

Evidence-Based Practices for English Learners



Cara Richards-Tutor
California State University,
Long Beach

Terese Aceves
Loyola Marymount University

Leslie Reese
California State University,
Long Beach

November 2016



Office of Special Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education

Disclaimer:

This content was produced under U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Award No. H325A120003. Bonnie Jones and David Guardino serve as the project officers. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service, or enterprise mentioned in this website is intended or should be inferred.

Recommended Citation:

Richards-Tutor, C., Aceves, T., & Reese, L. (2016). *Evidence-based practices for English Learners* (Document No. IC-18). Retrieved from University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development, Accountability, and Reform Center website: <http://cedar.education.ufl.edu/tools/innovation-configurations/>

Note: There are no copyright restrictions on this document; however, please use the proper citation above.



The CEDAR Center

University of Florida
360 Norman Hall
PO Box 117050
Gainesville, FL 32611

www.cedar.org
cedar@coe.ufl.edu
352.273.4259



Table of Contents

Innovation Configuration for Evidence-Based Practices for English Learners.....	5
Academic Instruction.....	7
Recommendation 1: Provide Students the Opportunity to Develop Academic Oral Language While Simultaneously Teaching Literacy and Other Content Areas	7
Recommendation 2: Teach Vocabulary Across Content Areas	11
Recommendation 3: Provide Instruction and/or Instructional Support in the Primary Language as Needed	15
Recommendation 4: Provide Appropriate Interventions for English Learners Who Need Support Beyond Tier 1 Instruction.....	18
Recommendation 5: Implement Culturally Responsive Instruction (see Aceves & Orosco, 2014).....	20
Progress Monitoring.....	20
Recommendation 1: Implement Purposeful and Appropriate Assessment Practices Taking Into Account English Learners’ Primary Language, English-Language Proficiency, and Ongoing Linguistic and Academic Progress.....	21
Recommendation 2: Utilize Curriculum-Based Measurement to Determine Risk and Monitor Progress Across Tiers With English Learners as Part of a School Site or District’s Comprehensive MTSS Model.....	25
Recommendation 3: Employ an Ecological Approach When Evaluating English Learners’ Possible Learning Difficulties and to Develop Appropriate and Culturally Responsive Supports.....	30
Family-School Partnerships	36



Recommendation 1: Develop Parent Involvement Programs That Are Carried Out in the Home Language, Are Sustained Over Time, and Are Responsive to the Cultural Experiences of the Families.	37
Recommendation 2: Understand the Out-of-School Experiences of Children and How These May Differ From the Skills Demonstrated at School.	40
Recommendation 3: Provide Strategies for Parents of English Learners to Enhance the Effectiveness of Parent Involvement Activities	44
Conclusion	45
References.....	46
Appendix A: Innovation Configuration for Evidence-Based Practices for English Learners Academic Instruction	68
Appendix B: Levels of Support for Evidence-Based Practices for English Learners	76



Innovation Configuration for Evidence-Based Practices for English Learners

This paper features an innovation configuration (IC) matrix that can guide teacher preparation professionals in evidence-based practices for English Learners. This matrix appears in Appendix A.

An IC is a tool that identifies and describes the major components of a practice or innovation. With the implementation of any innovation comes a continuum of configurations of implementation from non-use to the ideal. ICs are organized around two dimensions: essential components and degree of implementation (Hall & Hord, 1987; Roy & Hord, 2004). Essential components of the IC—along with descriptors and examples to guide application of the criteria to course work, standards, and classroom practices—are listed in the rows of the far left column of the matrix. Several levels of implementation are defined in the top row of the matrix. For example, no mention of the essential component is the lowest level of implementation and would receive a score of zero. Increasing levels of implementation receive progressively higher scores.

ICs have been used in the development and implementation of educational innovations for at least 30 years (Hall & Hord, 2001; Hall, Loucks, Rutherford, & Newton, 1975; Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987; Roy & Hord, 2004). Experts studying educational change in a national research center originally developed these tools, which are used for professional development (PD) in the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM). The tools have also been used for program evaluation (Hall & Hord, 2001; Roy & Hord, 2004).

Use of this tool to evaluate course syllabi can help teacher preparation leaders ensure that they emphasize proactive, preventative approaches instead of exclusive reliance on behavior reduction strategies. The IC included in Appendix A of this paper is designed for teacher preparation programs, although it can be modified as an observation tool for PD purposes.

The Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR) Center ICs are extensions of the seven ICs originally created by the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ). NCCTQ professionals wrote the above description.



This innovation configuration (IC) identifies effective practices for English learners (ELs) within a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) framework. In this IC, we have defined Tier 1 as core instruction, Tier 2 as a small-group strategic intervention for students who are struggling, and Tier 3 as intensive intervention for students with significant and persistent needs. To determine the effective practices for K-8 ELs, we conducted literature searches for each area using PsychInfo, Academic Search Complete, and ERIC. We searched the terms *English learners*, *English language learners*, *second language learners*, and *language minority students* for each of the three focus areas: (a) academic instruction, (b) progress monitoring, and (c) family-school partnerships. We summarized effective practices from peer-reviewed literature published between 2005 and 2015. We reviewed empirical work with and without student outcome measures (e.g., empirical work that focused on teachers) as well as non-empirical work (e.g., reviews of the literature, book chapters, Institute of Education Services [IES] practice guides) when the work reported the results of empirical findings of others. We did not include textbooks and articles that provided teaching recommendations and activities without specifying and describing the empirical rationale for the recommendations. We automatically included empirical studies that included only EL participants; we included the data if an empirical study included ELs and non-ELs and the data for the ELs were disaggregated.

The practices for ELs are divided into three categories: (a) academic instruction, (b) monitoring of student progress, and (c) family-school partnerships. Many of the overarching recommendations are not different from what would be recommended for students who are not ELs. However, the sub-recommendations are essential for ELs. The sub-recommendations may be different from what works for non-ELs or may not be necessary for these students. These recommendations are not just good teaching but are critical for positive outcomes for ELs. For



each sub-recommendation, we have indicated the tier or tiers that we recommend for practice. In a few cases, we have recommended the practice at tiers where there is not evidence from the literature, but implementing the practice for ELs across tiers (e.g., provide audio versions of books and vocabulary to be used at home) would make sense. Finally, we want to note that many of the recommended practices should be applied in conjunction with other practices rather than considered in isolation.

Academic Instruction

The purpose of this section of the IC was to provide recommendations for effective practices and strategies for academic instruction for ELs. For this IC, we have included English-language development as part of academic instruction. Here, we have reviewed four key recommendations that we found consistently represented in the literature related to academic instruction for ELs: (a) provide students the opportunity to develop academic oral language while simultaneously teaching literacy and other content areas, (b) teach vocabulary across content areas, (c) provide instruction and/or instructional support in the primary language as needed, and (d) provide appropriate interventions for ELs who need support beyond Tier 1 instruction. We also identified a fifth recommendation from the literature, which is to implement culturally responsive instruction. We did not review this recommendation, however, because Aceves and Orosco (2014) reviewed it in another the IC titled *Culturally Responsive Teaching*.

Recommendation 1: Provide Students the Opportunity to Develop Academic Oral Language While Simultaneously Teaching Literacy and Other Content Areas

In this recommendation, we have highlighted four sub-recommendations that provide pre- and in-service teachers with teaching tools to support ELs in developing academic oral language while they also learn academic content.



-
- Provide designated time to develop English oral language proficiency (as part of Tier 1 core instruction, even if students are receiving Tiers 2 or 3 interventions).
 - Provide sheltered instruction practices (i.e., comprehensible input and language objectives) to support students in content-area learning.
 - Use peer-supported learning to help students practice oral language during academic lessons.
 - Teach explicit comprehension strategies to assist students in accessing content while they are developing English proficiency.

Provide designated time to develop English oral language proficiency. Providing literacy instruction to ELs is not sufficient to provide the skills they need to become proficient readers and writers (August & Shanahan, 2006). ELs need time to develop their oral proficiency in English, which is often overlooked in the instructional programming for ELs (August & Shanahan, 2006). There is a strong link between oral language proficiency and text-level skills such as comprehension (Lesaux & Geva, 2006). In one study, Saunders, Foorman, and Carlson (2006) found that a separate block of time designated for English-language development increased the amount of instructional time spent on both oral language development and literacy and that ELs who received this designated time performed moderately but significantly better than students who received instruction that integrated English-language development. Focused time for developing language proficiency should be considered part of Tier 1 core instruction for ELs. If ELs need either Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention, this would be in addition to the designated English-language development time. In addition to designated English-language development, ELs must receive content instruction that integrates opportunities to further develop English proficiency. *We recommend providing designated time for English-language development as*



part of core instruction for ELs. Designated time should not be in place of necessary interventions in Tier 2 or Tier 3 nor should content intervention substitute for English-language development.

Provide sheltered instruction practices. As stated above, ELs need time during content instruction to develop English proficiency. Integrated time for developing English proficiency is most effectively accomplished by using sheltered instructional techniques to support students' content-area learning. Examples of sheltered instructional techniques include having clear content and language objectives, building background knowledge, providing information in a comprehensible way, teaching learning strategies, and providing students with opportunities to interact with peers and teachers (see Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2012). In one study using the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model, teachers who used sheltered instructional strategies had students who performed better on both reading and writing measures than those in classrooms where sheltered instructional strategies were not used (Echevarria, Richards-Tutor, Pham, & Rattleff, 2011). In another study that focused on building the background knowledge of ELs, students who received in-depth vocabulary instruction during science performed better on both science knowledge and vocabulary than students who did not receive the instruction (August, Branum-Martin, Cardenas-Hagan, & Francis, 2009). *We recommend sheltered content instruction at Tier 1. Although there is no literature to support its use in Tiers 2 and 3, we believe that sheltered practices are promising, and it makes sense to use them during Tiers 2 and 3 interventions, particularly as they align with many of the effective intervention practices.*

Use peer-supported instruction/learning. Using peers to support the learning of ELs is consistently highlighted in the literature. With peer support, students can practice academic



English during lessons, which helps further develop their English proficiency. Students are grouped or partnered with peers with varying levels of English proficiency, allowing them to learn content while having the opportunity to practice their English-language skills in a safe environment. Peer support provides a safe environment for ELs to thrive, perform, participate, and produce (S. Baker et al., 2014; Echevarria et al., 2012; Gersten et al., 2007). Positive increases in academic achievement have been noted for ELs with effective peer support (Calhoun, Otaiba, Cihak, King, & Avalos, 2007; McMaster, Kung, Han, & Cao, 2008; Richards-Tutor, Aceves, & Reutebach, 2015; Sáenz, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2005; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, Reutebuch, Carlson, & Francis, 2009). One instructional model for peer support, peer-assisted learning strategies (PALS), has been demonstrated in several studies to be effective for ELs (Calhoun, et al., 2007; McMaster et al., 2008; Sáenz et al., 2005). PALS uses structured instructional activities that provide ELs with needed oral language and reading practice that fosters overall reading development. PALS includes explicit teaching, routines, repetition, modeling and practice, and frequent opportunities to respond, all of which have been noted as critical for ELs. *We recommend peer support at Tier 1. Again, although there is limited literature to support its use in Tiers 2 and 3, we believe it is promising, and it makes sense to use peer-supported learning in Tiers 2 and 3 interventions.*

Teach explicit comprehension strategies. ELs must be explicitly taught comprehension strategies to help them access the content while they are developing English proficiency. There is support for this recommendation for students beginning as young as kindergarten and through the secondary level and across all tiers in an MTSS model (e.g., Cirino et al., 2009; Echevarria et al., 2012; A. W. Graves, Brandon, Duesbery, McIntosh, & Plye, 2011; A. W. Graves, Duesbery, Brandon, & McIntosh, 2010; Klingner, Boardman, & Annamma, 2012; Vaughn, Mathes, et al.,



2006; Solari & Gerber, 2008; Vaughn et al., 2011; Wanzek & Roberts, 2012). Teaching ELs learning strategies to access content information as they read is important (Echevarria et al., 2012). Strategies include summarizing, inferring, making connections, and asking questions. Collaborative strategic reading, developed for ELs and other struggling students, is one method that has been shown to be effective in teaching comprehension strategies (Klingner et al., 2012). Structured peer discussion and collaborative activities are included throughout the before-during-after reading process; together, students use reading strategies to monitor their comprehension, review and synthesize information, ask and answer questions, and take steps to improve their understanding. *We recommend teaching explicit comprehension strategies at all three tiers. Literature supports this practice at each tier for ELs, with more support at Tiers 1 and 2. This practice is not as well supported at Tier 3, but this is essentially due to the limited number of studies that exist that examine Tier 3 interventions for ELs.*

Recommendation 2: Teach Vocabulary Across Content Areas

In this recommendation, we have highlighted three sub-recommendations to help practicing teachers and teacher candidates teach vocabulary across the content areas.

- Provide opportunities for in-depth understanding of words through reading, writing, listening, and speaking.
- Teach high-utility academic words.
- Teach word-learning strategies.

Provide opportunities for in-depth understanding of words through reading, writing, listening, and speaking. ELs must receive opportunities for in-depth understanding of words through reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Findings from multiple studies support using instructional strategies such as student-friendly definitions, examples and non-examples,



and requiring students to use target words in their writing and discussions with teachers and peers (e.g. Cena et al., 2013; Lawrence, & White, 2009; Lesaux, Kieffer, Faller, & Kelley, 2010; Silverman & Hines, 2009; Townsend & Collins, 2009*; Vaughn et al., 2009*). In one study, Spanish vocabulary was taught to first-grade students using explicit instructional routines including defining the word, using examples and non-examples, writing a student-friendly definition, and sharing a sentence with a peer (Cena et al., 2013). Results indicated significant differences in the depth of understanding of Spanish vocabulary. Similar results were found for ELs in pre-K through second grade receiving an English vocabulary intervention using a combination of explicit instructional strategies and short video clips (Silverman & Hines, 2009). Furthermore, several Tier 2 interventions have indicated that similar strategies are effective in teaching vocabulary in supplemental interventions for struggling readers (e.g., Nelson, Vadasy, & Sanders, 2011; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson et al., 2006; Vaughn, Mathes et al., 2006). For example, one Tier 2 intervention for kindergarten students combined both decoding instruction and explicit vocabulary instruction in English, using several of the strategies above such as child-friendly definitions, examples and non-examples, reading words in context, and using the words in sentences (Nelson et al., 2011). The intervention was effective for increasing word knowledge of vocabulary words taught and decoding words.

Targeted vocabulary instruction is important, but it is not sufficient to teach ELs all of the words they need to learn. In-depth instruction will only account for about 20% of the number of words students must learn to keep the pace required by academic texts; it is very time intensive (Coyne, McCoach, & Kapp, 2007). Therefore, it is important that teachers augment this instruction with more embedded approaches, which requires teaching words when given teachable moments for providing explanations or definitions of academic vocabulary. *We*



recommend that ELs receive opportunities for in-depth understanding of words at Tiers 1, 2, and 3. ELs must develop deep understanding of words as part of core instruction but also in the context of interventions.

Teach high-utility academic words. Teaching high-utility academic words requires teachers to teach a set of academic vocabulary words across multiple days using multiple instructional strategies (e.g., August et al., 2009; S. Baker et al., 2014; Cena et al., 2013; Lesaux et al., 2010; Silverman & Hines, 2009; Vaughn et al., 2009). Teachers should consider several factors in word selection. Teachers should consider both general academic vocabulary words and domain-specific vocabulary (S. Baker et al., 2014). General academic vocabulary includes words such as *compare*, *analyze*, and *adapt*. Domain-specific academic vocabulary includes words such as *integer*, *photosynthesis*, and *colony*. The research recommends teaching about five to eight words across several days, using robust instruction (S. Baker et al., 2014). Fewer words should be selected for Tiers 2 and 3 interventions. Words should be selected for their usefulness. S. Baker and colleagues (2014) suggested the following six criteria for selecting words: (a) words central to understanding text, (b) words used frequently in the text, (c) words that might appear in other content areas, (d) words with multiple meanings, (e) words with affixes, and (f) words with cross-language potential (p. 23-24). *We recommend that teaching high-utility academic words take place across tiers, and although this is not clearly specified in the literature, there must be alignment of the vocabulary being taught in interventions and core instruction so that students can practice the words in multiple contexts.*

Teach word-learning strategies. Because students cannot possibly learn all of the words they need from instruction, they must be taught word-learning strategies to determine word meaning on their own. Three word-learning strategies are discussed in the literature: (a)



morphology (i.e., word parts), (b) context clues, and (c) cognates (see S. Baker et al., 2014).

Teaching students about word parts such as prefixes, suffixes, and root words allows them to use parts of the word that are familiar to determine the meaning of the word (e.g., Kieffer & Lesaux, 2012; Lesaux et al., 2010; Lesaux, Kieffer, Kelley, & Harris, 2014; Vadasy & Sanders, 2015).

This strategy can be combined with using context clues so that students are first taught to look for familiar parts of words and predict the meaning and then use context clues to confirm their predictions (e.g., M. F. Graves, August, & Mancilla-Martinez, 2013; Lesaux et al., 2010; Lesaux et al., 2014). Teaching context clues allows students to develop a working definition of the word as they read. Essentially, teaching context clues requires the student to read the sentence with the unknown word and determine whether that sentence has any information that helps them figure out the meaning of the word. If the sentence lacks information, students are encouraged to look at the previous and subsequent sentences. Teaching students to identify cognates, or words with common word derivation, between or across languages can be useful for determining meaning (e.g., August et al., 2009; Lesaux et al., 2010). For example, in Spanish, the word *problema* means *problem* in English. Students should be explicitly taught to look for words or parts of words of an unknown word that may be familiar to them in their primary language. Students should also be cautioned that some words are false cognates, and although the words look and sound very similar, they have different meanings, (e.g., *rope* and *ropa* [clothes]; *bigot* and *bigote* [moustache]. Again, students should use context clues and word parts in combination with cognates to help them gain the meaning of the word. *We recommend teaching word-learning strategies across all three tiers. The teaching of strategies, again, is best done if coordinated across core instruction and intervention so that students have multiple opportunities to practice across multiple settings.*



Recommendation 3: Provide Instruction and/or Instructional Support in the Primary Language as Needed

In this recommendation, we have emphasized three sub-recommendations that provide teachers with tools for providing instruction or instructional support in a student’s primary language.

- Consider transferability of literacy skills for students literate in their first language.
- Provide students with bilingual programs when possible.
- Provide instruction with primary-language support.

Consider transferability of literacy skills for students literate in their first language.

ELs, especially those literate in their first language, come to school with resources that can help them become literate in English. Several literacy skills transfer from a student’s first language to English (see Genesee & Geva, 2006). For teachers, it is important to consider these skills and show the students the connections between them. For example, for young children, even those not yet literate, it is important to note that phonological awareness (PA) skills often transfer from one language to another. PA is an important skill for students to have to read text. One example of this is the PA skill of segmenting. If a student can hear the sound in a word in his or her primary language, he or she has the skill in English, too. Therefore, if a Spanish-speaking student can segment *gato* (g-a-t-o), then he or she can segment *cat* (c-a-t). In Spanish, students are more likely to work at the syllable level rather than the phoneme level. However, they can easily learn to segment at the phoneme level, which is a useful skill for English reading. Another example for older students is word knowledge. For instance, many word parts in Spanish (i.e., roots, prefixes, and suffixes) are similar to English. Understanding affixes and root words can help students understand word meaning in English. For example, if a native Spanish speaker



encounters the word *review* in English, he or she may be able to use knowledge of the prefix *re-* in Spanish, which has the same meaning as *again*, to figure out the word. It is important for teachers to carefully examine the relationship of literacy skills in both languages because not all skills will transfer based on the native language. For example, spelling in many other languages is different than spelling in English, and, therefore, this is not a skill that will transfer. *We recommend that teachers consider the transferability of literacy skills in all three tiers to allow teachers to build on the strengths and resources that students bring to the classroom but also focus on areas that will be challenging for ELs.*

Provide students with bilingual programs when possible, including intervention in the language of instruction. We recommend providing instruction when possible in the primary language at Tier 1 and providing intervention (i.e., Tiers 2 or 3) in the primary language when that is the language of instruction for the student (see Francis, Lesaux, & August, 2006).

The research is clear that ELs benefit from either bilingual or dual-immersion programs. The research is also clear that these programs do not create academic deficits or confusion for students as previously thought (Francis, Lesaux, & August, 2006). The literature that does exist examining dual-language programs shows that ELs who begin learning two languages early on in their school careers experience positive outcomes. Although there is no literature about aligning language of intervention with language of instruction, there is strong logical evidence for this. For example, Vaughn and colleagues (Vaughn, Cirino, et al., 2006; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, et al., 2006; Vaughn, Mathes, et al., 2006) designed a first-grade reading intervention in both Spanish and English and provided the intervention in the language of instruction. The intervention was effective on multiple literacy measures in both languages for outcomes in the language of the intervention, which, for students in dual-immersion programs, may mean



providing intervention in reading in the primary language but intervention in math in English if this is what aligns with instructional program. We recognize that this type of program is not always possible in schools and districts where there is not a dominant primary language such as Spanish. In these cases, it is useful to follow the suggestion below regarding primary-language support and those above regarding sheltered instruction. *We recommend providing bilingual or dual-immersion programs to students when possible at Tier 1 and align intervention to the language of instruction at Tiers 2 and 3.*

Provide instruction with primary-language support. Even in English-only instruction, primary-language support is useful when used strategically for activating prior knowledge and making sure the information provided to students is comprehensible. Although there are limited empirical studies using primary-language support (Liang, Peterson, & Graves, 2005; Orosco, Swanson, O'Connor, & Lussier 2013), there is consensus in the field that the use of native language can support ELs in understanding content (August, Artzi, Kuchle, et al., 2015; Echevarria et al., 2012). Previewing concepts and text in the primary language is a strategy that helps to activate prior knowledge. For example, if the teacher or assistant speaks Spanish, then he or she can ask students to describe what they already know about the topic (e.g., ecosystems). This may not always be possible if the teacher or instructional assistant does not speak the primary language of the students or if there are multiple languages represented in the class. Additionally, materials, such as bilingual dictionaries and bilingual books (even audio recordings of books), can be useful to students, especially those who are literate in their first language. *We recommend providing primary-language support at all three tiers, which will provide students in English-immersion programs the supports they need to be successful as they simultaneously learn both content and English.*



Recommendation 4: Provide Appropriate Interventions for English Learners Who Need Support Beyond Tier 1 Instruction

In this recommendation, we specify two sub-recommendations for appropriate interventions for ELs who need support beyond Tier 1 (i.e., Tiers 2 and 3 interventions).

- Provide targeted small-group explicit interventions at Tier 2 for struggling ELs or Tier 3 for ELs who have intensive needs.
- Ensure that interventions include specific accommodations to meet the needs of ELs.

Provide targeted small-group explicit interventions at Tier 2 for struggling ELs or Tier 3 for ELs who have intensive needs. Using small-group instruction to support ELs who are struggling or have intensive needs is important to meet the needs of ELs for whom Tier 1 is not enough. Interventions should be either (a) developed specifically for ELs or (b) determined appropriate for ELs. Interventions should include foundational skills (e.g., phonological awareness, decoding) in addition to other literacy and language skills (e.g., listening comprehension, fluency, reading comprehension). The literature indicates strong support for providing small-group Tier 2 interventions in reading to improve reading skills of struggling ELs (e.g., S. Baker et al., 2014; Begeny, Ross, Greene, Mitchell, & Whitehouse, 2012; Gersten et al., 2007; A. W. Graves et al., 2011; Kim, Wang, & Michaels, 2015; O'Connor, Bocian, Beebe-Frankenberger, & Linklater, 2010; Orosco et al., 2013; Solari & Gerber, 2008; Vaughn, Cirino, et al., 2006; Vadasy & Sanders, 2010; Wanzek & Roberts, 2012). There is also support for interventions in mathematics for ELs (Orosco et al., 2013; Orosco, 2014) and one study to support Tier 2 support in behavior (Preciado, Horner, & Baker, 2009). There has only been one study that has examined a Tier 3 intervention with ELs, and the results did not indicate growth after intensive intervention (Vaughn et al., 2011). However, we believe that providing intensive



intervention for the most at-risk students is necessary, and it is likely that more time and smaller groups are needed to help ELs who are both at risk for or have reading disabilities. Although the interventions in the literature are diverse and vary in focus for different grade levels, several elements of intervention are common: explicit, systematic teaching of skills that include corrective feedback targeting skills that meet individual student needs, including skills that promote reading comprehension (i.e., listening comprehension, vocabulary, and reading comprehension strategies). *We recommend providing struggling ELs Tier 2 and, when needed, Tier 3 interventions. We recommend this for both reading and math. Although there is less evidence in math, the research does show that it can be effective. We also note that for students who need intensive interventions at Tier 3, more than an hour a day, especially for older students, may be required for students to make growth.*

Ensure that interventions include specific strategies to meet the needs of English Learners. Strategies to meet the needs of ELs include opportunities for oral language development, using visuals and gestures, building background knowledge, and clarifying the meaning of words. Although we have discussed several other recommendations for these four strategies, in this section, we have emphasized their importance in Tiers 2 and 3 interventions. Several of the effective interventions used these strategies to ensure access to content and build comprehension to support ELs during intervention (Cirino et al., 2009; A. W. Graves et al., 2010; A. W. Graves et al., 2011; Kim et al., 2015; O'Connor et al., 2010; Orosco et al., 2013; Orosco, 2014; Solari & Gerber, 2008; Vadasy & Sanders, 2010; Vaughn, Cirino, et al., 2006; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, et al., 2006; Vaughn, Mathes, et al. 2006; Wanzek & Roberts, 2012). For example, one kindergarten intervention provided students with the opportunity to develop listening comprehension skills and focused on main idea and predictions. The students were



provided with language to use to understand how to determine main idea and prediction and were required to provide oral responses (Solari & Gerber, 2008). In another example for older students in fourth grade, Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) was used as the intervention, and vocabulary words were introduced through basic definitions and explanations before reading the text. In addition, students were taught to identify word parts (e.g., affixes, roots) to understand the meanings of words they may not have known in the text (Wanzek & Roberts, 2012). *We recommend that during intervention, ELs receive accommodations to meet their needs. Accommodations include, but are not limited to, oral language development, using visuals and gestures, building background knowledge, and clarifying meaning of words.*

Recommendation 5: Implement Culturally Responsive Instruction (see Aceves & Orosco, 2014)

Progress Monitoring

The purpose of this section of the IC was to propose recommendations for professionals while monitoring ELs' academic progress. Other types of assessment, such as those used to determine eligibility in disability categories and the development of assessment tools, were beyond the scope of this review. Monitoring students' progress allows educational professionals to use student data to inform ongoing instruction, make necessary adjustments to instruction, and more strategically target students' needs. As with all instructional and assessment practices, field professionals caution practitioners to carefully and purposefully consider the needs of diverse populations, such as ELs, to ensure accurate and ethical administration and use of the data. Here, we have discussed three key practices consistently represented within empirical research involving ELs and essential papers that address the practice of monitoring academic progress for ELs. Researchers recommend that educational professionals and schools or districts

(a) implement purposeful and appropriate assessment practices while taking into account



students' primary language, English-language proficiency, and overall linguistic and cultural background; (b) utilize curriculum-based assessment to determine risk and monitor progress across tiers with ELs as part of a school site or district's comprehensive MTSS model; and (c) employ an ecological approach when evaluating ELs' possible learning difficulties and use appropriate and culturally responsive supports.

Recommendation 1: Implement Purposeful and Appropriate Assessment Practices Taking Into Account English Learners' Primary Language, English-Language Proficiency, and Ongoing Linguistic and Academic Progress.

In this recommendation, we have highlighted four sub-recommendations to consider while progress monitoring ELs.

- Monitoring students' primary language and English-language proficiency.
- Monitoring students' progress in the language of instruction.
- Measuring students' progress after redesignation to English-proficient status.

Monitor primary language and English-language proficiency. In the United States, students may come to school with knowledge, skills, and experience in one or more languages. Children may begin to learn English when they start school for the first time or come to school knowing English as well as other languages, each at various stages of proficiency. While assessing academic progress, educational professionals should consider students' language proficiency in English as well as their additional languages regardless of the learner's language of instruction. Regular evaluation of students' language proficiency in each of their languages should take place across tiers within an MTSS support model (August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015; Esparza-Brown & Sanford, 2011; Linan-Thompson & Ortiz, 2009; Wilkinson, Ortiz, Robertson, & Kushner, 2006).



Current research stresses the importance of monitoring students' primary language during early school experiences (Jackson, Schatschneider, & Leacox, 2014; Lajia-Rodriguez, Ochoa, & Parker, 2006; Miller et al., 2006). Obtaining data extends beyond an initial survey of home language practices, typically obtained upon school entry. Understanding students' early language proficiency in a first or primary language may facilitate identification of students who need additional support in English vocabulary development (Jackson et al., 2014) while predicting growth in English reading performance (Lajia-Rodriguez et al., 2006).

Monitoring students' proficiency in English is a more common practice upon school entry and throughout students' formal academic experiences and takes place until students demonstrate a designated mastery of English, which may take 5 to 7 years to achieve (Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000). Researchers recommend that school professionals continue to regularly monitor students' English-language development (A. W. Graves et al., 2011; Miller et al., 2006; Vanderwood, Linklater, & Healy, 2008; Yesil-Dagli, 2011) to provide appropriate supports. Furthermore, gaining additional background information regarding students' linguistic performance (e.g., narrative retells; Miller et al., 2006) and practices at home and in the community and previous schooling experiences may contribute valuable information regarding the skills students bring to school (Esparza-Brown & Sanford, 2011). *We recommend monitoring both languages across each tier, although evidence was primarily reported in Tier 1.*

Measure progress in language of instruction and skill ability in both languages as appropriate. Monitoring student progress is an essential role for teachers working within an MTSS model to refine instruction, especially for students experiencing learning difficulties, and improve students' skill performance over time. Research investigating this practice with ELs clearly supports regularly monitoring students' academic progress and doing so in the language



of instruction (Al Otaiba et al., 2009; D. L. Baker, Park, & Baker, 2010; Domínguez de Ramírez & Shapiro, 2006; Domínguez de Ramírez & Shapiro, 2007; Fien et al., 2008; A. W. Graves, Plasencia-Peinado, Deno, & Johnson, 2005; Keller-Margulis, Payan, & Booth, 2012; Muyskens, Betts, Lau, & Marston, 2009; Ortiz et al., 2011; Richards-Tutor et al., 2012; Wiley & Deno, 2005). In other words, if students receive their primary academic instruction in English or another language, teachers should monitor students' ongoing academic progress in that language. Special consideration should be made to determine how skills may be distributed across languages.

Linan-Thompson and Ortiz (2009) suggested that teachers administer grade-level measures in English for students in English immersion programs where instruction is provided in English with support in English-language development. For students in bilingual education programs, teachers should assess student progress in the primary language. However, after students begin to transition out of primary-language instruction, teachers should assess progress in both the primary language and English. For students in dual-language programs where students receive literacy and academic instruction in English and an additional language, assessing progress should occur in both languages. A teacher's interpretation of progress should involve an understanding of first- and second-language development and expected performance for students learning to acquire skills in a language they may not have mastered (Esparza-Brown & Sanford, 2011; Rinaldi & Samson, 2008; Wilkinson et al., 2006). *We recommend screening and monitoring in language of instruction across Tiers 1, 2, and 3. Additionally, it is important to determine whether specific knowledge and skills are present in the student's primary language when appropriate to facilitate instruction and learning.*



Measure progress even after redesignation to English proficient status. Schools and districts often redesignate students, moving them from a classification of *limited* to a classification of *fluent English proficiency status* when they achieve sufficient progress in English. The process of redesignation often involves formal annual assessment of students' English proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and listening. After a school redesignates a student as achieving full English proficiency status, added services and supports, such as English-language development or specially designed academic instruction in English, are often discontinued. The assumption is that added supports are no longer necessary given that the student has acquired sufficient English skills to handle mainstream academic content in English. Although students may demonstrate sufficient progress in English skill development according to specific measures to warrant redesignation, school professionals should choose to continue monitoring students' English-language performance (Al Otaiba et al., 2009). Students may continue to struggle given increasing academic and language demands in the general classroom (Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006). It may be appropriate to maintain some level of assistance or support in English to sustain their progress (Al Otaiba et al., 2009; August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015; Hopkins, Thompson, Linqanti, Hakuta, & August, 2013).

Additionally, educational, school, and district professionals should strategically monitor students who remain in English-learner status for extended periods of time (Hopkins et al., 2013). Long-term ELs often demonstrate sufficient skills in both languages but lack proficiency and skill in using academic language in English (Klingner & Eppolito, 2014). School professionals should provide these students with purposefully enhanced levels of support (see Appendix B) to meet their unique needs to achieve redesignation and maintain progress within the general curriculum. *We recommend monitoring students' performance throughout schooling*



whether or not they exit English-learner status. Although empirical evidence remained limited at Tier 1, we suggest monitoring across tiers.

Recommendation 2: Utilize Curriculum-Based Measurement to Determine Risk and Monitor Progress Across Tiers With English Learners as Part of a School Site or District’s Comprehensive MTSS Model

A significant portion of the literature on progress monitoring focuses on curriculum-based measurement (CBM). CBM is an approach that measures student growth in essential skills to identify students who may be at risk for experiencing further difficulty. After students are identified for further assistance, teachers may continue to monitor students’ performance to determine growth. Measures include quick, easy-to-administer, timed measures (e.g., 1 min) that evaluate basic academic skills in reading, writing, and math. Students may be monitored monthly, bi-monthly, weekly, or more frequently depending on students’ goals and needs.

In this recommendation, we highlight four sub-recommendations from the research and literature base related to progress monitoring ELs using curriculum-based assessments.

- Using valid and reliable tools.
- Obtaining additional formal and informal measures of student performance to clarify progress.
- Including added training procedures to ensure appropriate data collection.
- Improving teacher’s ability to interpret progress-monitoring data.

Research has documented the benefits of monitoring progress for students experiencing academic difficulty using CBMs (A. W. Graves et al., 2005; Klingner, Artiles, & Bareletta, 2006; Muyskens et al., 2009; Vanderwood et al., 2008). The benefits of administering CBMs include



providing a manner for teachers to easily communicate with parents and other educational professionals regarding students' performance, documenting students' progress quickly and easily over time, and providing immediate feedback regarding student performance to make necessary adjustments to instruction. Currently, research on CBM for ELs is still beginning to inform the development and implementation of CBM progress-monitoring practices for students. Although the adequacy of these measures for use with ELs has been questioned (e.g., Hosp, Hosp, & Dole, 2011), research has documented the effectiveness of these tools for use with ELs (e.g., Klingner et al., 2006).

Use valid and reliable tools. Within an MTSS framework, teachers should use tools for ELs with demonstrated validity and reliability to identify struggling learners and monitor students in need of instructional support (August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015). The fact that a tool is considered valid and reliable for monolingual English-speaking students does not mean that this is the case for ELs. Measures are considered valid when they assess what they claim to measure. Reliable measures produce consistent results related to student performance. Researchers investigating the progress and needs of ELs overwhelmingly recommend that practitioners seriously consider the appropriateness of the measures they select for monitoring students (Al Otaiba et al., 2009; D. L. Baker et al., 2010; Domínguez de Ramírez & Shapiro, 2006; Domínguez de Ramírez & Shapiro, 2007; Fien et al., 2008; A. W. Graves et al., 2005; Muyskens et al., 2009; Richards-Tutor et al., 2012; Richardson, Hawken, & Kircher, 2012; Wiley & Deno, 2005; Yesil-Dagli, 2011). In the area of reading, screening and progress-monitoring measures considered to be valid and reliable and predictive of later reading achievement can assist teachers to identify students experiencing difficulty and in need of additional instruction (Esparza-Brown & Sanford, 2011). For example, there have been several



studies that indicate that some CBMs, such as oral reading fluency, are valid and reliable for ELs (see intervention studies cited in previous section for additional empirical examples; Betts, et al., 2008; Domínguez de Ramírez & Shapiro, 2007; A. W. Graves et al.; 2005; Muyskens et al., 2009; Vanderwood et al., 2008). Additional CBMs considered valid and reliable for ELs can be found on the National Center on Intensive Intervention website (intensiveintervention.org/resources/tools-charts). *We recommend using valid and reliable tools across Tiers 1, 2, and 3. Empirical research was strong across Tiers 1 and 2.*

Obtain additional formal and informal measures of student performance to clarify progress. While assessing EL progress, teachers should complement information with additional formal and informal measures of student performance to ensure appropriate decision making (Hosp et al., 2011; Linan-Thompson & Ortiz, 2009; Liu, Ortiz, Wilkinson, Robertson, & Kushner, 2008; Wilkinson et al., 2006). Several added measures have been discussed in the present recommendations and include using information related to language proficiency across languages (August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015); parental feedback regarding linguistic practices at home and within the community (Liu et al., 2008); and employing dynamic assessment (DA) to test students' responsiveness to instruction (Linan-Thompson & Ortiz, 2009). DA involves assessing a student throughout the learning process while providing scaffolds as needed (E. Cho, Compton, Fuchs, Fuchs, & Bouton, 2014). Specifically, researchers recommend collecting multiple data points through DA before placing students in Tier 2 instruction (Linan-Thompson & Ortiz, 2009).

In the area of reading, assessing ELs' comprehension while measuring progress in oral reading fluency may further clarify reading ability versus monitoring oral fluency alone (Knight-Teague, Vanderwood, & Knight, 2014; Quirk & Beem, 2012). Similarly, collecting



students' writing samples may provide important information regarding students' language and skill development (August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015). Therefore, in isolation, CBM screening and progress-monitoring measures may not fully explain student performance or lack of performance, calling for teachers to collect additional evidence of student performance.

Although the evidence for this recommendation was found mostly in Tiers 1 and 3, we recommend collecting additional formal and informal data, beyond regular CBM progress monitoring, regarding student performance across all three tiers, which is important while making significant decisions regarding intervention instruction and referral.

Include added training procedures to ensure appropriate data collection. Research reviewed for this IC rarely discussed training or professional development (PD) recommendations that schools should provide teachers to ensure that data is collected accurately and represents ELs' performance. School professionals often assume that after teachers are trained to administer measures, they reliably and consistently uphold standardized testing procedures across students and throughout the year. In real schools and classrooms, or non-controlled settings, it can be challenging to effectively monitor how well teachers adhere to standardized testing protocols while screening and monitoring student progress. Moreover, schools must rely on teachers to accurately evaluate the unique skills and behaviors that ELs demonstrate during incredibly brief testing sessions.

Cummings, Biancarosa, Schaper, and Reed (2014) observed examiner error in oral reading CBM testing obtained from a large group of first- through sixth-grade students ($N = 3,364$) from across 19 districts in 15 states. Participants in this study included a small sample of ELs ($n = 296$, 8.8%). Results indicated that a small proportion of EL performance in oral reading fluency was explained by examiner variability. As a result, the authors recommended



including additional procedures in universal screening and progress monitoring to ensure reliable and valid data collection with ELs. Procedures include providing rigorous training for testing administration involving ELs, providing periodic follow-up training of assessors, conducting shadow scoring, employing measure-specific fidelity checklists, and conducting double-entry checks (Miller et al., 2006). Additionally, providing task models before administering testing items may ensure students' understanding of tasks and directions (Miller et al., 2006). School professionals should carefully consider including added procedures while collecting universal screening and progress-monitoring data to ensure reliable and valid data collection involving ELs. *Therefore, we recommend including additional steps to ensure quality testing administration and interpretation for general screening and progress monitoring involving ELs across each tier of instruction, intervention, and support.*

Improve teachers' ability to interpret progress-monitoring data. When groups of ELs demonstrate weaknesses in certain skills, the issue becomes not only a measure of students' ability but also an indication of instructional quality (August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015). Teachers must know how to reliably administer universal screeners and progress-monitoring measures, and how to accurately interpret data to inform their instruction. Teachers regularly make important decisions regarding ELs' programming by using the data they collect and interpret. For example, teachers can obtain critical information regarding areas in need of further instruction (e.g., recognition of letter-sound patterns) by conducting error analyses after administering students' CBM passages (Flynn, Hosp, Hosp, & Robbins, 2011).

Pre- and in-service teacher training programs should build general and special educators' technical capacities to analyze and use data involving ELs for educational decision-making purposes (Esparza-Brown & Sanford, 2011). Although the research we reviewed regarding



progress monitoring for ELs minimally discussed this important issue, one non-disaggregating study (Menzies, Mahdavi, & Lewis, 2008) reported that teachers were challenged by needing to collect and use CBM data to make instructional decisions. Interviews with teachers revealed that teachers were not convinced that the process of collecting ongoing data regarding students' performance was entirely useful. Although paraprofessionals administered the CBMs, teachers reported having little time to interpret the information. The authors noted that without having the assistance of the school's literacy coach, teachers likely would not have made the necessary changes to their instruction using the information collected. It is possible, however, that as teachers become more accustomed to conducting regular progress monitoring and reviewing progress monitoring and other student data to inform their instruction, these practices can eventually become more routine (Menzies et al., 2008). *We recommend that teachers increase their ability to interpret progress-monitoring data for the purpose of making strategic adjustments to intervention instruction, which may include conducting error analyses to inform targeted areas of need. Teachers should understand how to interpret and use student data across each tier of instruction and support.*

Recommendation 3: Employ an Ecological Approach When Evaluating English Learners' Possible Learning Difficulties and to Develop Appropriate and Culturally Responsive Supports

In this recommendation, we highlight five sub-recommendations from the research and literature base related to employing an ecological approach and integrating culturally responsive practices when evaluating ELs' progress. An ecological approach to evaluation considers intrinsic and contextual factors that could account for a student's progress or lack of progress (Klingner & Eppolito, 2014). These sub-recommendations include:



-
- Considering multiple variables while explaining ELs' lack of progress.
 - Collaborating with qualified educational professionals.
 - Developing comparable profiles of true peers.
 - Monitoring short- and long-term progress, and more frequently for ELs experiencing difficulty.
 - Supporting teacher judgment with documentation of progress.

Progress monitoring is often linked to models of early intervention, such as MTSS, for students experiencing academic difficulty. Growing interest in MTSS and problem-solving models originated due to a general dissatisfaction with existing models requiring teachers to wait for students to fail before initiating supportive instruction and services. For students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, culturally responsive MTSS models consider and support ELs' multiple ecologies (e.g., language proficiencies; culture; time in the United States; classroom, educational, and home experiences; Betts, Bolt, Decker, Muyskens, & Marston, 2009; Brown & Doolittle, 2008; Klingner & Eppolito, 2014) across tiers of instruction, intervention, and evaluation (Klingner & Edwards, 2006; Klingner et al., 2006). The empirical and related papers reviewed for this IC regarding progress monitoring for ELs demonstrated findings and suggested recommended practices to clarify how such models of early intervention can better support ELs.

Consider multiple variables when explaining ELs' lack of progress. Representative research recommends considering multiple sources and levels of evidence while determining the reason for an EL's lack of progress (Liu et al., 2008; Ortiz et al., 2011; Wilkinson et al., 2006). This may involve a careful review of clearly organized evidence, including the quality and appropriateness of the general classroom instruction, intervention, curriculum, classroom, and



school environments as well as carefully organized and accessible documentation of a student's individual educational, linguistic, cultural, and family histories. Specifically, in their review of three studies involving ELs identified with reading-related disabilities, Ortiz and colleagues (2011) found numerous issues contributing to the misclassification of students involved in each study. The authors cautioned that progress-monitoring data used for making significant educational decisions are often only collected during a single year. They suggested that these data must be contextualized considering the previously noted and other variables. Therefore, while interpreting students' lack of progress it is important to consider the teacher- and system-level factors when looking at data; if there are classrooms where a majority of students are below the expected level of achievement, teacher or system factors rather than disabilities might be at play (August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015, p. 7).

Similar recommendations are echoed in the general literature related to the topic of evaluating ELs who may require supplementary supports and services at Tier 2 (August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015; Kieffer & Vukovic, 2012; Wilkinson et al., 2006). *Although some of this work is present in Tier 3, we recommend that teachers and specialists consider multiple variables that may explain ELs' lack of progress across all three tiers.*

Collaborate with qualified educational professionals. The literature we reviewed emphasizes the critical importance of engaging in purposeful and ongoing collaboration with professionals who have the necessary expertise and training to work with and support culturally and linguistically diverse learners (Garcia & Ortiz, 2008; Linan-Thompson & Ortiz, 2009; Martinez, Harris, & McClain, 2014; Wilkinson et al., 2006). School professionals should involve qualified individuals (e.g., bilingual special educators) to review progress-monitoring data for the purposes of improving general classroom and intervention instruction for ELs and



referring students for intervention and/or special education evaluation. Qualified individuals may include “individuals with expertise in second-language acquisition, cultural influences on learning, effective primary-language and [English as a Second Language] ESL instruction, assessing progress in the primary language and in English, and partnering with culturally and linguistically diverse parents and families” (Ortiz et al., 2011, p. 328). School professionals should evaluate whether procedures within developing MTSS structures purposefully identify, actively involve, and clearly articulate the role and duties of qualified educational professionals across tiers throughout the process. Procedures should require ongoing discussions regarding students’ progress-monitoring data. Collaborative discussions about student data can enhance a school’s overall educational decision-making process and instruction for diverse learners while providing a clear picture of students’ progress (Martinez et al., 2014). “There is power in collaboration around student assessment data to improve quality and appropriateness of student-specific interventions as well as general education curriculum and instruction” (King Thorius & Simon, 2014, p. 172). Conversations regarding progress monitoring across grade levels over time are often more valuable than discussions around student performance over a series of weeks or months, particularly when making decisions regarding referral for special education evaluation or disability identification (Ortiz et al., 2011). *We recommend that schools include procedures to ensure collaboration with qualified professionals across all three tiers.*

Develop comparable profiles of true peers. While interpreting ELs’ progress-monitoring data, teachers should analyze these results while referencing an appropriate comparison group rather than interpret results using norms developed for monolingual students alone. “It is best to compare outcomes for bilingual students with those for students from similar backgrounds” (August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015, p. 7). This point is reiterated in several



empirical studies involving EL populations (Al Otaiba et al., 2009; Keller-Margulis, Clemens, Im, Kwok, & Booth, 2012; Ortiz et al., 2011). For instance, in a study involving 6,321 general education fluent English speakers and ELs in third through fifth grades, Keller-Margulis, Clemens, and colleagues (2012) noted differences in oral reading fluency growth between semesters based on students' levels of English proficiency and grade level. The authors recommended that EL performance should not be compared to fluent English speakers when differential growth is demonstrated. Instead, EL performance should be compared to same-language, age-level peers. Caution should, therefore, be paid when interpreting progress-monitoring data from linguistically diverse students (Barrera & Liu, 2010; Esparza-Brown & Sanford, 2011; Sandberg & Reschly, 2011; Wilkinson et al., 2006). *Although the research is still limited in this area, we recommend analyzing and interpreting EL student data against comparable EL peer profiles. Profiles should facilitate decisions across Tiers 1, 2, and 3.*

Monitor short- and long-term progress, and more frequently for English learners experiencing difficulty. Collecting multiple examples of students' performance and doing so more frequently is recommended for teachers who work with ELs experiencing academic difficulty (King Thorius & Simon, 2014; Martinez et al., 2014). Teachers can monitor students' short-term progress by collecting ongoing classroom work, performance samples, and teacher-made evaluations. Schools should also maintain evidence of students' long-term progress by obtaining examples of students' performance from one year to the next (Liu et al., 2008). Analyzing data over longer periods rather than exclusively across a series of intervention weeks may provide a clearer picture of EL students' performance over time. For ELs, schools may universally screen more frequently (e.g., four times per year) and choose to monitor progress more repeatedly (e.g., weekly, biweekly; Gersten et al., 2007). Collecting, maintaining,



and using this data will require schools to create more reliable organizational systems for data management and access (Liu et al., 2008). *We recommend monitoring short- (i.e., weekly) and long-term (i.e., year to year) progress and doing so more regularly for ELs.*

Support teacher judgment with documentation of progress over time. General education teachers are often the first to recognize and refer students who may require additional and differentiated academic assistance within general education programs. Special educators supporting students without disabilities may also participate in early support considerations as part of a school-wide MTSS model. Teacher judgment regarding the performance of ELs, however, should be supported with multiple and consistent documented examples of student performance (Knight-Teague et al., 2014) and based on specific criteria (August & Shanahan, 2006). Teacher nominations identifying students in need of additional assistance have been found to be unreliable sources of evidence without accompanying examples of documented progress (Begeny, Krouse, Brown, & Mann, 2011).

As an example, Knight-Teague and colleagues (2014) investigated the accuracy of teachers' identification of third- ($n = 199$) and fifth-grade ($n = 196$) ELs with efficient decoding ability but poor comprehension. Participating teachers ($N = 24$) had the necessary certification to teach ELs and were from diverse backgrounds (30% Hispanic, 30% Black, 21.7% White). Results across grade levels indicated inaccurate teacher judgment regarding ELs' reading ability. Specifically, teacher judgments demonstrated patterns of both overestimation and underestimation regarding students' reading skills. The authors recommended supplementing teacher judgment of ELs' academic performance with multiple pieces of data. In sum, teacher judgment alone may require additional data given the limitations regarding its effectiveness in identifying ELs in need of additional support, particularly in the area of reading (August &



Shanahan, 2006; Ortiz et al., 2011; Wilkinson et al., 2011). *We suggest supporting teacher judgments regarding ELs' progress across each tier using concrete diverse examples of student performance data. Providing specific documentation of students' performance over time can substantially improve teachers' instruction and decision making.*

Family-School Partnerships

The purpose of this section of the IC was to propose recommendations for professionals who collaborate with the families of ELs. Although there are numerous textbooks and manuals with recommendations for parent involvement in children's schooling, in general, the empirical base for effective practices for collaborating with and involving parents of ELs is rather limited. The majority of the research studies cited were carried out in general education settings; however, we feel that the recommendations would hold true for Tiers 2 and 3 settings as well. Here, we have reviewed three key recommendations from the literature related to involvement of the parents of ELs in school activities and programs as well as with their children's learning at home. Recommendations include (a) developing parent involvement programs that are carried out in the home language, are sustained over time, and are responsive to the cultural experiences of the families; (b) understanding the out-of-school experiences of children and how these may differ from the skills demonstrated at school; and (c) providing accommodations for parents of ELs to enhance the effectiveness of parent involvement activities. We have provided each recommendation with sub-recommendations for further elaboration.

All of the studies we reviewed for this section were grounded in research demonstrating the importance of parent participation in children's education, citing studies showing that "parents' involvement in their children's education improves their children's achievement, even after the students' ability and family socioeconomic status are taken into account" (Lahaie, 2008, p. 685). Epstein's (2001) seminal categorizing of the six types of parent involvement is often



cited in studies (e.g., Lopez & Donovan, 2009) examining parent participation in general as well as in those focusing on parents of ELs more specifically. Lahaie (2008) found that parent involvement was particularly beneficial for parents of ELs; however, Klugman, Lee, and Nelson (2012) found that immigrant Hispanic parents engaged in significantly fewer forms of parent involvement and perceived more barriers to involvement than mainstream parents. Pérez Carreón, Drake, and Barton (2005) argued that immigrant parents' involvement may be in different forms of "presence" (p. 465) in their children's schooling (e.g., strategic helpers, listeners, questioners) in ways that may not be readily recognized by teachers.

Recommendation 1: Develop Parent Involvement Programs That Are Carried Out in the Home Language, Are Sustained Over Time, and Are Responsive to the Cultural Experiences of the Families.

In this recommendation, we have highlighted six sub-recommendations from the research base that provide educators with guidelines for the development and implementation of involvement of parents of ELs in their children's education.

- Communication in the primary language.
- Importance of bilingual staff.
- Accurate and supportive translation.
- Consideration of the concerns and perspectives of parents.
- Need for explicit information about United States schools.
- Parent-to-parent support groups.

Communication in the primary language. The research suggests that successful parent involvement programs are carried out in the home language, are sustained over time, and are responsive to the cultural experiences of the families. O'Donnell and Kirkner (2014) studied the



impact of a YMCA Family Involvement Project on family involvement and children's education performance with 144 Latino, predominantly Spanish-speaking families and 208 children. Self-reported data showed greater family-teacher contact, family involvement in school, and better family-teacher relationships after participation in the project workshops. Higher levels of parent participation in the project significantly predicted better social skills and work habits, measured by students' report card grades, after 1 year. After 2 years, better academic performance was also associated with participation.

Using self-reported data from Latina mothers participating in Parent and Child Together activities, ESL classes, and Parent Time sessions, Rivera and Lavan (2012) concluded that the Chelsea Family Literacy Program had a positive impact on the promotion of Latina mothers' involvement in their children's education. The sessions, targeting the needs of newcomer immigrant parents, were carried out by bilingual staff and involved guided visits to the children's classrooms and coaching about what to look for and ask about in parent conferences with teachers. Although Auerbach's and Collier's (2012) in-depth study of one district's parent education program critiqued the program's narrow focus on improving children's reading test scores, the authors, nonetheless, found that the program, carried out in Spanish and English over a period of 6-8 weeks, did contribute to reported benefits of increased parent confidence in working with their children at home, improved parent-child and parent-teacher relationships, and increased parent comfort in participation at school (Auerbach & Collier, 2012). On the other hand, research carried out with Latino parents not involved in specially designed programs found that language barriers between parents and school staff contributed to communication gaps that both teachers and parents associated with the underachievement of ELs (Good, Masewicz, & Vogel, 2010).



Importance of bilingual staff. The programs described above that documented successful outcomes (Auerbach & Collier, 2012; O'Donnell & Kirkner, 2014; Rivera & Lavan, 2012) were all carried out in the primary language of participants by bilingual staff. The longitudinal study by Tang, Dearing, and Weiss (2012) of Mexican-American families' involvement in their children's schooling in Grades K-3 found that having a bilingual teacher increased the parent involvement of parents who did not speak English, and this was particularly beneficial for children with lower initial literacy achievement. The authors concluded that "fluent bilingual teachers appear to have indirect consequences for the achievement of Mexican-American children whose home language is Spanish because family involvement in school-based activities increases most in this language context for children who struggle early" (p. 184). Klugman and colleagues (2012) examined the impact of co-ethnic presence, concluding that the proportion of Hispanic students in the school had a positive, significant association with parental ties for immigrant parents, which was associated with a significant decrease in perceptions of barriers for immigrant parents.

Accurate and supportive translation. While interviewing immigrant parents of children with disabilities, researchers have found that parents are generally satisfied with the services that their children receive, but they report challenges and dissatisfaction with the facilitation of individualized education program (IEP) meetings in ways that support and encourage parent involvement (S. Cho & Gannotti, 2005; Lo, 2008). Providing translation for parents of ELs is essential to foster informed participation in decision making regarding their child's education. Equally important, however, is that translation is accurate and complete. Studies have found that this is often not the case; translators for IEP meetings are sometimes unfamiliar with special education terms and are unable to provide full and accurate translations



(S. Cho & Gannotti, 2005; Hardin, Mereoiu, Hung, & Roach-Scott, 2009; Lo, 2008). Parents have also reported feelings of disrespect when professionals arrive late to IEP meetings or leave early, as Lo (2008) observed in IEP meetings.

Additional supports for parents of English learners. Parents of ELs in both general and special education settings have expressed the desire for a greater voice in decision making regarding their children’s schooling and for greater respect from teachers and staff members (Good et al., 2010). Araujo’s (2009) review of effective practices for involvement of parents of ELs also underscores the importance of inclusion of parent concerns.

Parents report needing more information about the United States school system, especially special education (Hughes, Valle-Riestra, & Arguelles, 2008), a system that is “saturated with technical and cultural conventions that can make parental navigation extremely difficult” (Mueller, 2014, p. 4).

Research focusing on effective practices with parents of children with disabilities is extremely limited. One strategy that has proved successful for parents of children with special needs is participation in a parent-to-parent support group, provided in the home language and carried out over time (Mueller, Milian, & Lopez, 2009).

Recommendation 2: Understand the Out-of-School Experiences of Children and How These May Differ From the Skills Demonstrated at School.

In this recommendation, we have included two sub-recommendations that highlight the need for educators to understand the out-of-school experiences of ELs and their families.

- Home literacy practices.
- Reading in the primary language.

Home literacy practices. Research findings underscore the need for teachers to



understand the out-of-school experiences of children and how these experiences differ from the skills demonstrated at school (Lynch, 2009; Mercado, 2005; Reese, 2009; Reyes & Azuara, 2008). Findings also point out the dangers of school personnel assuming that there is no literacy use in the homes of low-income and immigrant families when daily book sharing or storybook reading is not a regular activity. In their examination of survey data from more than 14,000 immigrant families on the 2005, 2007, and 2009 *California Health Interview Survey*, Festa, Loftus, Cullen, and Mendoza (2014) found that immigrant families were less likely to engage in daily book sharing with their children than were mainstream families. However, when researchers have collected data on home literacy activities in a variety of domains and involving different family members, they have documented a wide range of activities (Lynch, 2009; Mercado, 2005; Reese, 2009; Reyes & Azuara, 2008). Reading for religious purposes was common among home literacy practices for Latino immigrant families (Farr, 2005). Other practices included reading and writing for household tasks, commercial interactions, and entertainment purposes and responding to communications from schools and other institutions (Reese, 2009). In a study focusing on immigrant children with special needs, Rodriguez (2005) also documented books in the homes of all four of the participating Dominican families as well as children's observations of or participation in a variety of activities involving literacy use. All of the children engaged in homework supervised by their mothers, and parents engaged children in other activities such as oral storytelling, visiting the library, and reading aloud to children.

Parents were responsive to school demands, and school-related literacy (involving reading communications from the school, assisting children with homework, and monitoring required home reading) was a commonly reported practice across immigrant families (Lynch, 2009; Reese, 2009; Rodriguez, 2005). However, when Durand (2010) asked 56 Latina mothers



of kindergarten children how they prepared their children for schooling, she reported that practices related to academic preparation (e.g., reading with children) were not correlated with child outcomes. Instead, mothers' social practices, such as encouraging good behavior and positive relationships, were related to both children's engagement in class and literacy outcomes. Perry and Moses (2011) also documented the ways in which television viewing by Sudanese refugee families served to enhance children's English vocabulary and concept understandings as well as support their literacy development through the use of captioning. The ethnographic study of three Sudanese families, each with focal children in kindergarten or first grade, documented how television helped to shape young children's development of print literacy skills through media-related print as well as their motivation to read or write about books or characters that they had seen on television.

Reading in the primary language. One of the most common recommendations that teachers make to parents of young children is to read to their children at home. Home literacy experiences are associated with superior literacy outcomes, according to a review of the research on parent involvement and its effects on ELs' literacy achievement (Goldenberg, Rueda, & August, 2006). However, for bilingual children, questions have been raised regarding the efficacy of reading to children in their home language, particularly when the language of instruction and assessment at school is English. There is ample evidence that instruction in the child's first language (L1) supports reading and academic performance in the second language (L2; Goldenberg, 2008). However, a similar research base on reading at home does not yet exist.

Roberts (2008) carried out a rare intervention study with Hmong-speaking and Spanish-speaking preschool students involving children randomly assigned to either a home L1 or home L2 reading group. Roberts' study showed that children who were read to in their L1



identified significantly more vocabulary from the storybooks in English than did children read to in English (L2), but only after classroom reading of the story in English. Although both L1 and L2 reading served to promote L2 vocabulary, parents who received the L1 materials reported significantly more reading to their children than did the families who received the L2 materials. When caregivers were given a choice of reading material, they overwhelmingly selected L1 materials to read with their children.

Reese and Goldenberg (2008), in a study involving more than 1,400 first-grade Spanish-dominant ELs, found moderate correlations between literacy practices in English or Spanish and reading outcomes in that language. These language-specific results indicated that greater frequency of reading to the child at home in English predicted higher student achievement in English reading (but not Spanish) while greater frequency of reading to the child in Spanish predicted higher achievement in Spanish. The authors concluded that the language in which literacy activities occurred was a key dimension connecting community influences, family influences, and child outcomes.

Duursma and colleagues (2007) examined predictors of Spanish and English vocabulary among 96 fifth-grade ELs and also found complex relationships among the language of instruction at school and the language of literacy at home. For children initially instructed in English, those who received more personal literacy support in English at home scored higher in English. For Spanish vocabulary development, students who spoke more Spanish at home with both parents scored higher in Spanish vocabulary. Students who spoke more English with their siblings had lower Spanish vocabulary scores. Durand's (2011) review of Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten (ECLS-K) data found that home involvement activities were associated with Latino kindergarten children's early literacy performance. It is likely, therefore,



that Bialystok's (2001) conclusion regarding the linguistic and cognitive development of bilingual children continues to hold true: With bilingual children, reading to children fosters both general literacy understandings and language-specific competence in the language of the stories.

Recommendation 3: Provide Strategies for Parents of English Learners to Enhance the Effectiveness of Parent Involvement Activities

In this recommendation, we include two sub-recommendations that recognize the fact that the involvement of the parents of ELs in their children's education in United States schools often involves providing accommodations to facilitate parent participation.

- Audio versions of books and materials.
- Materials for home use in the primary language.

Audio versions of books and materials. Just as accommodations are necessary for the instruction of ELs in the classroom to enable them to take full advantage of instruction to develop both content knowledge and linguistic proficiency, so too are accommodations recommended to enhance the effectiveness of parent involvement for parents of ELs.

Unfortunately, with respect to accommodations necessary for home learning activities, the research base is limited, and, in most cases, the sample sizes of the studies are small. Cooke, Mackiewicz, Wood, and Helf (2009) studied three mother-EL child pairs in a public pre-K center engaged in an intervention activity in the home. Mothers were instructed in the use of a Talking Photo Album with photos of 200 common home objects. The album identified the objects through a recording device in English and Spanish, and children were prompted to respond with the word label. Mothers were able to talk with their children in Spanish but, with the support of the audio in English, were able to prompt their children in English for the object label. All three children and their mothers showed substantial increases in naming objects; however, only one



child showed gains aligned with introduction of the intervention. Another type of audio support studied involved the use of a parent-delivered, pre-recorded reading program at home. Kupzyk, McCurdy, Hofstadter, and Berger (2011) found that with the two participating EL children and their mothers, the tutoring produced “immediate and generalized gains in oral reading fluency” (p. 98). Although accommodations, such as providing parents with pre-recorded materials (including labeled pictures as well as texts), show promise for parents of ELs to provide home support in English, more research with larger samples is needed.

Materials for home use in the primary language. Another example of a successful accommodation effort for parents of ELs is the Book Loan Program (Yaden, Madrigal, & Tam, 2005). Implemented at a comprehensive childcare center in downtown Los Angeles, the program successfully fostered home reading by low-income Latino families to 3- and 4-year-old children through the establishment of a lending library in the hallway outside the children’s classrooms. The library was open during the hours when parents dropped children off or picked them up from school. Many of the books in the library were in the families’ primary language and addressed culturally relevant themes. Findings from the Book Loan Program study indicated an increase in the rate of book check-outs and the number of children participating in the program over the 3-year period of implementation.

Conclusion

Ensuring the positive school outcomes for ELs within MTSS requires the coordination of practices in the areas of academic instruction, progress monitoring, and family-school partnerships. While the recommendations in this IC should not be considered exhaustive, they represent key practices that are grounded in the literature. Practicing teachers and teacher candidates who have the skills and knowledge needed to implement these practices will be well-equipped to promote positive outcomes for ELS.



References

- Aceves, T. C., & Orosco, M. J. (2014). Culturally responsive teaching (Document No. IC-2). Retrieved from University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development, Accountability, and Reform Center website: cedar.education.ufl.edu/tools/innovation-configurations/
- Al Otaiba, S., Petscher, Y., Pappamihel, N. E., Williams, R. S., Dyrland, A., & Connor, C. (2009). Modeling oral reading fluency development in Latino students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(2), 315-329.
- Araujo, B. (2009). Best practices in working with linguistically diverse families. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 45*, 116-123. doi:10.1177/1053451209340221
- Auerbach, S., & Collier, S. (2012). Bringing high stakes from the classroom to the parent center: Lessons from an intervention program for immigrant families. *Teachers College Record, 114*(3), 1-40.
- August, D., Artzi, L., & Barr, C. (2015). Helping ELLs meet standards in English language arts and science: An intervention focused on academic vocabulary. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 32*(4), 1-24. doi:10.1080/10573569.2015.1039738
- August, D., Artzi, L., Kuchle, L., & Halloran, C. (2015). Quality of English language proficiency assessments: Evaluation of state and local implementation of Title III assessment and accountability systems. Washington DC: American Institutes for Research, U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from ncela.ed.gov/files/15_2037_QELPA_ELSWD_Summary_final_dla_5-15-15_508.pdf



-
- August, D., Branum-Martin, L., Cardenas-Hagan, E., & Francis, D. (2009). The impact of an instructional intervention on the science and language learning of middle grade English language learners. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 2(4), 345-376. doi:10.1080/19345740903217623
- August, D., McCardle, P., & Shanahan, T. (2014). Developing Literacy in English language learners: Findings from a review of the experimental research. *School Psychology Review*, 43, 490-498. doi:10.17105/SPR-14-0088.1
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Baker, D. L., Park, Y., & Baker, S. K. (2010). Effects of initial status and growth in pseudoword reading on Spanish reading comprehension at the end of first grade. *Psicothema*, 22, 955-962.
- Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., . . . Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). *Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school* (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx.
- Barrera, M., & Liu, K. K. (2010). Challenges of general outcome measurement in the RTI progress monitoring of linguistically diverse exceptional learners. *Theory Into Practice*, 49, 273-280. doi:10.1080/00405841.2010.510713



-
- Begeny, J. C., Krouse, H. E., Brown, K. G., & Mann, C. M. (2011). Teacher judgments of students' reading abilities across a continuum of rating methods and achievement measures. *School Psychology Review, 40*(1), 23-38.
- Begeny, J. C., Ross, S. G., Greene, D. J., Mitchell, R. C., & Whitehouse, M. H. (2012). Effects of the Helping Early Literacy With Practice Strategies (HELPS) reading fluency program with Latino English language learners: A preliminary evaluation. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 21*, 134-149. doi:10.1007/s10864-011-9144-7
- Betts, J., Bolt, S., Decker, D., Muyskens, P., & Marston, D. (2009). Examining the role of time and language type in reading development for English language learners. *Journal of School Psychology, 47*, 143-166. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2008.12.002
- Betts, J., Reschly, A., Pickart, M., Heistad, D., Sheran, C., & Marston, D. (2008). An examination of predictive bias for second grade reading outcomes from measures of early literacy skills in kindergarten with respect to English-language learners and ethnic subgroups. *School Psychology Quarterly, 23*(4), 553-570. doi:10.1037/1045-3830.23.4.553
- Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. E., & Doolittle, J. (2008). A cultural, linguistic, and ecological framework for Response to Intervention with English language learners. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 40*(5), 67-72. doi:10.1177/004005990804000509
- Calhoun, M. B., Otaiba, S. A., Cihak, D., King, A., & Avalos, A. (2007). Effects of a peer-mediated program on reading skill acquisition for two-way bilingual first-grade classrooms. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 30*(3), 169-184. doi:10.2307/30035562



-
- Cena, J., Baker, D. L., Kame'enui, E. J., Baker, S. K., Park, Y., & Smolkowski, K. (2013). The impact of a systematic and explicit vocabulary intervention in Spanish with Spanish-speaking English learners in first grade. *Reading and Writing, 26*, 1289-1316. doi:10.1007/s11145-012-9419-y
- Cho, E., Compton, D. L., Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., & Bouton, B. (2014). Examining the predictive validity of a dynamic assessment of decoding to forecast response to Tier 2 intervention. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 47*(5), 409-423. doi:10.1177/0022219412466703
- Cho, S., & Gannotti, M. (2005). Korean-American mothers' perception of professional support in early intervention and special education programs. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities, 2*, 1-9.
- Cirino, P. T., Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., Cardenas-Hagan, E., Fletcher, J. M., & Francis, D. J. (2009). One year follow-up of Spanish and English interventions for English language learners at risk for reading problems. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*(3), 744-781. doi:10.3102/0002831208330214
- Cole, M. W. (2014). Speaking to read: Meta-analysis of peer-mediated learning for English language learners. *Journal of Literacy Research, 46*, 358-382. doi:10.1177/1086296X14552179
- Cooke, N., Mackiewicz, S. M., Wood, C., & Helf, S. (2009). The use of audio prompting to assist mothers with limited English proficiency in tutoring their pre-kindergarten children on English vocabulary. *Education and Treatment of Children, 32*, 213-229.
- Coyne, M. D., McCoach, D. B., & Kapp, S. (2007). Vocabulary intervention for kindergarten students: Comparing extended instruction to embedded instruction and incidental exposure. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 30*, 74-88. doi:10.2307/30035543



-
- Crevecoeur, Y., Coyne, M. D., & McCoach, D. B. (2014). English-language learners and English-only learners' response to direct vocabulary instruction. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 30*, 51-78. doi:10.1080/10573569.2013.758943
- Cummings, K. D., Biancarosa, G., Schaper, A., & Reed, D. K. (2014). Examiner error in curriculum-based measurement of oral reading. *Journal of School Psychology, 52*(4), 361-375. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2014.05.007
- Domínguez de Ramírez, R., & Shapiro, E. S. (2006). Curriculum-based measurement and the evaluation of reading skills of Spanish-speaking English language learners in bilingual education classrooms. *School Psychology Review, 35*, 356-369.
- Domínguez de Ramírez, R., & Shapiro, E. S. (2007). Cross-language relationship between Spanish and English oral reading fluency among Spanish-speaking English language learners in bilingual education classrooms. *Psychology in the Schools, 44*(8), 795-806.
- Dressler, C., & Kamil, M. L. (2006). First-and second-language literacy. In D. August & T. Shanahan, (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth* (pp.197-238). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Durand, T. (2010). Latino mothers' school preparation activities and their relation to children's literacy skills. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 9*, 207-222.
- Durand, T. (2011). Latino parental involvement in kindergarten: Findings from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 33*, 469-489. doi:10.1177/0739986311423077



-
- Duursma, E., Romero-Contreras, S., Szuber, A., Proctor, P., Snow, C., August, D., & Calderón, M. (2007). The role of home literacy and language environment on bilinguals' English and Spanish vocabulary development. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 28, 171-190.
doi:10.1017/S0142716406070093
- Echevarria, J., Richards-Tutor, C., Pham, V., & Rattleff, P. (2011). Did they get it? The role of fidelity in improving teaching for English learners. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 4, 425-434.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2012). *Making content comprehensible for English learners* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Epstein, J. L. (2001). *School, family, and community partnerships* (1st ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Esparza-Brown, J., & Sanford, A. (2011). *RTI for English language learners: Appropriately using screening and progress monitoring tools to improve instructional outcomes*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, National Center on Response to Intervention. Retrieved from rti4success.org/sites/default/files/rtiforells.pdf
- Farr, M. (2005). Literacy and religion: Reading, writing, and gender among Mexican women in Chicago. In M. Farr (Ed.), *Latino language and literacy in ethnolinguistic Chicago* (pp. 305-321). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Festa, N., Loftus, P., Cullen, M., & Mendoza, F. (2014). Disparities in early exposure to book sharing within immigrant families. *Pediatrics*, 134(1). Retrieved from askchisne.ucla.edu/publications/Documents/PDF/2014/peds.2013-3710.full.pdf



-
- Fien, H., Baker, S. K., Smolkowski, K., Smith, J. M., Kame'enui, E. J., & Beck, C. T. (2008). Using nonsense word fluency to predict reading proficiency in K-2 for English learners and native English speakers. *School Psychology Review, 37*, 391-408.
- Flynn, L. J., Hosp, J. L., Hosp, M. K., & Robbins, K. P. (2011). Word recognition error analysis: Comparing isolated word list and oral passage reading. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 36*(3), 167-178. doi:10.1177/1534508411398649
- Francis, D., Lesaux, N., & August, D. (2006). Language of instruction. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners* (pp. 365-414). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Francis, D., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006). Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: Research-based recommendations for instruction and academic interventions. (Under cooperative agreement grant S283B050034 for U.S. Department of Education). Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.
- Galloway, E. P., & Lesaux, N. (2015). Reading comprehension skill development and instruction for adolescent English language learners: A focus on academic vocabulary instruction. In K. Santi & D. Reed (Eds), *Improving reading comprehension of middle and high school students* (pp. 153-178). New York, NY: Springer International Publishing.
- Garcia, S. B., & Ortiz, A. A. (2008). A framework for culturally and linguistically responsive design of Response to Intervention models. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners, 11*(1), 24-41.



-
- Genesee, F., & Geva, E. (2006). Cross-linguistic relationships in working memory, phonological processes, and oral language. In D. L. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in a second language: Report of the National Literacy Panel* (pp.169-177). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gersten, R., Baker, S. K., Shanahan, T., Linan-Thompson, S., Collins, P., & Scarcella, R. (2007). *Effective literacy and English language instruction for English learners in the elementary grades: A practice guide* (NCEE 2007-4011). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from ies.ed.gov/ncee
- Goldenberg, C. (2008). English language learners: What the research does—and does not—say. *American Educator*, Summer 2008, 8-44.
- Goldenberg, C., Rueda, R., & August, D. (2006). Social and cultural influences on the literacy attainment of language-minority children and youth. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth* (pp. 269-318). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Good, M., Masewicz, S., & Vogel, L. (2010). Latino English learners: Bridging achievement and cultural gaps between school and families. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 9(4), 321-339. doi:10.1080/15348431.2010.491048
- Graves, A. W., Brandon, R., Duesbery, L., McIntosh, A., & Pyle, N. B. (2011). The effects of Tier 2 literacy instruction in sixth grade: Toward the development of a Response-to-Intervention model in middle school. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 34, 73-86. doi:1177/073194871103400105
- Graves, A. W., Duesbery, L., Brandon R. R., & McIntosh, A. S. (2010). Two studies of Tier II



-
- literacy development: Throwing sixth graders a lifeline. *Elementary School Journal*, 111, 641-661. doi:10.1086/659036
- Graves, A. W., Plasencia-Peinado, J., Deno, S. L., & Johnson, J. R. (2005). Formatively evaluating the reading progress of first-grade English learners in multiple-language classrooms. *Remedial and Special Education*, 26(4), 215-225. doi:10.1177/07419325050260040401
- Graves, M. F., August, D., & Mancilla-Martinez, J. (2013). *Teaching vocabulary to English learners*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hakuta, K., Butler, Y. G., & Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency?* Santa Barbara: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute. Retrieved from files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED443275.pdf
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1987). *Change in schools: Facilitating the process*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hall, G. E., Loucks, S. F., Rutherford, W. L., & Newton, B. W. (1975). Levels of use of the innovation: A framework for analyzing innovation adoption. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 26, 52-56. doi:10.1177/002248717502600114
- Hardin, B., Mereoiu, M., Hung, H., & Roach-Scott, M. (2009). Investigating parent and professional perspectives concerning special education services for preschool Latino children. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 37, 93-102. doi:10.1007/s10643-009-0336-x



-
- Hopkins, M., Thompson, K. D., Linqianti, R., Hakuta, K., & August, D. (2013). Fully accounting for English learner performance: A key issue in ESEA reauthorization. *Educational Researcher*, 42(2), 101-108. doi:10.3102/0013189X12471426
- Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. E. (1987). *Taking charge of change*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hosp, J. L., Hosp, M. A., & Dole, J. K. (2011). Potential bias in predictive validity of universal screening measures across disaggregation subgroups. *School Psychology Review*, 40(1), 108-131.
- Hughes, M., Valle-Riestra, D., & Arguelles, M. E. (2008). The voices of Latino families raising children with special needs. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 7, 241-257. doi:10.1080/15348430802100337
- Jackson, C. W., Schatschneider, C., & Leacox, L. (2014). Longitudinal analysis of receptive vocabulary growth in young Spanish English-speaking children from migrant families. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 45, 40-51. doi:10.1044/2013_LSHSS-12-0104
- Keller-Margulis, M., Clemens, N. H., Im, M. H., Kwok, O., & Booth, C. (2012). Curriculum-based measurement yearly growth rates: An examination of English language learners and native English speakers. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22, 799-805. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2012.07.005
- Keller-Margulis, M., Payan, A., & Booth, C. (2012). Reading curriculum-based measures in Spanish: An examination of validity and diagnostic accuracy. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 37(4), 212-223. doi:10.1177/1534508411435721



-
- Kieffer, M. J., & Lesaux, N. K. (2012). Effects of academic language instruction on relational and syntactic aspects of morphological awareness for sixth graders from linguistically diverse backgrounds. *The Elementary School Journal*, *112*(3), 519-545.
doi:10.1086/663299
- Kieffer, M. J., & Vukovic, R. K. (2012). Components and context: Exploring sources of reading difficulties for language minority learners and native English speakers in urban schools. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *45*(5), 433-452. doi:10.1177/0022219411432683
- Kim, S. A., Wang, P., & Michaels, C. A. (2015). Using explicit C-R-A instruction to teach fraction word problem solving to low-performing Asian English learners. *Reading and Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties*, *31*, 253-278.
doi:10.1080/10573569.2015.1030999
- King Thorius, K. A., & Simon, M. (2014). Multidisciplinary collaboration to support struggling readers: Centering culture in concerns about process and outcomes. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *24*(2), 165-182.
doi:10.1080/10474412.2014.903193
- Klingner, J. K., Artiles, A. J., & Barletta, L. M. (2006). English language learners who struggle with reading: Language acquisition or learning disabilities? *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *39*, 108-128.
- Klingner, J., Boardman, A., & Annamma, S. (2012). Promoting high expectations with Collaborative Strategic Reading. In C. Dudley-Marling & S. Michaels (Eds.), *Places where ALL children learn: The power of high expectation curricula* (pp. 73-86). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.



-
- Klingner, J. K., & Edwards, P. A. (2006). Cultural considerations with Response to Intervention models. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(1), 108-117.
- Klingner, J. K., & Eppolito, A. (2014). *How to distinguish between language acquisition and learning disabilities: Questions and answers*. Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Klugman, J., Lee, J., & Nelson, S. (2012). School co-ethnicity and Hispanic parental involvement. *Social Science Research, 41*, 1320-1337.
doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2012.05.005
- Knight-Teague, K., Vanderwood, M. L., & Knight, E. (2014). Empirical investigation for word callers who are English learners. *School Psychology Review, 43*(1), 3-18.
- Kupzyk, S., McCurdy, M., Hofstadter, K., & Berger, L. (2011). Recorded readings: A taped parent-tutoring intervention. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 20*(2), 87-102.
doi:10.1007/s10864-011-9123-z
- Lahaie, C. (2008). School readiness of children of immigrants: Does parental involvement play a role? *Social Science Quarterly, 89*, 684-705. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2008.00554.x
- Laija-Rodriguez, W., Ochoa, S., & Parker, R. (2006). The cross-linguistic role of cognitive academic language proficiency on reading growth in Spanish and English. *Bilingual Education Research, 30*(1), 87-106. doi:10.1080/15235882.2006.10162867
- Lesaux, N., & Geva, E. (2006) Synthesis: Development of literacy in language-minority students. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth* (pp. 53-74). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.



-
- Lesaux, N. K., Kieffer, M. J., Faller, S. E., & Kelley, J. G. (2010). The effectiveness and ease of implementation of an academic vocabulary intervention for linguistically diverse students in urban middle schools. *Reading Research Quarterly, 45*(2), 196-228.
doi:10.1598/RRQ.45.2.3
- Lesaux, N. K., Kieffer, M. J., Kelley, J. G., & Harris, J. R. (2014). Effects of academic vocabulary instruction for linguistically diverse adolescents: Evidence from a randomized field trial. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*, 1159-1194.
doi:10.3102/0002831214532165
- Liang, L. A., Peterson, C. A., & Graves, M. F. (2005). Investigating two approaches to fostering children's comprehension of literature. *Reading Psychology, 26*, 387-400.
- Linan-Thompson, S., & Ortiz, A. A. (2009). Response to Intervention and English language learners: Instructional and assessment considerations. *Seminars in Speech and Language, 30*, 105-120. doi:10.1080/02702710500285748
- Liu, Y. J., Ortiz, A. A., Wilkinson, C. Y., Robertson, P., & Kushner, M. I. (2008). From early childhood special education to special education resource rooms: Identification, assessment, and eligibility determinations for English language learners with reading-related disabilities. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 33*(3), 177-87.
doi:/10.1177/1534508407313247
- Lo, L. (2008). Chinese families' level of participation and experiences in IEP meetings. *Preventing School Failure, 53*, 21-27. doi:10.3200/PSFL.53.1.21-27
- Lopez, C. O., & Donovan, L. (2009). Involving Latino parents with mathematics through family math nights: A review of the literature. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 8*(3), 219-230.



-
- Lynch, J. (2009). Print literacy engagement of parents from low-income backgrounds: Implications for adult and family literacy programs. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(6), 509-521. doi:10.1080/15348430902888666
- Martinez, R. S., Harris, B., & McClain, M. B. (2014). Practices that promote English reading for English learners (ELs). *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 24*(3), 128-148. doi:10.1080/10474412.2014.903192
- McMaster, K. L., Kung, S.-H., Han, I., & Cao, M. (2008). Peer-assisted learning strategies: A "Tier 1" approach to promoting English learners' Response to Intervention. *Exceptional Children, 74*(2), 194-214. doi:10.1177/001440290807400204
- Menzies, H. M., Mahdavi, J. N., & Lewis, J. L. (2008). Early intervention in reading: From research to practice. *Remedial and Special Education, 29*(2), 67-77. doi:10.1177/0741932508315844
- Mercado, C. (2005). Seeing what's there: Language and literacy funds of knowledge in New York Puerto Rican homes. In A. C. Zentella, (Ed.), *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities* (pp. 134-147). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Miller, J. F., Heilmann, J., Nockerts, A., Iglesias, A., Fabiano, L., & Francis, D. J. (2006). Oral language and reading in bilingual children. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 21*, 30-43. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5826.2006.00205.x
- Mueller, T. (2014). Learning to navigate the special education maze: A 3-tiered model for CLD family empowerment. In L. Lo & D. Hiatt-Michael (Eds.), *Promising practices to empower culturally and linguistically diverse families of children with disabilities* (pp. 3-14). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.



-
- Mueller, T., Milian, M., & Lopez, M. (2009). Latina mothers' views of a parent-to-parent support group in the special education system. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 34*, 113-122. doi:10.2511/rpsd.34.3-4.113
- Muyskens, P., Betts, J., Lau, M., & Marston, D. (2009). Predictive validity of curriculum-based measures in the reading assessment of students who are English language learners. *The California School Psychologist, 14*, 11-21. doi:10.1007/BF03340947
- Nelson, J., Vadasy, P., & Sanders, E. (2011). Efficacy of a Tier 2 supplemental root word vocabulary and decoding intervention with kindergarten Spanish-speaking English learners. *Journal of Literacy Research, 43*(2), 184-211. doi:10.1177/1086296X11403088
- O'Connor, R. E., Bocian, K., Beebe-Frankenberger, M., & Linklater, D. L. (2010). Responsiveness of students with language difficulties to early intervention in reading. *The Journal of Special Education, 43*, 220-235. doi:10.1177/0022466908317789
- O'Donnell, J., & Kirkner, S. (2014). The impact of a collaborative family involvement program on Latino families and children's educational performance. *School Community Journal, 24*, 211-234.
- Orosco, M. J. (2014). A math intervention for Latino English language learners at risk for math disabilities. *Exceptionality, 22*(4), 205-225. doi:10.1080/09362835.2013.865535
- Orosco, M. J., Swanson, H. L., O'Connor, R. E., & Lussier, C. (2013). The effects of dynamic strategic math on English language learners' word problem solving. *Journal of Special Education, 47*(2), 96-107. doi:10.1177/0022466911416248



-
- Ortiz, A. A., Robertson, P. M., Wilkinson, C. Y., Liu, Y., McGhee, B. D., & Kushner, M. I. (2011). The role of bilingual education teachers in preventing inappropriate referrals of ELLs to special education: Implications for Response to Intervention. *Bilingual Research Journal, 34*, 316-333. doi:10.1080/15235882.2011.628608
- Peréz Carreón, G., Drake, C., & Barton, A. C. (2005). The importance of presence: Immigrant parents' school engagement experiences. *American Educational Research Journal, 42*(3), 465-498.
- Perry, K., & Moses, A. (2011). Television, language, and literacy practices in Sudanese refugee families: "I learned how to spell English on Channel 18." *Research in the Teaching of English, 45*(3), 278-307.
- Preciado, J. A., Horner, R. H., & Baker, S. K. (2009). Using a function-based approach to decrease problem behaviors and increase academic engagement for Latino English language learners. *The Journal of Special Education, 42*, 227-240.
doi:10.1177/0022466907313350
- Proctor, C. P., Dalton, B., & Grisham, D. L. (2007). Scaffolding English language learners and struggling readers in a universal literacy environment with embedded strategy instruction and vocabulary support. *Journal of Literacy Research, 39*(1), 71-93.
- Proctor, C. P., Dalton, B., Uccelli, P., Biancarosa, G., Mo, E., Snow, C., & Neugebauer, S. (2009). Improving comprehension online: Effects of deep vocabulary instruction with bilingual and monolingual fifth graders. *Reading and Writing, 24*(5), 517-544.
doi:10.1007/s11145-009-9218-2



-
- Quirk, M., & Beem, S. (2012). Examining the relations between reading fluency and reading comprehension for culturally and linguistically diverse students. *Psychology in the Schools, 49*, 539-553.
- Reese, L. (2009). Literacy practices among immigrant Latino families. In G. Li (Ed.), *Multicultural families, home literacies, and mainstream schooling* (pp. 129-152). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Reese, L., & Goldenberg, C. (2008). Community literacy resources and home literacy practices among immigrant Latino families. *Marriage and Family Review, 43*, 109-139.
doi:10.1080/01494920802010272
- Reyes, I., & Azuara, P. (2008). Emergent biliteracy in young Mexican immigrant children. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*, 374-398. doi:10.1598/RRQ.43.4.4
- Richards-Tutor, C., Aceves, T., & Reutebach, C. (2015). Peer-supported instruction for English Learners. In K. Harris & L. Meltzer (Eds.), *What works for special needs learners: The power of peers* (pp. 251-287). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Richards-Tutor, C., Solari, E. J., Leafstedt, J. M., Gerber, M., Filippini, A., & Aceves, T. C. (2012). Response to Intervention for English learners: Examining models for determining response and nonresponse. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 38*(3), 172-184.
doi:10.1177/1534508412461522
- Richardson, R. D., Hawken, L. S., & Kircher, J. (2012). Bias using maze to predict high-stakes test performance among Hispanic and Spanish-speaking students. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 37*(3), 159-170. doi:10.1177/1534508411430320
- Rinaldi, C., & Samson, J. (2008). English language learners and Response to Intervention: Referral considerations. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 40*(5), 6-14.



-
- Rivera, L., & Lavan, N. (2012). Family literacy practices and parental involvement of Latin American immigrant mothers. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 11*, 247-259.
- Roberts, T. (2008). Home storybook reading in primary or second language with preschool children: Evidence of equal effectiveness for second-language vocabulary acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*, 103-130.
- Rodriguez, M. V. (2005). Dominican children with special needs in New York City: Language and literacy practices. In A. C. Zentella, (Ed.), *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities* (pp. 119-133). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Roy, P., & Hord, S. M. (2004). Innovation configurations chart a measured course toward change. *Journal of Staff Development, 25*(2), 54-58.
- Sáenz, L. M., Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2005). Peer-assisted learning strategies for English language learners with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 71*(3), 231-247.
- Sandberg, K. L., & Reschly, A. L. (2011). English learners: Challenges in assessment and the promise of curriculum-based measurement. *Remedial and Special Education, 32*(2), 144-154. doi:10.177/0741932510361260
- Santoro, L. S., Jitendara, A. K., Starosta, K., & Sacks, G. (2006). Reading well with *Read Well*: Enhancing the reading performance of English language learners. *Remedial & Special Education, 27*, 105-115. doi:10.1177/07419325060270020101
- Saunders, W., Foorman, B., & Carlson, C. (2006). Is a separate block of time for oral English language development in programs for English learners needed? *Elementary School Journal, 107*(2), 181-198. doi:10.1086/510654



-
- Silverman, R. (2007). Vocabulary development of English language and English only learners in kindergarten. *Elementary School Journal*, *107*, 365-383. doi:10.1086/516669
- Silverman, R., & Hines, S. (2009). The effects of multimedia-enhanced instruction on the vocabulary of English-language learners and non-English-language learners in pre-kindergarten through second grade. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *101*(2), 305-314. doi:10.1037/a0014217
- Simon-Cereijido, G., & Gutierrez-Clellen, V. (2014). Bilingual education for all: Latino dual language learners with language disabilities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *17*, 235-254. doi:10.1080/13670050.2013.866630
- Snow, C. E., Lawrence, J. F., & White, C. (2009). Generating knowledge of academic language among urban middle school students. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, *2*(4), 325-344. doi:10.1080/19345740903167042
- Solari, E. J., & Gerber, M. M. (2008). Early comprehension instruction for Spanish-speaking English language learners: Teaching text-level reading skills while maintaining effects on word-level skills. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *23*, 155-168. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5826.2008.00273.x
- Taboada, A., & Rutherford, V. (2011). Developing reading comprehension and academic vocabulary for English language learners through science content: A formative experiment. *Reading Psychology*, *32*(2), 113-157. doi:10.1080/02702711003604468
- Tang, S., Dearing, E., & Weiss, H. B. (2012). Spanish-speaking Mexican-American families' involvement in school-based activities and their children's literacy: The implications of having teachers who speak Spanish and English. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *27*(2), 177-187. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2011.09.001



-
- Townsend, D., & Collins, P. (2009). Academic vocabulary and middle school English learners: An intervention study. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 22, 993-1020. doi:10.1007/s11145-008-9141-y
- Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2010). Efficacy of supplemental phonics-based instruction for low-skilled kindergarteners in the context of language minority status and classroom phonics instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102, 786-803. doi:10.1037/a0019639
- Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2015). Attention to orthographic and phonological word forms in vocabulary instruction for kindergarten English learners. *Reading Psychology*, 37, 1-34. doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2015.1116477
- Vanderwood, M. L., Linklater, D., & Healy, K. (2008). Predictive accuracy of nonsense word fluency for English language learners. *School Psychology Review*, 37, 5-17.
- Vaughn, S., Cirino, P. T., Linan-Thompson, S., Mathes, P. G., Carlson, C. D., Hagan, E. C., . . . Francis, D. J. (2006). Effectiveness of a Spanish intervention and an English intervention for English-language learners at risk for reading problems. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43, 449-487. doi:10.3102/00028312043003449
- Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., Kouzekanani, K., Bryant, D. P., Dickson, S., & Blozis, S. A. (2003). Reading instruction grouping for students with reading difficulties. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24, 301-315. doi:10.1177/07419325030240050501
- Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., Mathes, P. G., Cirino, P. T., Carlson, C. D., Pollard-Durodola, S. D., . . . Francis, D. J. (2006). Effectiveness of Spanish intervention for first-grade English language learners at risk for reading difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 39(1), 56-73. doi:10.1177/00222194060390010601



-
- Vaughn, S., Martinez, L. R., Linan-Thompson, S., Reutebuch, C. K., Carlson, C. D., & Francis, D. J. (2009). Enhancing social studies vocabulary and comprehension for seventh-grade English language learners: Findings from two experimental studies. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 2(4), 297-324. doi:10.1080/19345740903167018
- Vaughn, S., Mathes, P. G., Linan-Thompson, S., Cirino, P. T., Carlson, C. D., Pollard-Durodola, S. D., . . . Francis, D. (2006). Effectiveness of an English intervention for first grade English language learners at risk for reading problems. *The Elementary School Journal*, 107, 153-180. doi:10.1086/510653
- Vaughn, S., Wexler, J., Roberts, G., Barth, A., Cirino, P., Romain, M., . . . Denton, C. (2011). Effects of individualized and standardized interventions on middle school students with reading disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 77, 391-407.
- Wanzek, J., & Roberts, G. (2012). Reading interventions with varying instructional emphases for fourth graders with reading difficulties. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 35(2), 90-101.
- Wiley, H. I., & Deno, S. L. (2005). Oral reading and maze measures as predictors of success for English learners on a state standards assessment. *Remedial and Special Education*, 26(4), 207-214.
- Wilkinson, C. Y., Ortiz, A. A., Robertson, P. M., & Kushner, M. I. (2006). English language learners with reading-related LD: Linking data from multiple sources to make eligibility decisions. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 39(2), 129-142.
- Yaden, D., Madrigal, P., & Tam, A. (2005). Access to books and beyond: Creating and learning from a book lending program for Latino families in the inner city. In G. García (Ed.), *English learners: Reaching the highest level of English literacy* (pp. 357-386). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.



Yesil-Dagli, U. (2011). Predicting ELL students' beginning first grade English oral reading fluency from initial kindergarten vocabulary, letter naming, and phonological awareness skills. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 26, 15-29.



Appendix A

Innovation Configuration for Evidence-Based Practices for English Learners Academic Instruction

Essential Components	Implementation Levels				
<p>Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria level from 0 to 3. Score and rate each item separately.</p>	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Rating
		There is no evidence that the component is included in the syllabus, or the syllabus only mentions the component.	Must contain at least one of the following: reading, test, lecture/presentation, discussion, modeling/demonstration, or quiz.	Must contain at least one item from Level 1, plus at least one of the following: observation, project/activity, case study, or lesson plan study.	Must contain at least one item from Level 1 as well as at least one item from Level 2, plus at least one of the following: tutoring, small group student teaching, or whole group internship.
Recommendation 1.0 Provide Students Opportunity to Develop Academic Oral Language While Simultaneously Teaching Literacy and Other Content Areas					
<p>1.1 - Provide designated time to develop English oral language proficiency as part of Tier 1 core instruction.</p> <p>1.2 - Provide sheltered instruction practices (e.g., comprehensible input, language objectives) to support student in content-area learning.</p> <p>1.3 - Use peer-supported instruction and learning for students to practice oral language during academic lessons.</p> <p>1.4 - Teach explicit comprehension strategies to assist students in accessing content while they are developing English proficiency.</p>					



Essential Components	Implementation Levels				
	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Rating
Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria level from 0 to 3. Score and rate each item separately.	There is no evidence that the component is included in the syllabus, or the syllabus only mentions the component.	Must contain at least one of the following: reading, test, lecture/presentation, discussion, modeling/demonstration, or quiz.	Must contain at least one item from Level 1, plus at least one of the following: observation, project/activity, case study, or lesson plan study.	Must contain at least one item from Level 1 as well as at least one item from Level 2, plus at least one of the following: tutoring, small group student teaching, or whole group internship.	Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.
Recommendation 2.0 Teach Vocabulary Across Content Areas					
2.1 - Provide opportunities for in-depth understanding of words through reading, writing, listening, and speaking.					
2.2 - Teach high-utility academic words.					
2.3 - Teach word-learning strategies.					
Recommendation 3.0 Provide Strategies for Parents of English Learners to Enhance the Effectiveness of Parent Involvement Activities					
3.1 - Consider transferability of literacy skills for student literate in first language.					
3.2 - Provide students with bilingual programs when possible (including intervention in language of instruction).					
3.3 - In English-only instruction, primary language support is useful.					



Essential Components	Implementation Levels				
	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Rating
<p>Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria level from 0 to 3. Score and rate each item separately.</p>	<p>There is no evidence that the component is included in the syllabus, or the syllabus only mentions the component.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one of the following: reading, test, lecture/presentation, discussion, modeling/demonstration, or quiz.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one item from Level 1, plus at least one of the following: observation, project/activity, case study, or lesson plan study.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one item from Level 1 as well as at least one item from Level 2, plus at least one of the following: tutoring, small group student teaching, or whole group internship.</p>	<p>Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4.0 Provide Appropriate Interventions for English Learners Who Need Support Beyond Tier 1 Instruction</p>					
<p>4.1 - Provide targeted, small-group explicit interventions at Tier 2 for struggling ELs or Tier 3 for ELs who have intensive need. The interventions should be either (a) developed specifically for ELs or (b) have been determined appropriate for ELs. Interventions should include both foundational skills (e.g., phonological awareness, decoding) and other literacy and language skills.</p> <p>4.2 - Ensure that interventions include specific strategies to meet the needs of ELs (e.g., oral language development, primary language support, peer support).</p>					
<p>Recommendation 5.0 Implement Culturally Responsive Instruction (see IC on Culturally Responsive Pedagogy)</p>					



Monitoring Student Progress

Essential Components	Implementation Levels				
<p>Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria level from 0 to 3. Score and rate each item separately.</p>	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Rating
	<p>There is no evidence that the component is included in the syllabus, or the syllabus only mentions the component.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one of the following: reading, test, lecture/presentation, discussion, modeling/demonstration, or quiz.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one item from Level 1, plus at least one of the following: observation, project/activity, case study, or lesson plan study.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one item from Level 1 as well as at least one item from Level 2, plus at least one of the following: tutoring, small group student teaching, or whole group internship.</p>	<p>Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.</p>
<p>Recommendation 1.0 Implement Purposeful and Appropriate Assessment Practices, Taking Into Account English Learners' Primary Language, English-Language Proficiency, and Ongoing Linguistic and Academic Progress</p>					
<p>1.1a - Monitor students' primary language proficiency across tiers.</p>					
<p>1.1b - Monitor students' English-language proficiency across tiers.</p>					
<p>1.2 - Monitor students' progress in language of instruction.</p>					
<p>1.3 - Monitor students' progress after redesignation to English-proficient status.</p>					



Essential Components	Implementation Levels				
<p>Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria level from 0 to 3. Score and rate each item separately.</p>	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Rating
	<p>There is no evidence that the component is included in the syllabus, or the syllabus only mentions the component.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one of the following: reading, test, lecture/presentation, discussion, modeling/demonstration, or quiz.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one item from Level 1, plus at least one of the following: observation, project/activity, case study, or lesson plan study.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one item from Level 1 as well as at least one item from Level 2, plus at least one of the following: tutoring, small group student teaching, or whole group internship.</p>	<p>Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2.0 Use Curriculum-Based Measurement to Determine Risk and Monitor Progress Across Tiers With English Learners as Part of a School Site or District’s Comprehensive MTSS Model</p>					
<p>2.1 - Use tools with demonstrated validity and reliability for ELs to identify and monitor students' need for instructional support and possible special education evaluation.</p> <p>2.2 - Obtain additional formal and informal measures of student performance to clarify progress and ensure appropriate decision making.</p> <p>2.3 - Include additional procedures in universal screening and progress monitoring to ensure appropriate data collection involving ELs.</p> <p>2.4 - Build general and special educators' technical capacities to analyze data involving ELs for educational decision-making purposes.</p>					



Essential Components	Implementation Levels				
	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Rating
<p>Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria level from 0 to 3. Score and rate each item separately.</p>	<p>There is no evidence that the component is included in the syllabus, or the syllabus only mentions the component.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one of the following: reading, test, lecture/presentation, discussion, modeling/demonstration, or quiz.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one item from Level 1, plus at least one of the following: observation, project/activity, case study, or lesson plan study.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one item from Level 1 as well as at least one item from Level 2, plus at least one of the following: tutoring, small group student teaching, or whole group internship.</p>	<p>Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3.0 Employ an Ecological Approach When Evaluating English Learners’ Possible Learning Difficulties and to Develop Appropriate and Culturally Responsive Supports</p>					
<p>3.1 - Consider multiple variables when explaining ELs’ lack of progress.</p> <p>3.2 - Collaborate with qualified educational professionals.</p> <p>3.3 - Develop comparable peer profiles involving ELs within the school and district for the purpose of making decisions related to instruction, intervention, and referral for special education evaluation.</p> <p>3.4 - Monitor short- and long-term progress, and more frequently with ELs experiencing difficulty.</p> <p>3.5 - Support teacher judgment regarding the performance of ELs with multiple and consistent documented examples of progress over time.</p>					



Family-School Partnerships

Essential Components	Implementation Levels				
<p>Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria level from 0 to 3. Score and rate each item separately.</p>	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Rating
	<p>There is no evidence that the component is included in the syllabus, or the syllabus only mentions the component.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one of the following: reading, test, lecture/presentation, discussion, modeling/demonstration, or quiz.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one item from Level 1, plus at least one of the following: observation, project/activity, case study, or lesson plan study.</p>	<p>Must contain at least one item from Level 1 as well as at least one item from Level 2, plus at least one of the following: tutoring, small group student teaching, or whole group internship.</p>	<p>Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.</p>
<p>Recommendation 1.0 Develop Parent Involvement Programs That Are Carried Out in the Home Language, Are Sustained Over Time, and Are Responsive to the Cultural Experiences of the Families</p>					
<p>1.1 - Provide materials, informational letters, and communication with families in L1.</p> <p>1.2 - Whenever possible, have bilingual staff carry out parent meetings and trainings.</p> <p>1.3 - Provide accurate and supportive translation to promote parent involvement.</p> <p>1.4 - Consider the concerns, ideas, and cultural resources of parents.</p> <p>1.5 - Provide explicit information to parents about American schools (and especially about special education) as needed.</p> <p>1.6 - Promote parent-to-parent support group in L1 for parents of special-needs</p>					



Essential Components	Implementation Levels				
	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Rating
Instructions: Place an X under the appropriate variation implementation score for each course syllabus that meets the criteria level from 0 to 3. Score and rate each item separately.	There is no evidence that the component is included in the syllabus, or the syllabus only mentions the component.	Must contain at least one of the following: reading, test, lecture/presentation, discussion, modeling/demonstration, or quiz.	Must contain at least one item from Level 1, plus at least one of the following: observation, project/activity, case study, or lesson plan study.	Must contain at least one item from Level 1 as well as at least one item from Level 2, plus at least one of the following: tutoring, small group student teaching, or whole group internship.	Rate each item as the number of the highest variation receiving an X under it.
Recommendation 1.0 Develop Parent Involvement Programs That Are Carried Out in the Home Language, Are Sustained Over Time, and Are Responsive to the Cultural Experiences of the Families					
children.					
Recommendation 2.0 Understand the Out-Of-School Experiences of Children and How These May Differ From the Skills Demonstrated at School					
2.1 - Do not assume that there is no literacy use in the homes of low-income and immigrant families when daily book sharing is not a regular activity.					
2.2 - Encourage L1 reading with children at home.					
Recommendation 3.0 Provide Strategies for Parents English Learners to Enhance the Effectiveness of Parent Involvement Activities					
3.1 - Provide audio versions of books and vocabulary in English for families to use at home.					
3.2 - Provide L1 materials for home use.					



Appendix B

Levels of Support for Evidence-Based Practices for English Learners

Academic Instruction

*empirical study with student-outcome measures

Essential Components	Recommended Tier(s)	CEEDAR Level of Evidence	Citations
Recommendation 1.0 Provide Students Opportunity to Develop Academic Oral Language While Simultaneously Teaching Literacy and Other Content Areas			
1.1 - Provide designated time to develop English oral language proficiency as part of Tier 1 core instruction.	1	Limited	August & Shanahan, 2006; Saunders et al., 2006*
1.2 - Provide sheltered instruction practices (e.g., comprehensible input, language objectives) to support student in content-area learning.	1, 2, 3	Moderate Promising (Tiers 2 & 3)	August et al., 2009*; S. Baker et al., 2014; Echevarria et al., 2011*; Echevarria et al., 2012; Vaughn et al., 2009*
1.3 - Use peer-supported instruction and learning for students to practice oral language during academic lessons.	1	Moderate Promising (Tiers 2 & 3)	August et al., 2014; Calhoun et al., 2007*; Cole, 2014; Echevarria et al., 2011*; McMaster et al., 2008*; Richards-Tutor et al., 2015; Sáenz et al., 2005*; Vaughn et al., 2009*
1.4 - Teach explicit comprehension strategies to assist students in accessing content while they are developing English proficiency.	1, 2, 3	Limited (Tier1) Strong (Tier 2) Emerging (Tier 3)	August & Shanahan, 2006; August et al., 2009*; Echevarria et al. 2012; A. W. Graves et al., 2011*; A. W. Graves et al., 2010*; Klingner et al., 2012*; Solari & Gerber, 2008*; Vadasy & Sanders, 2010*; Vaughn, Cirino, et al., 2006*; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, et al., 2006*; Vaughn et al., 2009*; Vaughn, Mathes, et al., 2006*; Vaughn et al., 2011*; Wanzek & Roberts, 2012*



Essential Components	Recommended Tier(s)	CEEDAR Level of Evidence	Citations
Recommendation 2.0 Teach Vocabulary Across Content Areas			
2.1 - Provide opportunities for in-depth understanding of words through reading, writing, listening, and speaking.	1, 2, 3	Strong (Tier 1) Moderate (Tier 2) Emerging (Tier 3)	August et al., 2009*; S. Baker et al., 2014; Cena et al., 2013*; Crevecoeur et al., 2014*; Galloway & Lesaux, 2015; Lesaux et al., 2010*; Lesaux et al., 2010*; Nelson et al., 2011*; Silverman, 2007*; Silverman & Hines, 2009*; Snow et al., 2009*; Townsend & Collins, 2009*; Vadasy & Sanders, 2015; Vaughn, Cirino, et al., 2006*; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, et al., 2006*; Vaughn et al., 2009*; Vaughn, Mathes et al., 2006*; Vaughn et al., 2011*
2.2 - Teach high-utility academic words	1, 2, 3	Strong (Tier 1) Limited (Tier 2)	August, Artzi, & Barr, 2015; S. Baker et al., 2014; Cena et al., 2013*; Crevecoeur et al., 2014*; Lesaux et al., 2010*, 2014*; Nelson et al., 2011*; Proctor et al., 2007; Proctor et al., 2009; Santoro et al., 2006*; Silverman, 2007*; Silverman & Hines, 2009*; Taboada & Rutherford, 2011*;
2.3 - Teach word-learning strategies.	1, 2, 3	Strong (Tier 1) Limited (Tier 2) Emerging (Tier 3)	August et al., 2009*; August et al., 2014; S. Baker et al., 2014; M. F. Graves et al., 2013; Kieffer & Lesaux, 2012; Lesaux et al., 2010*, 2014*; Nelson et al., 2011*; Silverman, 2007*; Silverman & Hines, 2009*; Snow et al., 2009; Taboada & Rutherford, 2011*; Vadasy & Sanders, 2015; Vaughn et al., 2009*; Vaughn et al., 2011*



Essential Components	Recommended Tier(s)	CEEDAR Level of Evidence	Citations
Recommendation 3.0 Provide Instruction and/or Instructional Support in Primary Language as Needed			
3.1 - Consider transferability of literacy skills for students literate in first language.	1, 2, 3	**empirical base before 2005-2015 Strong** (Tiers 1 & 2) Potential (Tier 3)	August et al., 2014; Dressler & Kamil, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2012, 2017; Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006; Genesee & Geva, 2006
3.2 - Provide students with bilingual programs when possible (including intervention in language of instruction).	1, 2, 3	Strong** (Tier 1) Limited (Tier 2)	August et al., 2014; Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006; Orosco, 2015*; Simon-Cerejido & Gutierrez-Clellen, 2014; Vaughn, Cirino, et al., 2006*; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, et al., 2006*
3.3 - In English-only instruction, primary language support is useful.	1, 2, 3	Limited (Tier 1) Limited (Tier 2)	August et al., 2014; Echevarria et al., 2012; Liang et al., 2005*; Orosco, 2014*



Essential Components	Recommended Tier(s)	CEEDAR Level of Evidence	Citations
Recommendation 4.0 Provide Appropriate Interventions for English Learners Who Need Support Beyond Tier 1 Instruction			
4.1 - Provide targeted, small-group explicit interventions at Tier 2 for struggling ELs or Tier 3 for ELs who have intensive need. The interventions should be either (a) developed specifically for ELs or (b) have been determined appropriate for ELs. Interventions should include both foundational skills (e.g., phonological awareness, decoding) and other literacy and language skills.	2, 3	Strong (Tier 2) Emerging (Tier 3)	S. Baker et al., 2014; Begeny et al., 2012*; Cirino et al., 2009*; Gersten et al., 2007; A. W. Graves et al., 2011*; A. W. Graves et al., 2010*; Kim et al., 2015*; O'Connor et al., 2010*; Orosco, 2015; Orosco et al., 2014*; Solari & Gerber, 2008*; Vadasy & Sanders, 2010*; Vaughn, Cirino, et al., 2006*; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, et al., 2006*; Vaughn, Mathes, et al.,*; Vaughn et al., 2011*; Wanzek & Roberts, 2012*
4.2 - Ensure that interventions include specific strategies to meet the needs of ELs (e.g., oral language development, primary language support, peer support).	2, 3	Strong (Tier 2) Emerging (Tier 3)	Cirino et al., 2009*; A. W. Graves et al., 2011*; A. W. Graves et al., 2010*; Kim et al., 2015*; O'Connor et al., 2010*; Orosco et al., 2014*; Orosco, 2015*; Solari & Gerber, 2008*; Vadasy & Sanders, 2010; Vaughn, Cirino et al., 2006*; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson et al., 2006*; Vaughn, Mathes et al.,*; Vaughn et al., 2011* (Tier 3); Wanzek & Roberts, 2012*
Recommendation 5.0 Implement Culturally Responsive Instruction (see IC on Culturally Responsive Pedagogy)			



Monitoring Student Progress

Essential Components	Recommended Tier(s)	CEEDAR Level of Evidence	Citations
Recommendation 1.0 Implement Purposeful and Appropriate Assessment Practices Taking Into Account English Learners' Primary Language, English-Language Proficiency, and Ongoing Linguistic and Academic Progress			
1.1a - Monitor students' primary language proficiency across tiers.	1, 2, 3	Moderate (Tier 1)	August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015; Esparza-Brown & Sanford, 2011; Jackson et al., 2014*(T1); Laija-Rodriguez et al., 2006*(T1); Linan-Thompson & Ortiz, 2009; Miller et al., 2006*(T1); Wilkinson et al., 2006*(T3)
1.1b - Monitor students' English-language proficiency across tiers.	1, 2, 3	Moderate (Tier 1)	August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015; Esparza-Brown & Sanford, 2011; A. W. Graves et al., 2011*(T2); Linan-Thompson & Ortiz, 2009; Miller et al. 2006*(T1); Vanderwood et al., 2008*(T1); Wilkinson et al., 2006*(T3); Yesil-Dagli, 2011*(T1)
1.2 - Monitor students' progress in language of instruction.	1, 2, 3	Strong (Tiers 1 & 2)	Al Otaiba et al., 2009*(T1); D. L. Baker et al., 2010*(T1); Domínguez de Ramírez & Shapiro, 2006*(T1); Domínguez de Ramírez & Shapiro, 2007*(T1); Esparza-Brown & Sanford, 2011; Fien et al., 2008*(T1); A. W. Graves et al., 2005*(T1); Keller-Margulis, Payan, & Booth (2012)*T1; Linan-Thompson & Ortiz, 2009, Muyskens et al., 2009*(T1); Ortiz et al., 2011*(T3); Richards-Tutor et al., 2012*(T2); Rinaldi & Samson, 2008; Wiley & Deno, 2005*(T1); Wilkinson et al., 2006*(T3) [refer to T2 studies cited in Recommendation 4 of Academic Instruction]
1.3 - Monitor students' progress after redesignation to English-proficient status.	1, 2, 3	Limited (Tier 1)	Al Otaiba et al., 2009*(T1); August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015; Francis, Rivera, et al., 2006; Hopkins et al, 2013; Klingner & Eppolito, 2014



Essential Components	Recommended Tier(s)	CEEDAR Level of Evidence	Citations
Recommendation 2.0 Use Curriculum-Based Measurement to Determine Risk and Monitor Progress Across Tiers With English Learners as Part of a School Site or District’s Comprehensive MTSS Model			
2.1 - Use tools with demonstrated validity and reliability for ELs to identify and monitor students' need for instructional support and possible special education evaluation.	1, 2, 3	Strong (Tiers 1 & 2)	August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015; Al Otaiba, et al. 2009*(T1); D. L. Baker et al., 2010*(T1); Betts et al., 2008*(T1); Domínguez de Ramírez & Shapiro, 2006*(T1); Domínguez de Ramírez & Shapiro, 2007*(T1); Esparza-Brown & Sanford, 2011; Fien et al., 2008*(T1); A. W. Graves et al., 2005*(T1); Muyskens et al., 2009*(T1); Richards-Tutor et al., 2012*(T1, T2); Vanderwood et al., 2008*(T1); Wiley & Deno, 2005*(T1); Yesil-Dagli, 2011*(T1); [refer to T2 studies cited in Recommendation 4 of Academic Instruction]
2.2 - Obtain additional formal and informal measures of student performance to clarify progress and ensure appropriate decision making.	1, 2, 3	Limited (Tiers 1 & 3)	August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015; E. Cho et al., 2014; Hosp et al., 2011*(T1); Knight-Teague et al., 2014*(T1); Linan-Thompson & Ortiz, 2009; Liu et al., 2008*(T3); Quirk & Beem, 2012*(T1); Wilkinson et al., 2006*(T3)
2.3 - Include additional procedures in universal screening and progress monitoring to ensure appropriate data collection involving ELs.	1, 2, 3	Emerging	Cummings et al., 2014*(T1); Miller et al., 2006*(T1)
2.4 - Build general and special educators' technical capacities to analyze data involving ELs for educational decision-making purposes.	1, 2, 3	Emerging	Esparza-Brown & Sanford, 2011; Menzies et al, 2008



Essential Components	Recommended Tier(s)	CEEDAR Level of Evidence	Citations
Recommendation 3.0 Employ an Ecological Approach When Evaluating English Learners' Possible Learning Difficulties and to Develop Appropriate and Culturally Responsive Supports			
3.1 - Consider multiple variables while explaining ELs' lack of progress.	1, 2, 3	Moderate (Tier 3)	August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015; Betts et al., 2009*(T1); Kieffer & Vukovic, 2012; Liu et al., 2008*(T3); Ortiz et al., 2011*(T3); Wilkinson et al., 2006*(T3)
3.2 - Collaborate with qualified educational professionals.	1, 2, 3	Emerging (Tier 3)	Garcia & Ortiz, 2008; King Thorius & Simon, 2014; Linan-Thompson & Ortiz, 2009; Martinez et al., 2014; Ortiz et al., 2011*(T3); Wilkinson et al., 2006*(T3)
3.3 - Develop comparable peer profiles involving ELs within the school and district for the purpose of making decisions related to instruction, intervention, and referral for special education evaluation.	1, 2, 3	Limited (Tiers 1 & 3)	Al Otaiba et al., 2009*(T1); August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015; Barrera & Liu, 2010; Esparza-Brown & Sanford, 2011; Keller-Margulis, Clemens, et al., 2012*(T1); Ortiz et al., 2011*(T3); Sandberg & Reschly, 2011; Wilkinson et al., 2006*(T3)
3.4 - Monitor short- and long-term progress, and more frequently with ELs experiencing difficulty.	2, 3	Emerging	Gersten et al., 2007; King Thorius & Simon, 2014; Liu et al, 2008*(T3); Martinez et al., 2014



Family-School Partnerships

Essential Components	Recommended Tier(s)	CEEDAR Level of Evidence	Citations
Recommendation 1.0: Develop Parent Involvement Programs That Are Carried Out in the Home Language, Are Sustained Over Time, and Are Responsive to the Cultural Experiences of the Families			
1.1 - Provide materials, informational letters, and communication with families in L1.	1, 2, 3	Limited	Araujo, 2009; Auerbach & Collier, 2012; Hardin et al., 2009; Mueller et al. 2009; Yaden et al., 2005
1.2 - Whenever possible, have bilingual staff carry out parent meetings and trainings.	1, 2, 3	Limited	Good et al., 2010; Hardin et al., 2009; O'Donnell & Kirkner, 2014*; Rivera & Lavan, 2012; Tang et al., 2012*
1.3 - Provide accurate and supportive translation to promote parent involvement.	3	Limited	S. Cho & Gannotti, 2005; Hardin et al., 2009; Lo, 2008; Mueller, 2014
1.4 - Consider the concerns, ideas, and cultural resources of parents.	1, 2, 3	Limited	Araujo, 2009; Auerbach & Collier, 2012; Good et al., 2010
1.5 - Provide explicit information to parents about American schools (and especially about special education) as needed.	1, 2, 3	Limited (Tier 1) Potential (Tier 2) Limited (Tier 3)	Hughes et al., 2008; O'Donnell & Kirkner, 2014*; Rivera & Lavan, 2012
1.6 - Promote parent-to-parent support group in L1 (for parents of special needs children).	3	Limited	Mueller, 2014; Mueller et al., 2009



Essential Components	Recommended Tier(s)	CEEDAR Level of Evidence	Citations
Recommendation 2.0: Understand the Out-of-School Experiences of Children and How These May Differ From the Skills Demonstrated at School			
2.1 - Do not assume that there is no literacy use in the homes of low-income and immigrant families when daily book sharing is not a regular activity.	1	Strong	Farr, 2005; Lynch, 2009; Mercado, 2005; Reese, 2009; Reyes & Azuara, 2008; Rodriguez, 2005
2.2 - Encourage L1 reading with children at home.	1	Moderate	Durand, 2011*; Reese & Goldenberg, 2008*; Roberts, 2008*
Recommendation 3.0: Provide Strategies for Parents of English Learners to Enhance the Effectiveness of Parent Involvement Activities			
3.1 - Provide audio versions of books and vocabulary in English for families to use at home.	1, 2, 3	Limited (Tier 1) Potential (Tiers 2 & 3)	Cooke et al., 2009*; Kupzyk et al., 2011*
3.2 - Provide L1 materials for home use.	1, 2, 3	Limited (Tier 1) Potential (Tiers 2 & 3)	Yaden et al., 2005

