding states as the initial screening instrument although the number of items on the HLS varied from state to state. Also, some states, such as New Mexico, use ethnicity as the identification criteria on the HLS and others use languages spoken. Variations in these instruments generate different kinds of information that can be collected regarding LEP populations. One additional factor that may be problematic in using this self-report type of instrument stems from misinformed parents or guardians who feel a need to misrepresent the native language spoken in the home. Such parents often feel that their children will be placed in programs that are not conducive to learning English if they respond truthfully on the HLS.

**Standardized Achievement Tests (SATs)** are used by every state, however, the cutoff score for identification, and exit criteria, varies between the 23rd percentile and the 40th percentile. This large discrepancy between cutoff scores will significantly impact on the number of LEP students identified per state.
Oral Language Proficiency Tests (OLPTs) are also used by every state although some states, such as New Mexico, limit their recommendations to four specifically listed OLPTs and others, such as Texas, list eight possible options. Inter- and intra-state variations in the OLPTs utilized also contribute to inconsistent identification and data collection practices because there is no correlation between the various instruments.

Some of the states suggest the use of optional criteria and merely list the possibilities, e.g., interviews, observations, and classroom performance, while other states (Louisiana, New Mexico) suggest specific interview techniques or checklists for specific performance behaviors. Regardless of the optional criteria used, the difficulty lies in that there is no apparent means of correlating performance on these alternative measures with their performance on the SATs or the OLPTs.

Additionally, many states allow each school district total autonomy regarding procedures utilized. This factor, coupled with the wide variation in practices, has implications for collecting consistent data regarding the number of LEP students, the kinds of languages spoken, and the level of assistance needed. Further, it makes it extremely difficult to conduct statewide or nationwide research on programs serving LEP students that will yield consistent, credible, and defensible data for decision makers in the field.

Recommended Integrative Approaches to Language Assessment

In reviewing the states' practices for identifying LEP students, two criteria surfaced repeatedly as being used extensively, although the manner in which these criteria were used varied. These two criteria are the standardized achievement tests and the oral language proficiency tests. Much has been written about the inadequacies of standardized achievement tests and oral language proficiency tests as measures of an individual's proficiency in English (Canales, 1990; TEA, 1988; Oller, 1973). Regardless of their shortcomings, to date, they have been widely used by the majority of the states as a basis for consistent measurement of students' linguistic performance. Since the 1970s, however, several options have been recommended that would provide practitioners with a more realistic and comprehensive assessment of an individual's English language proficiency (Canales, 1990; Erickson, 1981; Thonis, 1980; Oller, 1973). Some states reported using these measures, or at least recommending them as optional measures in their state publications.

These optional measures assess language proficiency while a student is engaged in a meaningful speech event. This is known as an integrative approach to language assessment because students utilize
several communication skills simultaneously. The use of these recommended measures to assess an individual's integrative use of language skills is necessary because, heretofore, primary measures of language assessment, namely SATs and OLPTs, have focused on discreet items of language proficiency, e.g., use of verb tense, use of correct vocabulary term. This process severely limits the amount of information regarding an individual's actual proficiency with a language because language usage:

1. is dynamic and contextually based (varies depending upon the situation, the speakers, and the topic)
2. is discursive (requires connected speech)
3. requires the use of integrative skills to achieve communicative competence.

This definition of language usage is predicated on a socio-linguistic theoretical base suggesting that language is more than just a sum of its discrete parts. The implication then is that language assessment instruments also need to follow a similar theoretical base, a practice that has historically been ignored in traditional language assessment procedures (Canales, 1990).

Language assessment instruments consistent with this philosophy are known as measures of integrative skills and include observation instruments (rating scales and checklists), interviews, dictation tests, and cloze instruments. A description of each follows.

**Observation Instruments**

Classroom observations of students interacting in various settings are the basis for determining students' linguistic proficiency. A student's linguistic performance in listening and speaking is rated on a five-point scale of proficiency, ranging from non-native speaker of English to proficient speaker of English, for each of the four linguistic subsystems -- graphophonemic (letters/sounds), lexicon (vocabulary), morphology (grammar), and semantics (syntax/meaning) (see Appendix A & B). These rating scales are completed by the classroom teacher after observing students in various classroom settings. Separate rating scales can also be completed for observations of casual, social interactions, such as playground or cafeteria talk. Appropriate completion of these rating scales requires that the classroom teacher have an understanding of the criteria used to rate each of the linguistic subsystems.

The behaviors on the rating scale can also be listed in a checklist format in increasing order of difficulty for ease in scoring and analysis.
**Interviews**

Structured interviews are developed and administered on an individual basis. Ideally, an examiner should conduct the interview while a language specialist transcribes the examinee's responses, noting the use of the four linguistic subsystems. The advantages of this kind of measure are that it can be individually tailored to the experiences of the examinee and it allows the examiner opportunities to explore an individual's knowledge of the language.

The disadvantages, however, are several. First, it usually requires two people to administer the interview, a skilled interviewer and a language specialist. Second, this interview scenario has the potential to distract the examinee and perhaps contribute to diminished responses because of intimidation, especially for young children. Third, individualized administration makes it a time-consuming procedure. Finally, without appropriate scaling criteria, interviews are unsuitable for widespread use in schools as a tool for identification and placement of students.

**Dictation Tests**

The examinee listens to text dictated from graded material and writes down what is heard. The premise for this measure of integrative skills is that the individual needs to have knowledge of the four linguistic subsystems in order to convert speech to print. The use of dictation tests is advantageous because they:

- are easily developed from material used in everyday classroom situations such as basal readers, science books, or social studies books;
- can be administered in a group setting; and
- do not require extensive specialized training to develop or administer.

The few disadvantages of dictation tests, which can occur in the administration phase and the scoring phase, are manageable if the examiner is aware of them. First, an examiner's dialectal differences may cause difficulties in transcribing speech to print, a problem that could be overcome by using a taped version of the dictation. A related problem, students' lack of familiarity with this type of test, can be mitigated with practice sessions prior to the actual dictation to be used as the measure of language proficiency.

Second, an examinee's unfamiliarity with all of the variations in spelling of English sounds may cause interference for the examinee
in converting speech to print, for example, writing “miss is esmith” for “Mrs. Smith,” for example. This difficulty can be overcome by having the dictation tests scored by someone who knows the differences between the graphic and phonetic systems of the examinee’s native language compared to the system in English.

Third, the dictation test requires that the individual being tested knows how to write and finally, appropriate criteria for scaling need to be developed as in the case of the interviews.

**Cloze Instruments**

The examinee is asked to complete a readability-graded passage from which words have been omitted at regular intervals (usually every fifth word). The premise of this procedure is that language is highly redundant, with many contextual clues that can inform the examinee of the appropriate missing words if that person has a command of the language being tested. Cloze instruments have been used for many years and validated by reading specialists. Administered and analyzed properly, the results of cloze tests will yield information regarding the examinee’s level of facility with the text. Such information is useful in planning for students’ instructional needs.

In addition to its instructional orientation, there are many advantages to this procedure. The test can be prepared easily using texts that students use in the classroom, thus making the assessment procedure a functional one. Further, the test can be administered in a group setting and quickly scored. If administered to native English speakers at the same grade level, their scores can serve as a basis of comparison for the non-native speakers’ scores. Additionally, the construction, administration, and scoring of the cloze test do not require any extensive specialized training to use correctly.

The difficulty in implementing the use of integrative measures of English language proficiency lies in the lack of

- broad based acceptance with respect to their ease of development and administration,

- understanding of the breadth and depth of their usefulness, and

- standardized procedures for consistently collecting and correlating alternative data on students.

These factors preclude the use of ‘integrative measure’ data in making uniform decisions regarding the identification, placement, and exit needs of LEP students.
Following is a model for ameliorating this dilemma. The scope of the model, however, exceeds the traditional practice of identification and can be used to make decisions for placement and exit, as well. Use of this model consolidates the gathering of information for practitioners and enables them to make informed decisions regarding the needs of the linguistically different children.

**Paradigm for Determining English Language Assistance Needs**

The model mentioned above is a comprehensive process that identifies not only students in need of language assistance but the level of assistance needed as well. The process involves a systematic documentation of students' linguistic proficiency in formal and informal settings and academic and non-academic settings. In short, this process generates a profile of a student's needs for language assistance and thus, has been titled the English Language Assistance Needs (ELAN) Profile Chart. The ELAN Profile Chart enables practitioners to document data needed to appropriately meet the instructional needs of students and the programmatic needs of campuses.

There are specific steps that must be addressed prior to implementing the effective use of such a model. These steps include:

- identifying **criteria** to be used,
- developing a **Likert rating** scale to accompany each criterion,
- determining the range of scores possible for each **category of need**, and
- designing and implementing the **training** necessary to institutionalize the process.

Specifically, each step entails the following considerations.

**Criteria Development**

A comprehensive assessment of a student's language assistance need(s) requires that data be gathered in three areas. These three sets of data include non-academic related oral language proficiency data, social data, and academic data (OSA). In each of these areas local/state education agencies have the flexibility to include as many options as are feasible to be undertaken. The important consideration is that each option be clearly delineated and available to all of the individuals involved to ensure consistency of implementation. Some of the examples of the types of options have been mentioned in the section entitled "Review of Language Assessment Practices in Se-
lected States” and discussed in the section entitled “Recommended Integrative Approaches to Language Assessment.” These options, and others, are listed below along with a brief rationale for their utilization.

**Oral Language Proficiency Data**

*Home Language Survey* -- This serves as an initial screening and is currently used in many states. It can provide useful information regarding baseline data such as language(s) spoken in the home.

*Oral Language Proficiency Test* -- These prepackaged instruments provide inexperienced practitioners with baseline data regarding students' linguistic performance albeit minimal data.

*Oral Language Interview Instruments* -- These instruments enable interviewers to probe for information not readily accessible through pen and paper tests.

*Observation Instruments* -- Provide detailed, comprehensive data on students as they engage in actual speech events which minimize the intimidation factor present in other testing situations.

**Social Data**

*Socio-Economic Status (SES)* -- An often disregarded criterion, the SES of a student can offer valuable information regarding the amount of oral/aural stimulation received in the home. Typically, children from low to mid SES home environments are not likely to have

- engaged in much dialogue,
- been read to by their parents,
- or experienced summer camps, organized sports, or other similar experiences that help develop linguistic skills.

*Schooling Experience* -- This, too, is an often disregarded criterion. Information gained can inform practitioners about the possible level of skills learned in a formal school setting. If these skills are not continuously developed or are developed in a country other than that of the target community, students will need additional intervention services.

*Observation Data* -- This information obtained from the home and other social settings such as the playground, the cafeteria, etcetera can validate, or confirm, other data gathered.
Academic Data

Achievement Test -- Standardized achievement tests have been a primary source of data used by many states. As mentioned previously, however, the cut off score for eligibility has varied from state to state. Many states also use state-specific standardized tests. Unless these instruments are administered at each grade level, such instruments will not provide consistent data and, thus, are not recommended for use as criteria.

Cloze Test -- Used by many states, such instruments provide useful data regarding the students' language proficiency level with classroom text information that is the basis for participation and promotion in the schooling process. Its ease of administration and scoring make it a valuable criterion for consideration.

Six Weeks Grades -- This criterion provides formative data on students' performance and is the primary criterion used for promotion. The mean should be monitored during each six weeks across subject areas and the mean for the first five of the six weeks should be used as one of the criteria for assessing English language assistance needs. Individual school agencies need to establish specific subject areas to include in the mean.

Observation Data -- Checklists or rating scales utilizing specific performance criteria can provide information regarding students' use of language in contextual situations.

While the number of criteria suggested above may seem unreasonable, multiple data are necessary to develop a consistent and defensible process for documenting the identification, placement, and progress of LEP students and the benefit of effective programs needed to serve them.

Likert Rating Scale Development

The second necessary step in the process is the development of a rating scale for each criterion to be included in the ELAN Profile Chart (see Appendix O). A five-point scale is recommended to provide consistency across sites using a similar procedure. Following are examples of suggested scales as well as brief rationales/ explanations for the descriptors accompanying each rating.
Home Language Survey

1 -- Only Native Language Spoken
2 -- Mostly Native Language Spoken
3 -- Native and English Languages Spoken
4 -- Mostly English Spoken
5 -- Only English Spoken

Most of the home language surveys presently used by state or local education agencies ask three to eight questions that would yield this information. Examples of some of the questions include,

- Which language did your child first learn to speak?
- What language does your child use most often at home?
- What language do you most often use to speak to your child?
- What language does the father speak to his child most of the time?
- What language does the child speak to his/her father most of the time?
- What language does the mother speak to her child most of the time?
- What language does the child speak to his/her mother most of the time?
- What language does your child speak to his/her brothers and sisters most of the time?
- What language does your child speak to his/her friends most of the time?

Oral Language Proficiency Instrument

1 -- Non-English Speaker
2 -- Extremely Limited English Proficiency
3 -- Limited English Proficiency
4 -- Near Native-Like English Proficiency
5 -- Fluent English, Native-Like Proficiency

The descriptors for this scale reflect those found in OLPTs adopted for state use. Each descriptor has a range of possible scores based on the students' performance on the test.

Oral Language Interview Instrument

1 -- 80-100 percent Native Language Responses
2 -- 50-79 percent Native Language Responses
3 -- < 50 percent in either Language
4 -- 50-79 percent English Language Responses
5 -- 80-100 percent English Language Responses
This scale can be applied to any interview instrument regardless of the number of items contained therein. While specific response criteria is not provided, the expectation is that the interviewer will have been appropriately trained to score acceptable responses.

**Observation Data**

1 -- Pre-Production Stage  
2 -- Early Production Stage  
3 -- Speech Emergence Stage  
4 -- Intermediate Stage  
5 -- Fluent Stage

These are widely used labels for the various stages of language development (references). Specific behaviors relevant to each of the stages can be found in Appendix C.

**Socio-Economic Status**

1 -- < $5,000  
2 -- $5,000 - 10,000  
3 -- $10,000 - 25,000  
4 -- $25,000 - 35,000  
5 -- $35,000 - 45,000

These ranges are partially arbitrarily based on the qualifications for free and reduced lunch as well as a general approximation of the relative cost of meeting the basic needs of a family versus the affordability of “frills.”

[Note: Perhaps a more precise scale can be determined using the current Poverty Level Index that considers the number of family members versus the income.]

**Schooling Experience**

1 -- No Previous Schooling or All English Program Only  
2 -- Internationally Schooling/Some ESL Instruction  
3 -- Schooling in Other Countries  
4 -- ESL program only since entering U.S. school system  
5 -- Bilingual education program only since entering U.S. school system

This factor is critical to successful participation in the academic setting. Students with little or no previous formal schooling experiences or students placed in inappropriate programs will be in need of extensive linguistic and cultural education services.
**Observation Data (Home, with friends)**

1 -- Uses native language ONLY in all settings  
2 -- Relies on native language in all settings  
3 -- Uses the native language sparingly in all settings  
4 -- Uses the English language with friends only  
5 -- Uses the English language mostly in all settings  

Knowledge of language use in various settings can also indicate the possible level of proficiency with respect to vocabulary development.

**Standardized Achievement Data**

1 -- < 20 %ile  
2 -- 20-29 %ile  
3 -- 30-40 %ile  
4 -- 41-59 %ile  
5 -- 60-80 %ile  

The distribution of percentile points for each rating decreases from 20 to 9 because of the critical need to have a command of the language in order to perform well on these tests, recognizing of course that knowledge of the English language is not the only critical factor central to performing well on these measures. It should be noted that the ratings of 1 and 2 exceed the maximum cut-off scores found in states with large populations of linguistically different students, however, this type of scale can provide consistency in identification data and is thus presented as such.

**Cloze Test**

1 -- Raw Score of 0 - 20  
2 -- Raw Score of 21 - 30  
3 -- Raw Score of 31 - 40  
4 -- Raw Score of 41 - 49  
5 -- Raw Score of 50  

Cloze measures can be statewide versions based on state adopted texts or local versions. Decisions will need to be made regarding which content areas to include as cloze texts.

**Six Weeks Grades**

1 -- <= 59  
2 -- 60's  
3 -- 70's  
4 -- 80's  
5 -- 90's
The six weeks grades for each of the content areas can be used as a formative measure to monitor additional needs for English language assistance. The mean of the six weeks grades for the first five six weeks, either for individual subject areas or across subject areas, is recommended to assist decision makers in the early identification of students in need of English language assistance for the subsequent school year. Subject areas to be considered for determining this mean should at least include Language Arts, Science, and Social Studies given the language demands of the disciplines.

**Observation Data by Grade Level and Subject Area**

1 -- Points, identifies
2 -- Names, lists
3 -- Describes, tells (simply)
4 -- Compares, describes (more complex)
5 -- Analyzes, synthesizes

Linguistic information obtained as students engage in academic work can be particularly insightful for making programmatic decisions for these students. This information can be obtained using checklists or rating instruments once the desired behaviors have been identified (see Appendices D-L).

The ratings for each criterion presented above can easily be recorded in sample charts provided in the Appendix section of this paper. Appendix M illustrates an **Individual** English Language Assistance Needs Profile Chart and Appendix N illustrates a **Campus** Language Assistance Needs Profile Chart for use in recording the pertinent data.

In some instances, decisions will need to be made regarding missing data or non-applicable data. Suggested for use are “M” for data that is Missing and “0” for data that is not applicable, so that it will not get factored into the total count. Comments about why the descriptors were not applicable would be helpful in informing future users of the data and alerting them to changes which may need to be made. This procedure will ensure consistency in and utility of data collected.

**Distribution of Scores by Category of Need**

Once the criteria and the ratings have been determined, the next step involves the distribution of the number of points possible into each of the categories of needs -- Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced. Given the descriptors attached to each rating, the greater the number of points accumulated per child, the greater the child’s proficiency in the English language. In contrast, the fewer the number of
points accumulated for each child, the greater the demand for English language assistance. This inverse relationship between points accumulated versus need is consistent with current practices in the various states. Such that, if students are at a “Level 3,” they are at the advanced, near proficiency stage, and if they are at a “Level 1,” their proficiency in English is virtually non-existent.

To further illustrate this point, if 11 criteria are selected to include in the ELAN Profile Chart as suggested above, then the greatest number of points would equal 55 [5 (rating) x 11 (criteria)] and the least number of points possible would equal 11 [1 (rating) x 11 (criteria)]. An individual student can total less than 11 points if there are some data that are Not Applicable (see Note below). An example, of the distribution of points is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Stage Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34 - 55</td>
<td>Advanced Stage (Total possible if student scores all 5s or some 5s &amp; 4s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - 33</td>
<td>Intermediate Stage (Total possible if student scores all 3s or some 3s and 2s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00 - 22</td>
<td>Beginning Stage (Total possible if student scores all 2s or 1s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[NOTE: A score of 0-10 might be possible if there were missing data. If the criterion was important enough to include, decision makers may want to monitor the student’s performance until the necessary additional information is available.]

As with every process conceptualized for wide use, certain realities, such as lack of resources, often preclude the comprehensive and extensive use of recommended procedures. In those instances, the following alternative is offered:

1. Deduct five points per criterion omitted from the overall total and adjust the totals in the three categorical levels accordingly.

   55  Total in example (11 criteria)
   -  5  Oral language interview
   -  5  Observation Data (Social)
   45  New Total for 9 criteria

   28 - 45  Advanced (Scored all 5s or some 5s & 4s)
   19 - 27  Intermediate (Scored all 3s or some 3s and 2s)
   00 - 18  Beginning (Scored all 2s or 1s, and possibly some 0s)

2. Add five points for each criterion included to the overall total and adjust the three categorical levels accordingly.

   55  Total in example (11 criteria)
   +  5  State-wide test administered at each grade level
   60  New Total for 12 criteria

   15
If the school records of students are unavailable due to high mobility factors or recent immigrant status, then certain criteria may be selected in order to identify language assistance needs upon the student’s arrival. For example, the Home Language Survey, the Oral Language Proficiency Test, the Previous Schooling, and the Oral Interview data can all be obtained readily. The distribution of scores would then be adjusted accordingly so that decisions regarding need and placement could be made. This would ensure that the student received appropriate services pending the arrival or attainment of additional information such as SAT scores or grades.

**Advantages of the ELAN Profile Chart**

Although at first glance, the process may seem cumbersome, the ELAN Profile Chart has many potential advantages. Some of these advantages include:

- **Teacher judgment** is systematically documented.
- **Comprehensive information** regarding a student’s language proficiency is uniformly documented and available for use by teachers or parents.
- **Needs assessment** can be conducted during end of the year LPAC meetings which, in turn, can facilitate student and faculty assignments for successive years.
- **Consistency** in the identification process is possible in that the categorization of English Assistance Needs levels are based on Likert scale totals with corresponding points of distribution regardless of the number of criterion used.
- **Autonomy and flexibility** in the criteria to be utilized remain a viable option for the state and local education agencies yet enable the United States Department of Education and the state education agencies, respectively, to collect data on the number of students in need of language assistance.
- **Identification, placement, and exit criteria** systematically documented enable Language Proficiency Assessment Committees to execute their responsibilities conscientiously, consistently, and equitably.
Paper work is reduced to a manageable level, utilizing the comprehensive ELAN Individual Profile Chart (see Appendix M) or the ELAN Campus Profile Chart (see Appendix N).

Future Directions

Four critical mega-steps, if you will, need to be accomplished in order to implement the use of an ELAN Profile Chart.

First, the criteria to be utilized must be determined, or developed as in the case of the observation instruments. Second, participants in the process will require training in the development and usage of the instruments. Third, the data collected annually should be evaluated quantitatively and qualitatively to assess any patterns and note any anomalies. Fourth, longitudinal data should be cross validated for accuracy so that adjustments in the Likert scales can be made accordingly.
WHEATLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

WHEATLAND ORAL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT FOR DIAGNOSIS AND PLANNING

RECEPTIVE LANGUAGE - LISTENING

NAME____________________ GRADE_______ SCHOOL YEAR 19___ - 19___

SCHOOL____________________ Context: Home _ Peers _ School _ Primary Language____________________

Indicate the pupil's language competencies by circling the appropriate rating. Use RED in October; BLACK in May

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonology</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Grammar/Syntax</th>
<th>Semantics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sound System</td>
<td>The Lexical System</td>
<td>The Structural System</td>
<td>The Meaning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands immediately all speech in any formal classroom or informal presentation</td>
<td>Understands words at a very advanced level within context of formal classroom instruction and informal situations</td>
<td>Understands large units of connected discourse presented rapidly and grasps easily necessary grammatical and syntactical cues</td>
<td>Understands all classroom instruction and informal conversation very well, obtains meaning from oral context immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands classroom instruction and informal speech at the normal rate of presentation</td>
<td>Understands words beyond the basic level necessary to manage classroom instruction</td>
<td>Understands complex sentences containing several ideas and given at the normal rate; has ordinary grasp of syntax and grammar</td>
<td>Understands classroom instruction and informal conversation and obtains meaning from spoken context; occasionally asks for repetition of materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands most of what is said, but occasionally asks for repetition</td>
<td>Understands words basic to the formal instructional program</td>
<td>Can understand simple sentences of moderate length when given at a slow rate; usually grasps word order and grammatical cues</td>
<td>Understands ordinary classroom instruction and comprehends the context or daily activities at the level of an average native speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can understand what is said if speech is slowly and carefully pronounced</td>
<td>Understands only those words related to simple classroom instructions and informal directions</td>
<td>Can understand very short, simple sentences, given at an abnormally slow rate of speed; has some difficulty with syntax and grammar</td>
<td>Understands some of what is said in class and comprehends the context of only very simple material when slowly presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has great difficulty understanding what is said and appears to confuse sounds</td>
<td>Understands only those words necessary to basic needs</td>
<td>Has great difficulty in understanding, more than one word statement</td>
<td>Understands relatively little of what is said in class and does not obtain meaning from the context of orally presented material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Wheatland Elementary School District

## Wheatland Oral Language Assessment for Diagnosis and Planning

**Expressive Language - Speaking Fluency**

**Name**

**Grade**

**School Year**

**School**

**Content**

**Primary Language**

---

**Indicate the pupil's language competencies by circling the appropriate rating. Use RED in October; BLACK in May.**

### Phonology

The Sound System

- **5**: Pronounces words and sentences without error and with the fluency of a native speaker of commensurate age.
- **4**: Pronounces words and sentences in a level comparable to the language skills of an average native speaker.
- **3**: Pronounces words and sentences in a manner that can be understood but there is evidence of occasional error or influence of non-native speech.
- **2**: Pronounces words and sentences which are not fully understood because of errors which may cause comprehension problems.
- **1**: Pronounces words and sentences which cannot be understood at all.

### Vocabulary

The Lexical System

- **5**: Has an excellent vocabulary; uses figurative language and idiomatic expressions with the ease and facility of a highly fluent native speaker.
- **4**: Has an above average vocabulary; may occasionally use figurative language and idiomatic expressions of a native speaker.
- **3**: Has a vocabulary estimated at an average level for a native speaker and can manage adequately the subject matter idioms and figurative language.
- **2**: Has a limited vocabulary; may experience difficulty in expressing ideas; does not use idiomatic or figurative language.
- **1**: Vocabulary deficits result in the wrong use of words, idioms or figurative language; usually silent.

### Grammar/Syntax

The Structural System

- **5**: Speaks very fluently in the classroom and in informal settings; oral expression is comparable to the language proficiency of native speakers of commensurate age.
- **4**: Speaks fluently and can express ideas adequately in the classroom and in other settings; language competency appears to be that of an average native speaker.
- **3**: Speaks haltingly and has some difficulty expressing ideas; makes many grammatical errors and is frequently unable to respond.
- **2**: Often silent; rarely speaks at all except in a very limited manner in informal settings only.
- **1**: Cannot express meaningful ideas in connected discourse at all; expressions are usually one or two words sometimes accompanied by gestures.

---

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**
## Identifying & Instructing the LEP Student

(English as a Second Language)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Proficiency</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESL Categories</td>
<td>Pre-Production Stage</td>
<td>Early Production Stage</td>
<td>Speech Emergence Stage</td>
<td>Intermediate Fluency Stage</td>
<td>Near Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intermediate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Near Proficient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L2 Language</strong></td>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- minimal comprehension</td>
<td>- no verbal production</td>
<td>- communicate with action and gestures</td>
<td>- increased comprehension</td>
<td>- very good proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- increased comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- limited comprehension</td>
<td>- most complex sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- one/two-word responses</td>
<td>- complex errors in speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- simple sentences</td>
<td>- engage in conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- some errors in speech</td>
<td>- and produce connected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- narrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- near proficient orally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- very good comprehension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- vocabulary approaches that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of native speaker of same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- few, if any, errors in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- understands and produces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>complex sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- of native speaker of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>same age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- lack of experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with written language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- scores at or above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40th percentile on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>state approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>achievement test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Indicators</strong></td>
<td>listen point</td>
<td>select move</td>
<td>name list</td>
<td>label category</td>
<td>group tell/say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Focus</strong></td>
<td>* Develop listening comprehension</td>
<td>* Expand receptive vocabulary</td>
<td>* Design activities to develop higher level of language use</td>
<td>* Introduce language experience activities</td>
<td>* Continue to expand receptive vocabulary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) in the Content Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level I
- **Proficiency**
  - Basic comprehension
  - Limited proficiency

### Level II
- **Proficiency**
  - Advanced comprehension
  - Complex proficiency

### Level III
- **Proficiency**
  - Very advanced proficiency
  - Excellent proficiency

### Level IV
- **Proficiency**
  - Extraordinary proficiency
  - Master proficiency

### LEP Pupil Descriptors

#### Mathematics
- **Pre-Production Stage**
  - Recognizes visual of numeral (1-20) upon hearing name
  - Identifies objects together from one larger
  - Names appropriate numeral 0-10 upon seeing visual
  - Matches appropriate numeral to picture of corresponding number of objects

#### Social Studies
- **Pre-Production Stage**
  - Points to self upon hearing name called
  - Shows picture of appropriate family member upon hearing name
  - Shows age and gender to be in object
denitions

#### Science
- **Pre-Production Stage**
  - Points to the appropriate sense organ when cued verbally as to its sense and function
  - Demonstrates an appropriate reaction to a visual depicting a weather situation

### Social Studies
- **Early Production Stage**
  - Sequences events of numerals 1-20 from smallest to largest
  - Names appropriate numeral 0-10 upon seeing visual
  - Responds with more than or less than when shown two different numerals 0-10

### Production Stage
- **Early Production Stage**
  - Names family positions in a personal photograph of one's immediate family
  - Tells birth date
  - Tells current age and age to be next birthday

### Speech Emergence Stage
- **Early Production Stage**
  - Describes self in relation to other family members
  - Explains past and future events in own life
  - Identifies weather patterns in own life

### Intermediate Proficiency Stage
- **Early Production Stage**
  - Describes family members in relation to self
  - Completes an open-ended statement about various family members
  - Creates and describes an imaginary birthday

### Social Studies
- **Intermediate Proficiency Stage**
  - Identifies weather patterns in own life
  - Supports need for protection against heat and cold

### Science
- **Intermediate Proficiency Stage**
  - Creates and solves oral word problems using objects

### Social Studies
- **Intermediate Proficiency Stage**
  - Describes other family members in relation to self
  - Completes an open-ended statement about various family members
  - Creates and describes an imaginary birthday

### Science
- **Intermediate Proficiency Stage**
  - Defines appropriate sense when cued verbally as to its sense and function
  - Defines body parts responsible for each sense

### Social Studies
- **Intermediate Proficiency Stage**
  - Defines and explains concept of greater than and less than using objects

### Science
- **Intermediate Proficiency Stage**
  - Describes weather of the day in a simple sentence
  - Names one function of each of the five senses

### Social Studies
- **Intermediate Proficiency Stage**
  - Describes what the loss of a sense might be like
  - Develops concepts for identifying "hot" and "cold"

### Science
- **Intermediate Proficiency Stage**
  - Describes the advantages of good personal hygiene

---

### Best Copy Available
## Grade 1

### Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) to The Content Areas

#### PROFEICENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>LEVEL I</th>
<th>LEVEL II</th>
<th>LEVEL III</th>
<th>LEVEL IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minimal comprehension</td>
<td>improved comprehension</td>
<td>increased comprehension</td>
<td>very good comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no oral production</td>
<td>one-two word response</td>
<td>simple sentences</td>
<td>more complex sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>recall, summary, retell, describe, define, role-play, explain, recognize, compare, contrast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL STUDIES</th>
<th>PRE-PRODUCTION STAGE</th>
<th>EARLY PRODUCTION STAGE</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE FLUENCY STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>holds up set when hearing numbers 0-10</td>
<td>states number from 0-20 when seeing set of numbers</td>
<td>creates and solves written word problems using addition and subtraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>points to numbers 1-100 according to verbal cue</td>
<td>counts to 100</td>
<td>uses name of standard and non-standard measurement in a sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>selects largest or smallest number to 100 when asked</td>
<td>writes numeral 1-100 upon hearing verbal cue</td>
<td>recognizes ordinal numbers through 5 in their written form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>holds up correct math symbol when asked</td>
<td>names math symbols</td>
<td>uses names of money denominations in a complete sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shows penny, nickel, dime or quarter when asked</td>
<td>identifies penny, nickel, dime and quarter by stating correct name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>picks one half of a group or region when asked</td>
<td>tells value of coins, penny, nickel, dime and quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tells place value of a 1-digit number</td>
<td>counts to five with ordinal numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIENCE</th>
<th>SOCIAL STUDIES</th>
<th>SOCIAL STUDIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>raises hand when hearing name of long things</td>
<td>points to appropriate picture of family member when given verbal cue</td>
<td>points to appropriate picture of family member when given verbal cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points in picture of season according to verbal cue</td>
<td>holds up pictures of school personnel when requested</td>
<td>holds up pictures of school personnel when requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points to person in picture of season according to verbal cue</td>
<td>points to appropriate picture when given verbal cue about national/cultural symbols and holidays</td>
<td>points to appropriate picture when given verbal cue about national/cultural symbols and holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>throws toy, van, cloud, and water when requested</td>
<td>points north, south, east, west on a map according to verbal cue</td>
<td>points north, south, east, west on a map according to verbal cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points to picture of season according to verbal cue</td>
<td>follows simple directions using relative location (spatial) words</td>
<td>follows simple directions using relative location (spatial) words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points to plant parts as directed</td>
<td>acts out roles of family members and school personnel</td>
<td>acts out roles of family members and school personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holds up magnet, mirror, magnifying lens when asked</td>
<td>names an appropriate family member when a visual is shown and corresponding role is stated</td>
<td>assigns one job responsibility of each school employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>says name of school personnel upon seeing visual and hearing role described</td>
<td>lists basic needs of a family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answers &quot;yes&quot; or &quot;no&quot; to statements heard promoting cooperation between friends and classmates</td>
<td>describes three ways to promote cooperation as word and play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>names national/cultural symbols and holidays when shown appropriate pictures</td>
<td>responds to questions about safety rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>states &quot;north/south/east/west&quot; while concerning such direction</td>
<td>gives other directions using relative direction words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>replaces &quot;living/non-living&quot; when answering or hearing cue</td>
<td>describes each of the seasons in a simple sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>names the four seasons</td>
<td>lists what living things require to sustain life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lists what living things require to sustain life</td>
<td>indicates &quot;day/night&quot; when shown various pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>list the functions of the various sense organs</td>
<td>answers simple questions about weather with one/two word responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>describes vs. opposite characteristics of rough/smooth and big/smaller</td>
<td>names plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identifies various animals with a brief description of each</td>
<td>lists animals when cued with a visual reflection of a certain habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>defines what each part of a plant contributes to its life</td>
<td>describes a proper diet and a poor diet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX E**
**Integrated English Language Development (ESL) in the Content Areas**

### Grade 3

#### PROFICIENCY LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTORS</th>
<th>LEVEL I</th>
<th>LEVEL II</th>
<th>LEVEL III</th>
<th>LEVEL IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-minimal comprehension</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>advanced comprehension</td>
<td>increased comprehension</td>
<td>very good comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-no verbal production</td>
<td></td>
<td>-one/word response</td>
<td>-simple sentences</td>
<td>-more complex sentences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selects appropriate numeral(s) (1 to 9,999) according to verbal cue</td>
<td>Names numbers orally (1 to 9,999)</td>
<td>Names numbers orally (1 to 9,999) in context of a simple sentence</td>
<td>Names numbers orally (1 to 9,999) in context of a simple sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points to appropriate math symbol upon hearing name of operation</td>
<td>States math operations (+, -, x, ÷) upon seeing a completed problem</td>
<td>Explains math operation using name of math symbol</td>
<td>Counts change through addition and subtraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points to appropriate coin/paper money upon hearing name</td>
<td>Names different coins and paper money denominations</td>
<td>Verbalizes answer to multiplication and division facts through 45</td>
<td>Verbalizes multiplication by 10 and 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selects correct numerical answer to multiplication and division facts through 45 with verbal cues</td>
<td>Chooses correct answer for multiples of 10 and 100 with verbal cues</td>
<td>States answer to problems involving multiples of 10 and 100</td>
<td>States answer to problems involving multiples of 10 and 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places hands on clock on current numbers for time stated</td>
<td>Tells time to the nearest hour</td>
<td>Tells time to the nearest hour</td>
<td>Tells time to the nearest hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes appropriate devices for measuring</td>
<td>Identifies name of community worker</td>
<td>Identifies name of community worker</td>
<td>Identifies name of community worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SOCIAL STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points to self upon hearing own cultural/ethnic group name</td>
<td>Responds with name of land formation upon seeing visual cue</td>
<td>Points to appropriate plant or animal upon hearing name</td>
<td>Points to appropriate plant or animal upon hearing name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points to land formations upon hearing geographic name</td>
<td>Says &quot;density&quot; or &quot;sparsity&quot; upon seeing visual of a specific area of the city</td>
<td>Matches community workers with appropriate place of employment</td>
<td>Matches community workers with appropriate place of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows labels &quot;density/sparsity&quot; of visual reflecting an area of the city</td>
<td>Observes pictures reflecting four different seasons</td>
<td>Points to appropriate animal in a specific land formation</td>
<td>Points to appropriate animal in a specific land formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observes pictures reflecting four different seasons</td>
<td>Points to forms of transportation upon hearing name</td>
<td>Observes pictures reflecting four different seasons</td>
<td>Observes pictures reflecting four different seasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points to forms of transportation upon hearing name</td>
<td>Follows map upon hearing simple spatial directions</td>
<td>Points to appropriate animal in a specific land formation</td>
<td>Points to appropriate animal in a specific land formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows map upon hearing simple spatial directions</td>
<td>Matches community workers with appropriate place of employment</td>
<td>Points to appropriate animal in a specific land formation</td>
<td>Points to appropriate animal in a specific land formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matches community workers with appropriate place of employment</td>
<td>Points to appropriate animal or plant upon hearing name</td>
<td>Points to appropriate plant or animal upon hearing name</td>
<td>Points to appropriate plant or animal upon hearing name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points to appropriate animal or plant upon hearing name</td>
<td>Matches certain plant and animal population to their corresponding habitats</td>
<td>Matches certain plant and animal populations to their corresponding habitats</td>
<td>Matches certain plant and animal populations to their corresponding habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examines objects that reflect a solid state underwater pictures that are liquids, and puts an x over pictures of gases</td>
<td>Points to mountains, trees, and soil in an appropriate picture</td>
<td>Points to mountains, trees, and soil in an appropriate picture</td>
<td>Points to mountains, trees, and soil in an appropriate picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points to mountains, trees, and soil in an appropriate picture</td>
<td>Selects food when called by name</td>
<td>Selects food when called by name</td>
<td>Selects food when called by name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MATHEMATICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selects appropriate numeral(s) (1 to 9,999) according to verbal cue</td>
<td>Points to appropriate math symbol upon hearing name of operation</td>
<td>Points to appropriate math symbol upon hearing name of operation</td>
<td>Points to appropriate math symbol upon hearing name of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points to appropriate coin/paper money upon hearing name</td>
<td>Names different coins and paper money denominations</td>
<td>Verbalizes answer to multiplication and division facts through 45</td>
<td>Verbalizes multiplication by 10 and 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selects correct numerical answer to multiplication and division facts through 45 with verbal cues</td>
<td>Chooses correct answer for multiples of 10 and 100 with verbal cues</td>
<td>States answer to problems involving multiples of 10 and 100</td>
<td>States answer to problems involving multiples of 10 and 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places hands on clock on current numbers for time stated</td>
<td>Tells time to the nearest hour</td>
<td>Tells time to the nearest hour</td>
<td>Tells time to the nearest hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes appropriate devices for measuring</td>
<td>Identifies name of community worker</td>
<td>Identifies name of community worker</td>
<td>Identifies name of community worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SCIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
<th>PRU: PRODUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points to appropriate plant or animal upon hearing name</td>
<td>Points to appropriate plant or animal upon hearing name</td>
<td>Points to appropriate plant or animal upon hearing name</td>
<td>Points to appropriate plant or animal upon hearing name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matches certain plant and animal population to their corresponding habitats</td>
<td>Names plants and/or animals that live in the natural habitat reflected by a picture</td>
<td>Identifies name of community worker</td>
<td>Points to appropriate plant or animal upon hearing name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examines objects that reflect a solid state underwater pictures that are liquids, and puts an x over pictures of gases</td>
<td>Names plants and/or animals that live in the natural habitat reflected by a picture</td>
<td>Points to mountains, trees, and soil in an appropriate picture</td>
<td>Points to mountains, trees, and soil in an appropriate picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points to mountains, trees, and soil in an appropriate picture</td>
<td>Selects food when called by name</td>
<td>Selects food when called by name</td>
<td>Selects food when called by name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BEST COPY AVAILABLE
## Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ELD) in the Content Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>LEVEL IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL III</strong></td>
<td>increased comprehension, simple sentences, some errors in speech, recall, summarize, write, describe, define, note-play, explore, compare, contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL II</strong></td>
<td>limited comprehension, some errors in speech, name, but label categories, group, utilize response, answer (with one/two words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL I</strong></td>
<td>some errors in speech, name, count, label, solve, indicate, utilize, group, recall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROFICIENCY LEVEL DESCRIPTIONS

#### LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>LEVEL IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Level I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>Level II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level IV</strong></td>
<td>very good comprehension, more complex sentences, complex errors in speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level III</strong></td>
<td>fair comprehension, some complex sentences, complex errors in speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level II</strong></td>
<td>limited comprehension, some errors in speech, name, but label categories, group, utilize response, answer (with one/two words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level I</strong></td>
<td>some errors in speech, name, count, label, solve, indicate, utilize, group, recall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

#### MATHEMATICS

Select appropriate numeral (1 - 9,999) according to visual cue. Points in appropriate early addition or subtraction of numerals. Chosen appropriate numerical form for visual cue. Points in appropriate part of equations upon hearing function. Identifies appropriate visual or verbal cue. Acts out a safety measure in response to hazard cue.

#### SOCIAL STUDIES

Follows simple experiment instructions. Identifies simple machines with verbal cue. Places the planets of the solar system in correct location to one another. Machine weather forms to appropriate visual cue. Uses appropriate forms for each verbal cue. Points to appropriate material in construction of mechanical current (battery, wire, bulb).

#### SCIENCE

Describes each cultural group in region with two simple sentences. Explains the life experiences of the early humans and their environment. Describes the interrelationships of the parts of the state government. Analyzes appropriate/appropriate reactions to simple hazards辨.

### SOCIAL STUDIES

Examines a detail the interactions of one cultural group in region. Tells the story of one cultural group. Describes the interactions of one cultural group in region with another cultural group. Describes the interactions of one cultural group in region with the environment. Describes the interrelationships of the parts of the state government. Analyzes appropriate/appropriate reactions to simple hazards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) in the Content Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL I</strong></td>
<td>- minimal comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL II</strong></td>
<td>- limit comprehension, one/two word response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL III</strong></td>
<td>- increased comprehension, simple sentences, some errors in speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL IV</strong></td>
<td>- very good comprehension, more complex sentences, complex errors in speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTORS

- **LEVEL I:** minimal comprehension
- **LEVEL II:** limit comprehension, one/two word response
- **LEVEL III:** increased comprehension, simple sentences, some errors in speech
- **LEVEL IV:** very good comprehension, more complex sentences, complex errors in speech

### LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

#### PRERECORTION STAGE

- Listens, draws, points, repeats, moves choices, name, ask, out, match, etc.

#### EARLY PRODUCTION STAGE

- Names, lists, labels, categorizes, groups, tells, plays, responds, answers (with one/two words)

#### MATHMATICS

- Holds up appropriate numeral card (1 - 100,000,000) according to cue
- Points to place value (10,000) according to cue
- Shows understanding of terms "decimal, fraction, whole number" by pointing according to verbal cue
- Chooses appropriate fractional parts of diagrams when given oral cue
- Draws parallel and perpendicular lines according to oral cue

#### SOCIAL STUDIES

- Matches cultural group card to correct name upon hearing verbal cue
- Sequences in order first four periods of our country's history
- Points to river, mountain, lake, ocean, and desert upon receiving verbal cue
- Matches picture with name of natural resource
- Matches capital with state
- Selects correct map type when named

#### SCIENCE

- Plants to picture of energy source when given verbal cue (solar, nuclear)
- Chooses simple device indicated by verbal cue
- Selects appropriate picture of animal or plant when receiving verbal cue
- Selects correct food group when given food name orally
- Holds up visual of stage of life cycle of insect when hearing name

### BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Analyze, evaluate, create, justify, defend, support, debate, examine, complete, describe, detail
- Describes the calculation of averages
- Explains measures, measurements
- Explains use of protractor, while measuring angles
- Compares congruent, symmetric and similar polygons and segments
- States all steps to solve a 3-place multiplication problem

- Describes a favorite period of U.S. history
- Supports the need for ecological balance
- Analyzes the contribution and influence of U.S. diverse cultures
- Defends democracy against other forms of government
- Explains use of one special map based on a purpose
- Compares science problem-solving and decision-making
- Describes the characteristics of the solar system's celestial bodies
- Explains the process of photosynthesis
- Defends the need for conservation of energy and national resources
- Creates a chart showing major developmental changes during puberty
- Creates a balanced meal using major food groups in the national for choice.
## Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) in the Content Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>- minimal comprehension</td>
<td>- limited comprehension</td>
<td>- increased comprehension</td>
<td>- very good comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP PUPIL</td>
<td>- no verbal production</td>
<td>- one-word response</td>
<td>- simple sentences</td>
<td>- more complex sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>- some errors in speech</td>
<td>- complex errors in speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP PUPIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL STUDIES</td>
<td>Pre-production stage</td>
<td>Early production stage</td>
<td>Intermediate proficiency stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes correct category of whole number, fraction or decimal upon receiving verbal cue.</td>
<td>Round out whole numbers and decimals orally.</td>
<td>Explains process of calculating volume of a cone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selects improper fractions or mixed numbers upon verbal cue.</td>
<td>Names information needed to determine volume of a cone.</td>
<td>Describes the colonization of U.S. with another country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puts correct personal and possessive pronouns in sentences. When given a choice on paper, puts correct gender, number, and case.</td>
<td>Names information needed to determine area of rectangle.</td>
<td>Compares the technology of yesterday with that of today.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points out angle, segment, triangle, square, and circle when signaled verbally.</td>
<td>Changes fractions and decimals to percent orally, with flashcard cue.</td>
<td>Explains the use of map key or legend.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizes natural resources. Identifies geographical features on a map when cued orally.</td>
<td>Gives metric measurements of length, capacity, and mass.</td>
<td>Identifies charts, graphs, tables, and diagrams to answer basic questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points to graph, chart, table or timeline when cued verbally.</td>
<td>Reads temperature in degrees Celsius.</td>
<td>Lists scientific instruments and their uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifies reference materials when asked for such as atlas, dictionary, encyclopedia.</td>
<td>Identifies charts, graphs, tables, and diagrams.</td>
<td>Categorizes plants and animals into typical and non-typical types.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selects picture of natural resources according to verbal cue.</td>
<td>Points to graph, chart, table or timeline when cued verbally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grade 7

**Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) in the Content Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Language Development</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL I</td>
<td>-minimal comprehension</td>
<td>-minimal production</td>
<td>Selects correct powers by exponent with verbal cue</td>
<td>Points to major parts of microscope according to verbal cue</td>
<td>Points to correct picture upon hearing &quot;living&quot; or &quot;non-living&quot; when shown pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL II</td>
<td>-limited comprehension</td>
<td>-minimal production</td>
<td>Selects correct powers by exponent with verbal cue</td>
<td>Points to major parts of microscope according to verbal cue</td>
<td>Sequences pictures for property using the microscope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL III</td>
<td>-increased comprehension</td>
<td>-minimal production</td>
<td>Selects correct powers by exponent with verbal cue</td>
<td>Points to major parts of microscope according to verbal cue</td>
<td>Sequences pictures for property using the microscope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL IV</td>
<td>-very good comprehension</td>
<td>-minimal production</td>
<td>Selects correct powers by exponent with verbal cue</td>
<td>Points to major parts of microscope according to verbal cue</td>
<td>Sequences pictures for property using the microscope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTORS**

- minimal comprehension
- minimal production

- limited comprehension
- one/two word response

- increased comprehension
- simple sentences

- very good comprehension
- more complex sentences

- complex errors in speech
- very complex errors in speech

**LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

- no verbal production
- more complex sentences

- one /two word response
- complex errors in speech

- more complex sentences
- very complex errors in speech
## Integrated English Language Development (ESL) in the Content Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>Basic comprehension, fewer word response, no visual production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>Intermediate comprehension, some word responses, visual production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>Advanced comprehension, complete sentences, some errors in speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td>Very good comprehension, complex sentences, complex errors in speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mathematics
- Selects correct numerical or algebraic expressions according to verbal cue.
- Solves simple square, triangle or rectangle problems when hearing a name.
- Solves parallel or perpendicular line problems upon hearing the cue.
- Locates spots on graphs when hearing coordinates.
- Selects correct picture when given geographical features orally.
- Solves to appropriate picture when hearing name of cultural group in ESL.
- Responds with "yes" or "no" when shown the picture of a cultural domain in ESL development and a contribution person, indicating match or no match.
- Names men and women who have contributed to the US upon hearing a specific contribution.
- Selects pictures of cultural changes from Colonial to present day America, while hearing a simple description of the location in a map of the US showing growth while hearing land acquisition story.
- Responds "yes" or "no" to statements referring to contributions of slave groups to US culture.
- Performs an experiment with partners and simple verbal directions.
- Shows appropriate parts of equipment, when used verbally.
- Points to cardiovascular, reproductive and respiratory systems on an anatomical chart, according to verbal cue.
- Performs an experiment with simple virtual directions.
- Follows simple oral directions for using science equipment.
- Points to cardiovascular, reproductive and respiratory systems on an anatomical chart, according to verbal cue.
- Performs experiment with written directions.
- Names potential disease when hearing the name of an organ.
- Selects the steps followed in an experiment.
- Chooses systems and common problems/diseases.

### Social Studies
- Performs an experiment with partners and simple verbal directions.
- Shows appropriate parts of equipment, when used verbally.
- Points to cardiovascular, reproductive and respiratory systems on an anatomical chart, according to verbal cue.
- Performs an experiment with simple virtual directions.
- Follows simple oral directions for using science equipment.
- Points to cardiovascular, reproductive and respiratory systems on an anatomical chart, according to verbal cue.
- Performs experiment with written directions.
- Names potential disease when hearing the name of an organ.
- Selects the steps followed in an experiment.
- Chooses systems and common problems/diseases.

### Science
- Performs an experiment with partners and simple verbal directions.
- Shows appropriate parts of equipment, when used verbally.
- Points to cardiovascular, reproductive and respiratory systems on an anatomical chart, according to verbal cue.
- Performs an experiment with simple virtual directions.
- Follows simple oral directions for using science equipment.
- Points to cardiovascular, reproductive and respiratory systems on an anatomical chart, according to verbal cue.
- Performs experiment with written directions.
- Names potential disease when hearing the name of an organ.
- Selects the steps followed in an experiment.
- Chooses systems and common problems/diseases.
INDIVIDUAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE NEEDS FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>PK</th>
<th>K</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Language</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>Survey</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>OLPT</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>Oral Lang.</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>Interview</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>Observation Data</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>SES</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>Schooling</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>Experience</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>Observation Data</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>Achievement Test</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>Close Test</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>Six Wks. Grades</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>Observation Data</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>TOTAL Points</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>Classification</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>Parental</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>Approval/Denial</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>

Name of Student: __________________________
Appendix O

Likert Rating Scale for Determining English Language Assistance Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Language Proficiency Data</th>
<th>Academic Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Language Survey</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standardized Achievement Data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Only Native Language Spoken</td>
<td>1 - &lt; 20 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Mostly Native Language Spoken</td>
<td>2 - 20-29 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Native and English Languages Spoken</td>
<td>3 - 30-40 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Mostly English Spoken</td>
<td>4 - 41-59 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Only English Spoken</td>
<td>5 - 60-80 %ile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Language Proficiency Instrument</th>
<th>Class Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Non-English Speaker</td>
<td>1 - Raw Score of 0 - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Extremely Limited English Proficiency</td>
<td>2 - Raw Score of 21 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Limited English Proficiency</td>
<td>3 - Raw Score of 31 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Near Native-Like English Proficiency</td>
<td>4 - Raw Score of 41 - 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Fluent English, Native-Like Proficiency</td>
<td>5 - Raw Score of 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Instrument</th>
<th>Six Weeks Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 50-100% Native Language Responses</td>
<td>1 - &lt; 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 50-79% Native Language Responses</td>
<td>2 - 60's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - &lt; 50% in either Language</td>
<td>3 - 70's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 50-79% English Language Responses</td>
<td>4 - 80's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 80-100% English Language Responses</td>
<td>5 - 90's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Data</th>
<th>Observation Data by Grade Level and Subject Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Pre-Production Stage</td>
<td>1 - Points, identifies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Early Production Stage</td>
<td>2 - Names, lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Speech Emergence Stage</td>
<td>3 - Describes, tells (simple)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Intermediate Stage</td>
<td>4 - Compares, describes (more complex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Fluency Stage</td>
<td>5 - Analyzes, synthesizes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Data</th>
<th>Social-Economic Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - &lt; 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5,000 - 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 10,000 - 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 25,000 - 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 50,000 - 80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schooling Experience</th>
<th>Observation Data (Home, with friends)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - No Previous Schooling or All English Program Only</td>
<td>1 - Uses native language ONLY in all settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Interrupted Schooling/Some ESL Instruction</td>
<td>2 - Relies on native language in all settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Schooling in Other Countries</td>
<td>3 - Uses the native language sparingly in all settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - ESL program only since entering U.S. school system</td>
<td>4 - Uses the English language with friends only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Bilingual education program only since entering U.S. school system</td>
<td>5 - Uses the English language mostly in all settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Data (Home, with friends)</th>
<th><strong>BEST COPY AVAILABLE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Uses native language ONLY in all settings</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Response to JoAnn Canales's Presentation

Julia Lara
Council of Chief State School Officers,
Washington, DC

The comments outlined below draw extensively from the work of Ed De Avila, and from a report recently completed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) titled, "Recommendations for Improving the Assessment and Monitoring of Students with Limited English Proficiency".

The author of this paper should be commended for bridging the gap between our knowledge of socio-linguistic theory of language learning and the application of the principles of this theory to the assessment of limited English proficient students. There has been for a number of years agreement within the field concerning the need to encourage the use of integrative approaches to language assessment (observations, interviews, dictation, etcetera. However, as noted in the paper, these approaches can be costly and time consuming and consequently districts have been reticent to use these approaches extensively. Another key barrier preventing the use of these approaches has been the absence of an operational definition of a limited English proficiency student and of a fully English proficient student (see CCSSO document for conceptual definition of LEP and FEP). The methods of assessment outlined in the paper; the rating scales; and the social and academic data elements suggested are important elements of a comprehensive data collection system on LEP students.

However, there are a number of areas that need clarification and perhaps elaboration in this paper. The following comments discuss each of this areas of concern.

The discussion of state assessment and data collection practices is limited given the limited number of survey responses obtained by the author. A more extensive discussion of state assessment and data collection practices is contained in a publication by the CCSSO titled, "Summary of State Practices Concerning the Assessment of Data Collection about Limited English Proficient Students." This report lists on a state by state basis, the pre-screening, classification, placement, and exiting procedures and instruments used in each state, and types of instrument. The report also identifies data elements collected at the state level on LEP performance and academic status.

Differentiation needs to be made between procedures used for classification of language proficiency status from those to be used for
placement. It appears that the author suggests that integrative approaches used be used for purposes of classification along with the traditional oral language proficiency and achievement tests. While in the ideal situation this would be the best course of action to follow, we cannot lose sight of the realities (limitations in funding, personnel) at the local level, and the importance of identifying students within a reasonable period of time. In states with large numbers of LEP students, LEAs are advised to screen, classify, and place LEP students in language assistance programs within 30 days of enrollment. Districts in these states must use methods that are simple, effective, quick, and efficient. I am not convinced that, for purposes of classification, local practitioners can use all three assessment methods suggested (oral language proficiency tests, achievement tests and integrative tests) within 30 days or less. In spite of the limitations inherent in the language proficiency tests (do not measure all four language areas) districts may need to rely heavily on these instruments' use for purposes of classification. However, it makes sense to use integrative approaches in borderline cases when student's score on the language proficiency tests are close to the cut-off point.

For purposes of placement, monitoring language development and mainstreaming LEP students into the English-Only classroom, it is essential that the communicative based approaches outlined in the model be used by classroom teachers on a consistent basis. These assessments are particularly important prior to decision-making points along the LEP student educational continuum. A review of state practices shows that, for placement purposes, no state requires the use of observations, although 33 states do recommend that these methods be used. In terms of interview methods in five states they are required, while in 23 states they are recommended. Unless these procedures are required by the state, it is difficult to sort out when and how districts use integrative approaches. It appears that in many instances, LEAs opt for the least expensive option. Thus, at the national level, we do not have a clear picture of local practice regarding use of various assessment instruments. However, we do know that LEAs with resources are more likely than others to use a variety of assessment methods for purposes of placement and exiting.

In terms of reclassification, there is no doubt that, at the classroom level, teachers need to have information about what students can and cannot do relative to the linguistic demands of the mainstream classroom. Without this normative information, placement decisions are likely to be made in isolation of the classroom context and may result in premature exiting of LEP students from the language support programs. Integrative methods are certainly the most valid mechanisms for providing information to teachers about student linguistic performance.
More needs to be said about issues of reliability. Some concerns have been raised about the extent to which rating scales can be applied systematically across various contexts. Ed DeAvila has noted in his writings that teacher rating is problematic because they are highly dependent on the teacher's language background, the teacher's familiarity with the child, and the teacher's knowledge of language development (Ed DeAvila, 1990). I am not certain that these concerns have been addressed by the model. Assessment experts may need to look more closely at this issue relative to the recommendations outlined in this paper.

The use of socio economic data for purposes of identification and placement can be misused. The author asserts that this information can be used as an indicator of "oral/aural stimulation received in the home" and subsequently suggests family income as the measure of SES. The relationship between lack of stimulation in the home and development of linguistic skills in the LEP students' first or second language needs further exploration. There is no direct relationship between poverty status and inability to learn a second language as there is between poverty and academic achievement (broadly defined). To imply that there might be a positive relationship between the two is to minimize the role of both the developing linguistic and literacy skills of LEP students independent of socio economic background. The author needs to strengthen the case for the use of SES as an important element of the profile and show how it bears on language learning.

In terms of data collection, the data elements contained in the ELAN profile will be useful in terms of classroom level instructional needs. However, for decision making at the state and local level, the data set needs to be more comprehensive. Administrators and decision makers need information that can be used for program evaluation/development purposes such as referrals to special education, placement in categorical programs, dropout rates, attendance, retention in grade and much more.

Finally, while this paper identified the key assessment methods essential for student identification, it did not outline how these various assessment methods would relate to each other and at what point in the educational experiences of the LEP student. Nonetheless, the ELAN Profile chart is a promising mechanism for decision making at the local level. With additional development it should be very useful to practitioners and to officials in state education agencies.
Notes

1 The CCSSO publication cited above, “Recommendations for Improving...Limited English Proficiency,” contains a definition for a limited English proficient student and for a fully English proficient student.

2 Along with the information obtained in the screening devise, Home Language Survey.
Response to JoAnn Canales' Presentation

Robert Rueda
University of Southern California

The paper by Dr. JoAnn Canales on innovative practices in the identification of LEP students set out to accomplish three distinct goals. One was to provide information on current identification practices by state departments of education, including measures which they suggest or propose. A second goal was to present a way to systematically identify LEP students through the use of multiple alternative criteria. Finally, the last goal was to outline a paradigm that would permit state departments to collect consistent data for students in need of English language assistance. In preparing my comments, I have followed the order of the main points made in the paper, and therefore I will present those comments in that sequence. At the end of the commentary, I will present a set of suggestions for possible future drafts of the paper.

Current Practices

In order to provide data on current practices around the country, Dr. Canales conducted a survey in which seventeen states were contacted. Responses were received from eight of these states. Although there were practical constraints on collecting this data due to limited time, certain details were omitted from this early draft of the paper which would have been desirable from a methodological perspective. For example, it is not entirely clear exactly what the state department representatives were asked in terms of survey items. In addition, information about sampling would have been useful as well. For example, how were these seventeen states selected? In examining the states that responded, some of the states with significant numbers of language minority students were absent, including Florida, California, and Arizona. Since states vary significantly regarding proportions of language minority students, they are not all weighted equally in terms of importance, and it would be interesting to have additional data on what other states are doing. These limitations in terms of sampling need to be taken into account in interpreting the generalizability of the survey results.

Notwithstanding these potential limitations regarding generalizability, there appear to be two major findings which emerged from the survey. First, there is wide variation in terms of current state practices. This is not altogether surprising, however, it does suggest that aggregating data and arriving at a summary statement regarding national practices is not a simple or direct matter.
The second finding is that, if the measures the states are using are examined, in addition to the Home Language Survey which is used by almost all, there is a strong reliance on standardized tests and oral language proficiency tests. In attempting to evaluate this pattern, it is useful to ask what is currently known about language in terms of research and theory and then compare that with current practices.

Although the body of research on language and bilingualism is immense and complex, there are some generalizations which would likely result in wide agreement. For example, work in linguistics, anthropology, cross-cultural psychology, cognitive psychology, and other fields suggest that language use (and by extension, "proficiency") is context-sensitive and context-specific. Proficiency is no longer viewed as a fixed, invariant, "within-the-head" phenomenon. Secondly, language is inherently social. It is acquired and used in social settings for social purposes. Thirdly, language is acquired, not learned. That is, it is rare to see a parent saying to a child, "Today we are going to learn plurals" in the normal course of the day's activities. It is acquired in natural settings in the course of people's needs to accomplish specific social activities such as eating, dressing, and so forth.

Another thing which is known about language is that it is used in order to accomplish meaningful activities. That is, it is purposeful, a tool in order to accomplish everyday tasks. It is also a tool in the sense of being a sign system, which is used to mediate cognition. In this sense, there is an intriguing link between language and thought as Piaget, Vygotsky, and many others have noted. A final point about language is that it can be seen as an integrated part of a larger system of literacy. Therefore, if language is broadened to include written language and so forth, then perhaps the focus on oral language is overly narrow.

If the above generalizations about language are taken as a simplified summary of current views, and compared to the reported practices of state departments of education, there is not a great deal of correspondence or match. Specifically, the heavy reliance on standardized tests, achievement tests, and oral language proficiency measures as reported in the survey suggest that an outdated view of language is being used to drive practice.

**Comments on an Alternative Model:**

_The ELAN Profile Chart_

Taking the same general points about language as a starting point, the author's proposed model can be compared to the generalizations described above as well. In the paper, Dr. Canales discussed
the theoretical base of the model as being sociolinguistic. As described in the paper, it is fairly consistent with the generalizations of language outlined earlier, certainly much closer than reported school practices.

The proposed model suggests that data be collected in three areas: oral language proficiency, social data, and academic data. The use of multiple evaluative criteria is suggested, and it is proposed that the scores can then be converted to Likert-scale ratings. From these converted ratings, a profile can be constructed and a classification derived, resulting in a designation of either advanced, intermediate, or beginning level.

Although the proposed model is certainly more comprehensive than what is currently being carried in many school districts, there are some components which might merit consideration for inclusion. One, for example, would be data on the affective state of the child with respect to first and second languages and their usage. As my colleague at USC, Steve Krashen suggests, the affective state of the child is important in terms of how rapid and effective the second language acquisition process is, and is an additional but important piece of data.

Another important piece of data of great interest would be the socio-political context in which the first and second languages are being or have been acquired. The relative status of L1 and L2 has an important impact on the child's acquisition of language, yet it is normally ignored in the assessment process because the focus is exclusively on the child.

A major component of the ELAN Profile Chart is the Likert-scale score conversions, which in essence is a data-reduction technique. That is, data from various types of proposed measures are converted to a five-point scale, making the data more comparable. However, when data is reduced by this or any other technique, precision is lost. As an example, a percentile score of 83.5 on a standardized measure, when converted to its transformed equivalent on a five point scale in order to make it more comparable to other data, loses some precision. This may be useful in aggregating and summarizing data across districts and/or states, however data is converted to an ordinal scale of measurement. That is, it is possible to say that a four is less than a five, but not how much more, and the distance between a three and a four, for example, may not be equivalent to the distance between a four and a five.

Another consideration in the proposed model is that equal weights are given to each of the proposed indicators, if my understanding is correct. Assuming that it is, this would suggest that the data from the Home Language Survey would be equivalent in impor-
tance to protracted observational data in a large number of contexts. Is it logical to equate the meaningfulness or usefulness of these distinctly different sources of data? I would suggest that this point is certainly open to question.

One of the curious aspects of the proposed ELAN Profile Chart is that many of the alternative measures proposed were already listed as options by many state departments of education. An important question, it seems, is why are states not using these measures already? These alternatives to standardized tests already exist and are available, suggesting that perhaps the development of completely new measures may not be what is needed in the assessment of LEP students. The alternatives which do exist are not extensively used, and I will return to this point shortly.

One point of contention with the proposed ELAN model would be the almost exclusive focus on oral language, more specifically English oral language. It seems this is overly restrictive in light of how language and literacy are currently viewed. From my perspective, it would be desirable to consider relative linguistic proficiency, not only in English but in the child’s native language as well. Secondly, I would suggest broadening the scope to a wider focus on literacy as opposed to oral language exclusively. This might mean more attention to written language and other forms of literacy which are traditionally separated for assessment and instructional purposes. However, given the strong relationships among these, and the current view of language and literacy as part of a complex whole, separating out oral language from other parts of the child’s development may not be the most advisable course.

A final point with respect to the ELAN model has to do with the distinction between classification and diagnosis. The former is the term for sorting and comparing students. That is, who is lower? Who is higher? Who goes into this group? Who goes into that group? The latter term, in contrast, refers to data used to derive intervention or treatment. The conceptual distinction between these two terms is often confused in discussions or assessment procedures. My understanding of the ELAN model suggests that it is concerned with the issue of classification. Certainly Likert-scale conversions will allow one to say who is higher and who is lower on one or more measures. However, data of this type are not terribly useful for day-to-day instructional decisions. Data of the type provided by converted standardized scores are severely limited. If the concern is “What does this child know and what is the next thing this child needs to work on?” For the practitioner needing to know, “What do I do with this particular child today?” Global comparative data does not provide a very specific answer. Simply put, I would like to argue for increased attention to instructional relevance and data more accessible to instructional personnel.
Considerations for Future Revisions

Obstacles to change. In this final section, I would like to provide some suggestions for consideration in future revisions to the paper presented. One critical question has to do with the obstacles to change in educational institutions. A great deal of attention is currently being given in assessment circles to alternatives to traditional standardized assessment, which many have described as problematic. Why is it, however, that even when alternatives are available they are not heavily used? I would like to propose two hypotheses which might merit consideration as alternative assessment models are developed and considered.

One hypothesis is that teachers, bilingual specialists, and other practitioners in school settings have a particular schema or mental model of assessment. That is, this mental model provides a unified, logical framework of thinking about what assessment is, why it is used, how it fits together with instruction, and so forth. One possibility is that the mental model of assessment embedded in schools is very different from that embedded in the work of those researchers and theoreticians concerned with developing alternative assessment models. However, these underlying assumptions and belief systems are rarely taken into account. Innovative practices which do not neatly fit into one's existing mental model are ignored or discarded. Simply put, it is not enough to develop and disseminate alternative assessment models or procedures without taking into account the existing belief structures of the "end users." When viewed in this perspective, the failure of school practitioners to incorporate new assessment developments is logical and understandable. Unfortunately, rather than examining test-users, research (mostly guided by a psychometric framework), has tended to concentrate on the technical characteristics or procedural aspects of the tests themselves with little attention to those who would use them. It is important to recognize that many of the new innovations in assessment methodology and theory are rooted in a different paradigmatic framework from that familiar to many practitioners.

A second hypothesis is based on Mehan's work on educational decision making in special education. In his ethnographic examination of the referral, assessment, and placement process, he found that decisions were rarely made on the basis of rational consideration of test data and other child-related characteristics, as is assumed to take place in current law. Rather, he found the process to be characterized by "social negotiation," trade-offs, and bargaining; A child's educational fate often depended upon these interpersonal negotiations among educational personnel. In trying to make sense of these findings, Mehan assumed that all the actors were not malicious or incompetent. Rather, he concluded that their behavior was rational given the "institutional constraints" under which they were forced to
operate: limited time, budgetary shortages, conflicting laws, and so forth. The conclusion was that these very powerful everyday constraints had an overwhelming impact on day-to-day behavior, and what appeared irrational on the surface actually made sense. By extension, it can be assumed that there are such constraints in institutional settings such as state departments of education, school districts, and individual classrooms which mitigate against change. These have yet to be studied, although it is possible that they exert significant pressure on the implementation of new assessment procedures.

**The Larger Context of Assessment**

One point that I would like to see addressed in this paper is increased consideration of recent developments regarding assessment at the national level. As an example, there is much talk about more authentic assessment to reflect closer alignment to authentic curriculum (c.f., the California Language Arts Framework) and to recent theories of cognition and learning. Portfolios and other innovations are being widely discussed, even as pressure is mounting for national indicators of performance. It is likely that the next few years may usher in significant change in how assessment is conceptualized and used because of events taking place at the national level. The work discussed in this present paper under consideration should not be treated in isolation from these developments, but rather should be considered within that larger context.

The issue of entry and exit. One factor which might merit further attention in future work on this topic is the whole issue of entry to and exit from bilingual programs. At present, it appears that schools operate from a rather inflexible, all-or-none system that is heavily reliant on standardized assessments. It would be useful to consider more flexibility within this system, especially since learning is not conceptualized in such an all-or-none fashion. How could alternative assessment for LEP students be restructured to assist in this process?

The issue of eligibility. Because of my background in special education, I have a special sensitivity to the whole issue of eligibility. This has been a central concern of the field, and I would like to hope that in the treatment of language minority students we learn from the mistakes which have been made. Historically, much attention has been placed on the question, Who has learning problems, and who does not? Who should receive services and who should be excluded? Tremendous amounts of scarce resources are spent on generating psychological reports and making complicated eligibility determinations. Entry into the system in most cases is dependent upon meeting a certain profile or criteria. In spite of the fact that the as-
essment methodology and procedures are often technically inadequate, the field has focused on making finer and finer distinctions between groups of students at a tremendous cost. However, much of the assessment data collected during this sorting process does not readily translate into educational prescriptions. Moreover, many have argued that there are not really separate treatments for all the various diagnostic categories once they are filled.

The field of special education is currently in the midst of widespread controversy precisely because of these factors. It would be my hope that, in the field of bilingual education, we could avoid and even learn from some of these same mistakes. In order to meet these challenges, truly innovative developments are required at the level of assessment. However, it is not sufficient to consider the procedural aspects of new assessment methodologies apart from the new paradigms in which they are embedded or apart from the social contexts in which they will be used, that is, individual classrooms.