Data-based Eligibility Special Education Decision and Program Development for English Learners

Dr. Julie Esparza Brown
jebrown@pdx.edu
Presentation to NYC BERN
March 27, 2018

Review RTI/MTSS: Anticipatory Guide

- Work in pairs or triads to complete the “Before” column.

Your Own Data

- Baseline data on your ELLs for group work and for you to reference during group work
- ELL Interventions that you are currently using for Tier 1 or 2
- What is your CORE Program for literacy instruction at your school? For Example: Core Knowledge, Ready Gen etc.
Using Your Data

- Using “Guiding Questions” document, review the questions for:
  - Tier 1
  - Tier 2
  - Tier 3

Rate Yourself

- On a scale of 1 – 5, how would you rate your system?

Assessment of ELs

SPECIAL EDUCATION CONSIDERATIONS
EL Students in Special Education

Generally, students with disabilities represent about 12% of a population. Thus, we would expect that approximately 12% of English Learners (or any other subgroup) should require special education.

Do you know the percentage of ELs in special education at your school?

EL Students in Special Education

Eligibility for special education services:

“Special Rule for Eligibility Determination – A child must not be determined to be a child with a disability under this part –

(1) If the determinant factor for that determination is:

(i) Lack of appropriate instruction in reading, including the essential components of reading instruction
(ii) Lack of appropriate instruction in math; or
(iii) Limited English proficiency; and

Steps in the Special Education Process

1. The student is struggling either academically, behaviorally, or in both.

A team will design interventions for the student and monitor his/her progress to try to determine whether there is a problem in the learning environment or in the learner.

These interventions must be adjusted based on each students’ language proficiency level and in consideration of their experiential backgrounds.
RTI and Special Education Referral

- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KrapFXnZIDE

2. Referral for Evaluation

After interventions have not proven successful in supporting the student to meet grade level standards, either a parent or teacher can request a comprehensive evaluation.

An Assessment Planning Meeting will be held at a mutually agreeable time and place for the parents and team members. Parents must sign a consent form. Non-English-speaking parents have the right to an interpreter so that they fully understand what they are authorizing.

Parents also have the right to bring support people.

After consent is provided, the school has sixty days to complete the evaluation and consider placement into special education programs.

If the parents disagree with the results of the evaluation, they may request a full independent educational evaluation at the school’s expense.

Multidisciplinary Teams

- Usually consist of all or most of the members of the IEP team
- For ELLs, interpreter is required, whether the parent requests one or not. (Sometimes parents feel they have enough English to understand the contents of the meetings but special education can be so complicated that it is best to provide an interpreter.)
- Bilingual/ESL expert essential as team member.

What they need to know

- Is the problem a disability or is it something else (language, culture, SES, lack of educational opportunity).
- Know how to interpret basic assessment data in consideration of a student’s acculturation and linguistic profiles.
- Know how to use that data to implement culturally and linguistically appropriate intervention strategies.

Top 10 Reasons Why ELs are Referred

1. Poor/low achievement
2. Behavioral problems
3. Oral language related problems (acquisition or delay)
4. Reading problems
5. Learning difficulties
6. Socio-emotional difficulties
7. Diagnosis for particular handicapping condition*
8. Written language problems
9. Low attention span
10. Unable to understand or follow directions

*This phrase technically pertains to all referrals for special education evaluation and does not actually constitute a specific enough condition that necessitates a referral for special education services.

Source: National Middle School Association, 1999
Cognitive Evaluations

“Because of the professional movement to eliminate the discrepancy formula, many have called for the elimination of IQ testing from LD identification altogether (e.g., Pasternack, 2002; Stanovich, 1991). However, a great deal of research has identified cognitive processing deficits that are linked to learning disabilities (e.g., Tallal et al., 1996; Wolf, 2001), and if cognitive assessment can be used to identify cognitive processing strengths and weaknesses, elimination of testing would be a mistake.”

Fiorello & Primerano (2005)

Native Language Assessment

• Generally refers to the assessment of bilinguals by a bilingual psychologist who has determined that the examinee is more proficient (“dominant”) in their native language than in English
• Being “dominant” in the native language does not imply age-appropriate development in that language or that formal instruction has been in the native language or that both the development and formal instruction have remained uninterrupted in that language
• Although the bilingual psychologist is able to conduct assessment activities in the native language, this option is not directly available to the monolingual psychologist
• Native language assessment is a relatively new idea and an unexplored research area so there is very little empirical support to guide appropriate activities or upon which to base standards of practice or evaluated test performance

Native Language Assessment (cont.)

• Whether a test evaluates only in the native language or some combination of the native language and English (i.e., presumably “bilingual”), the norm samples may not provide adequate representation or any at all on the critical variables (language proficiency and acculturative experiences)—bilinguals in the U.S. are not the same as monolinguals elsewhere
• Without a research base, there is no way to evaluate the validity of the obtained test results and any subsequent interpretations would be specious and amount to no more than a guess
• There are few studies of native language assessment but the following slides present an unpublished study by Brown (2007).

ELL Test Performance: Esparza Brown Study

Comparison of Order of Means for WJ III and Bateria III Classifications

ELL Test Performance: Esparza Brown Study

Comparison of Bateria III Cluster Means for ELL’s by Language of Instruction

- GA
- Go
- Gv
- Gc
- Gf
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Native Language Instruction

English Language Instruction

Norm Sample

**Comparison of Bateria III Cluster Means for ELL’s by Language of Instruction**

- **ELL Test Performance: Esparza Brown Study**

  - **Comparison of Bateria III Cluster Means for ELL’s by Language of Instruction**

  - **Native Language Instruction**

  - **English Language Instruction**

  - **Norm Sample**

**Practical Considerations for Addressing Validity in Evaluation Procedures for SLD with ELLs**

1. The usual purpose of testing is to identify deficits in ability (i.e., low scores)
2. Validity is more of a concern for low scores than average/higher scores because:
   - Test performances in the average range are NOT likely a chance finding and strongly suggests average ability (i.e., no deficits in ability)
   - Test performances that are below average MAY be a chance finding because of experiential or developmental differences and thus do not automatically confirm below average ability (i.e., possible deficits in ability)
3. Therefore, testing in one language only (English or native language) means that:
   - It can be determined that a student DOES NOT have a disability (i.e., if all scores are average or higher, they are very likely to be valid)
   - It CANNOT be determined if the student has a disability (i.e., low scores must be validated as true indicators of deficit ability)

**Practical Considerations for Addressing Validity in Evaluation Procedures for SLD with ELLs**

1. **Testing in both languages (English and native language) is necessary to determine disability**
   - Testing requires confirmation that deficits are not language-specific and exist in both languages (although low performance in both can result from other factors)
2. **All low test scores, whether in English or the native language, must be validated**
   - Low scores from testing in English can be validated via research underlying the C-LIM
   - Low scores from testing in the native language cannot be validated with research

**Practical Considerations for Addressing Validity in Evaluation Procedures for SLD with ELLs**

Given the preceding considerations, the most practical and defensible general approach in evaluating ELLs would be:

- Test in English first and if all test scores indicate strengths (average or higher) a disability is not likely and thus no further testing is necessary
- If some scores from testing in English indicate weaknesses, re-test those areas in the native language to cross-validate as areas of true weakness

When combined with the C-LIM (see next slides), this approach provides the most efficient process and best use of available resources for evaluation since it permits ANY evaluator to begin (and in some cases, complete) the testing without being bilingual or requiring outside assistance.

In addition, this approach is IDEA compliant and consistent with the specification that assessments “be provided and administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information” because it relies on an established body of research to guide examination of test score validity and ensures that the results upon which decisions are based are in fact accurate.
3. An eligibility meeting is held

The assessment team, which includes the parents, will meet to review the results of the evaluation and determine whether a child qualifies for special education services.

If the parents do not agree with the committee’s decision, they have the right to request mediation, file a formal complaint, or request a due process hearing.

4. Student is eligible for Special Education

If the student qualifies and the team agrees that a child has a disability, the school develops an individual education program (IEP)

The IEP must be developed within the original 60 day evaluation timeline and no more than 30 days after the child is determined eligible for special education services.

5. An IEP meeting is held

The special education team, including the parent, meets to develop the IEP.

Some schools may bring a draft of the IEP to the meeting but they cannot bring a completed IEP because parents, and other team members, have the right to provide input.
6. Committee completes IEP and determines placement

Once the IEP is completed, the committee determines the most appropriate placement for the student in the least restrictive environment

Parents must sign consent to placement

- **Typical Environment for ELs in Special Ed**
  - Only SPED (many times this is all day)
  - Only Bilingual Ed/ ESOL (many times this is all day)

- **Better would be**
  - SPED trained to work with bilingual/ ESOL methods
  - Bilingual Ed/ ESOL trained to work with SPED methods
  - Trained paraprofessional under close supervision of both Bilingual Ed/ ESOL and SPED

- **Legally required**
  - Both special education and ESOL services

---

### Case Study: Joaquin

![Image of Joaquin](image)

### Acknowledgement

- This case study is based on the work of Karen Apgar, M.A./C.A.G.S., NCSP
  - School Psychologist
  - Eugene School District 4J
Student

- Joaquin
- English Language Learner
- 8 years, 5 months old
- Grade 3
- Initial evaluation

Reason for Referral

- Despite multiple years of differentiated instruction and targeted intervention, Joaquin continues to struggle with basic reading skills, reading fluency, and reading comprehension.

Initial Considerations

Developmental History

- Joaquin is the fifth of seven children.
- Birth and developmental milestones normal.
- Parents do not have any concerns.

Language Background

- Spanish is the home language.
- Parents speak only Spanish to Julio and his siblings.
- Amongst themselves, Julio and his siblings communicate in English.
Instructional History/Attendance

- He has attended his current school since kindergarten.
- He has never missed more than four days of school per academic year.
- His core instruction is Houghton-Mifflin.
- His math instruction had been in Everyday Math but changed to the standards-based Envisions/Investigations math when the district adopted this new curriculum.

English Language Proficiency Assessment

- Joaquin’s current English language proficiency score is 2, which indicates he is in the “Early Intermediate” range of English.
- On the Listening subtest, Joaquin scored a 1 (Beginner) and a 3 (Intermediate) on Speaking.
- A review of records indicates that he scored at the Early Intermediate level of English in kindergarten thus showing very little growth in English proficiency.
- His two older siblings are at Advanced level and their acquisition of English has been consistent.
- What’s missing???

Interventions and Progress Monitoring

- Joaquin has been receiving intensive, targeted instructional intervention in basic skills since first grade.
- He continues to struggle to consistently use all letter sounds.
Second Grade

- Joaquin continued to receive interventions including 30 minutes per day of small group instruction.
- *Phonics for Readers* was implemented and focused on letter sounds and phonemic awareness.
- He also received 20 minutes additional time per day of *Reading Mastery* to work on letter sounds and word pronunciation.
- He also attended an after school program four days per week where he worked on fluency using *Read Naturally*.
- Joaquin made very slow and inconsistent progress.

Third Grade

- Joaquin continued to receive intensive targeted reading interventions.
- He received 25 minutes per day of phonics instruction in a small group (three students).
- The interventions programs were *Phonics for Reading* and *Read Naturally*.
- He also received small-group instruction in his general ed classroom in the general education curriculum.
- Progress monitoring was conducted using second grade material.
Mathematics

- In math, Joaquin is performing within grade-level for most activities.
- When reading or difficult vocabulary is involved, Joaquin struggles more than when numerical operations are involved.
- Recent easyCBM assessment indicates grade level skills.
- Joaquin does continue to receive small-group, targeted math skill instruction in order to keep him progressing.

Concerns

- Although Joaquin has received “considerable and continuous” targeted interventions in basic reading skills, he has not retained the skills.
- In math, however, he is “close to average.”
- He has also had a difficult time learning and retaining English vocabulary and skills.

Decision Point

- What would your team do?
Team Decision

- This team decided to refer.
- In November, 2007 OSERs issued a memo.
- Subject: A Response to Intervention (RTI) Process Cannot Be Used to Deny-Delay an Evaluation for Eligibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)
- “States and LEAs have an obligation to ensure that evaluation of children suspected of having a disability are not delayed or denied because of implementation of an RTI strategy.”

Evaluation Plan

- The team, including parents, determined that Joaquin should be assessed in the following areas:
  - Language skills
  - Academic achievement
  - Basic psychological processes
- The team noted that “extreme” caution should be taken when selecting assessment tools and methods, as well as in interpreting results, due to Joaquin’s bilingual language skills and non-dominant cultural background.

Classroom Observation

- The school psychologist observed Joaquin during a small-group reading lesson.
- Joaquin struggled to sound-out words but was able to read some sight words. He appeared to guess at many unknown words but would often get the first sound correct.
- Specifically, he was unable to remember the silent/e/ at the end of a word rule even though they had been working on it for several months.
- He appeared to struggle to stay focused.

Test Session Behavior

- Joaquin was willing, cooperative and remained focused.
- He enjoyed having an adult's individual attention and was eager to attempt each new task.
- Testing was conducted in English but Joaquin was allowed to provide answers in English or Spanish.
- When the tasks became more academic, he continued to try but voiced his dislike of the materials.
- He was able to complete math facts quickly but struggled to read and understand what was read.
ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

KAUFFMAN TEST OF EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT (2ND ED.)

Reading
- Average skills: orally segmenting words into parts; can pronounce most consonant sounds
- Struggles: to blend sounds; inconsistent in identifying vowel sounds; reading fluency slowed by difficulty in decoding, could not answer comprehension questions

Math
- Average: math facts, computations, multiplication emerging appropriately

Written Language
- Average: able to use visual cues (pictures) to inform his writing
- Struggles: difficulty writing words correctly, errors in sentence structure, unable to produce grade-appropriate written work

Oral Language
- Average: Listening comprehension; naming objects/colors/letters
- Struggles: timed association task,

SPEECH/LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT

Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals – 4th Ed. (CELF-4: SPANISH)
Speech/Language

- Joaquin demonstrated overall language skills in the average range.
- His working memory skills was in the low-average range.

COGNITIVE ASSESSMENT

KAUFFMAN ASSESSMENT BATTERY FOR CHILDREN - (2ND ED.)

| Sequential (short term memory) | Average: sequential processing, used good strategies to repeat information. |
| Simultaneous (relate and integrate information) | Average: math facts, computations, multiplication emerging appropriately |
| Learning (attention, concentration, memory, long term memory) | Average: very low average |
| Planning (high-level decision-making; analysis, planning and organization) | Average: planning abilities using visual information; focus, solutions to problems and rearranging materials to create best response |
| Struggles: timed association task, | |

Graphics Profile of Scores:
Discussion of Findings

Strengths:
• Math calculation
• Math problem solving
• Oral expression
• Listening comprehension
• Short-term memory
• Problem-solving and mental control

Weaknesses
• Basic reading skills
• Reading fluency
• Long-term memory

Inconclusive
• Reading Comprehension skills are low but may be due to weaknesses in basic reading skills and reading fluency.
• Written Expression skills are low. However, he has the related processing strengths needed to be a successful writer (Planning, Mental Control, Language Use).

Rule Out “Exclusionary Factors”

Summary

• Joaquin is a happy, energetic third-grader who speaks both English and Spanish. He is good at math, speaking and listening. He shows strong short-term memory, planning abilities and simultaneous processing abilities.
• He currently has weak skills in basic reading and reading fluency his affects his reading comprehension and written expression skills. He also has weak long-term memory abilities.
• Weakness in long-term memory may cause difficulties in recalling information he has learned, pairing visual with auditory information and memorizing lengthy information.
• What would your team do???
Problem with Assessment Data

Standardized intelligence and cognitive tests have inadequate psychometric properties and inappropriate norms for ELL students.
The problems are not solved by using nonverbal tests, native-language tests or interpreters.
All tests of intelligence reflect the culture in which they were developed and are based on the cultural values and beliefs of the authors.
A variety of procedures have been developed that primarily revolve around the modified use of or alternatives to standardized tests.
What is needed is a systematic and comprehensive approach to nondiscriminatory assessment.
Sources: (Gunderson & Siegel, 2001; Flanagan & Ortiz, 2001)

Solution

- Assessors must appropriately select, administer and interpret assessment data in a systematic manner that is based on research on how culture and language impact test performance for ELL students.
Sources: (Flanagan & Ortiz, 2001; Valdes & Figueroa, 1994)

Traditional Approaches to Assessment

- The traditional psychometric approach uses standardized, norm-referenced tests to measure various aspects of psychological functioning in individuals.
- Research has consistently shown performance differences between racial or ethnic groups.
- The 1990 American Psychological Association (APA) guidelines state that assessors must:
  - Consider the influence of language and culture on behavior when working with diverse groups
  - Consider the validity of the methods and procedures used to assess minority groups
  - Make interpretations of resultant psychological data within the context of an individual’s linguistic and cultural characteristics
What IQ Tests Really Measure in Diverse Students

- They measure the degree to which a student has acquired and can access culturally specific information that is in the test.
- IQ tests are based on the assumption that there is an equivalent level of acculturation across the variables of age or grade for individuals on whom the test was standardized and with whom it will be used.

Sources: (Cummins, 1984; Figueroa, 1990; Matsumoto, 1994; Valdes & Figueroa, 1994)

What IQ Tests Really Measure in Diverse Students

- Tests will measure a lower range of abilities in diverse individuals because the tests measure only the cultural content related to the mainstream experience and not the full range of cultural content possessed by the individual.

Sources: (Flanagan & Ortiz, 2001, 2002; Cummins, 1984; Figueroa, 1990; Matsumoto, 1994; Valdes & Figueroa, 1994)

Are Tests Really Culturally Biased?

- Considerable research says IQ tests are sound and appropriately normed and are not culturally biased.
- Jensen (1976) says they are, however, culturally loaded.
- Tests and test items can be ordered along a continuum of culture loading, which is the specificity or generality of the informational content of the test items.

Sources: (Jensen, 1976; Sattler, 1992; Valdes & Figueroa, 1994)

Are Tests Really Culturally Biased?

- The narrower or less general the culture in which the test’s information content could be acquired, the more culture loaded it is.
- A test may contain information that could only acquired within a particular culture.
- That is why it important to know a student’s level of acculturation.

Sources: (Jensen, 1976; Sattler, 1992; Valdes & Figueroa, 1994)
Acculturation

Acculturation refers to changes in identification, social skills, attitudes, values and norms that groups and individuals undergo when they come in contact with another culture.
It is a complex, personal and individual process of cultural change.
Progression through the acculturation phrases is usually nonlinear, repetitive and stressful.
Some immigrants may never achieve the final phase and never fully acculturate.

Are Tests Really Linguistically Biased?

Tasks that are primarily language-based do not measure incidental learning equally well compared to tasks that are more visual or perceptual in nature.
That is why language background, not just language proficiency, must be taken into account in test development, selection, administration, and interpretation.
Sources: (Figueroa, 1990, Cummins, 1984; Jensen, 1974, 1976)

Language Profiles

The term “bilingual” does not imply any particular level of proficiency, comfort, or skill with the languages spoken.
There are four common ELL language profiles:
- High literacy and content in primary language and little or no English
- Low Literacy & Content in Primary Language and Little or No English
- Literacy & Content Knowledge in Primary Language and Strong Oral English
- Low Literacy and Strong Oral English (English Dominant)

Which profile(s) are referred most often?
Source: (Dutro, 2005)

A Least-Biased Framework

Flanagan & Ortiz have organized tests of cognitive ability according to three test characteristics:
- The broad and narrow abilities they measure (CHC Abilities)
- Degree of Cultural Loading
- Degree of Linguistic Demand
A Least-Biased Framework

The classifications, the Culture-Language Test Classifications (C-LTC), were based on the limited research on the use of intelligence tests in diverse populations and expert consensus (Yerkes, 1921; Sanchez, 1934; Jensen, 1974; Cummins, 1982, Vukovich & Figueroa, 1992).

Using these classifications as a starting point, assessors can create a selective set of tests that may be less discriminatory and more valid for use with ELL students.

The Culture and Language Classifications (C-LTC) in their entirety can be found in Flanagan & Ortiz (2001) Essentials of Cross-Battery Assessment.

Despite their limitations, they offer one method by which decisions regarding the selection of tests and subsequent interpretation of test results can be made on a systematic, logical and theoretically defensible basis.

Degree of Cultural Loading

Flanagan & Ortiz (2001) considered the following:

- The degree to which a given test requires specific knowledge of or experience with mainstream U.S. culture. The characteristics include emphasis on process, content, and nature of the response, the relationship between examinee and examiner (i.e., cultural specific elements apart from actual oral language, such as affirmative head nods, pointing, etc.).
- The research that suggests that tests that are more process oriented and contain more novel, culture-reduced stimuli and communicative requirements might yield scores that are better estimates of ability or skill.

The tests were then classified based on their cultural loading into three categories:

- high
- moderate
- low
Degree of Linguistic Demand

- Flanagan and Ortiz (2001) also classified tests based on the amount of linguistic skill required by cognitive tests.
- Three main factors were considered:
  - Verbal vs. nonverbal language requirements on the part of the examiner in the test administration
  - Receptive language requirements on the part of the examinee
  - Expressive language requirements on the part of the examinee

Culture-Language Interpretive Matrix

- Flanagan and Ortiz (2001) concurrently developed a matrix, the C-LIM, in order to address the fundamental question in the evaluation of diverse learners; is the measured performance a reflection primarily of actual ability or one of cultural and/or linguistic difference?
- The C-LIM (Flanagan & Ortiz, 2001) is a 3 x 3 table which consists of nine cells.
Using the C-LTC and C-LIM

- Practitioners first group the tests they have administered according to their cultural and linguistic dimension (based on the C-LTC).
- Individual subtest scores are then recorded into one of the nine cells on the Culture-Language Interpretive Matrix (C-LIM).
- If tests from more than one battery are used, it may be necessary to convert the scores into a common metric (SS 100+15)
- Then the average is calculated for each cell.

Three General Patterns

- Three general patterns may emerge:
  - **Effect of cultural loading only:** Scores decrease as they move down the cells in the matrix
  - **Effect of linguistic demand only:** Scores decrease as they move across the cells from left to right in the matrix
  - **Overall effect of both culture and language:** Scores in or near the upper left corner of the matrix tend to be higher than scores at or near the bottom right corner of the matrix.
Interpreting the Patterns

- It is important to look for the interaction effect of acculturation and language proficiency because they are not perfectly correlated.
- When patterns that emerge from the data are not consistent with the expected general patterns of performance for ELL students, then practitioners should revert to the inter- and intra-cognitive analyses conducted previously and base interpretation on results at that level.

This framework should be used in conjunction with other relevant assessment information such as:

- Direct observation
- Level of acculturation
- Review of records
- Interviews
- Language proficiency testing in L1 and L2
- Knowledge of SES
- Developmental data
- Family history
- Authentic work samples
- Curriculum-based data
- Results of interventions

CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC CLASSIFICATION OF TESTS

ADRESSING BIAS IN TEST VALIDITY AND INTERPRETATION

Pattern of Expected Performance of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Children

DEGREE OF CULTURAL LOADING

LOW MODERATE HIGH

DEGREE OF LINGUISTIC LOADING

LOW MODERATE HIGH

PERFORMANCE LEAST AFFECTED

INCREASING EFFECT OF LANGUAGE DIFFERENCE

PERFORMANCE MOST AFFECTED

INCREASING EFFECT OF CULTURAL DIFFERENCE

INCREASING EFFECT OF CULTURAL & LANGUAGE DIFFERENCES

JOAQUIN’S MATRIX OF CULTURAL LOADING AND LINGUISTIC DEMAND CLASSIFICATIONS OF THE K-ABC II

DEGREE OF CULTURAL LOADING

LOW MODERATE HIGH

DEGREE OF LINGUISTIC DEMAND

LOW MODERATE HIGH

Note: Some of the ability and culture-language classifications listed in this packet are preliminary, based primarily on expert consensus procedures and judgment; and that subject to change in accordance with future research findings. They are not intended for diagnostic purposes but rather to guide decisions regarding the relative influence of acculturation and English-language proficiency on test results.

*These tests demonstrate mixed loadings on the two separate factors indicated.
Consideration of Linguistic and Cultural Factors on the KABC-II

- The following graphic is the Culture-Language Interpretive Matrix (C-LIM; Flanagan & Ortiz, 2004) designed to determine the cultural loading and linguistic demand of standardized assessments that may influence a student’s standard scores.
- The shaded area with a dotted line represents the expected Average score for this student.
- The bars show the four score areas for Joaquin.
- One area (long-term memory) falls below the average line and may indicate a weakness.

General Guidelines for Expected Patterns of Test Performance for Diverse Individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Cultural Loading</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Different:</td>
<td>3-5 points</td>
<td>5-7 points</td>
<td>7-10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different:</td>
<td>5-7 points</td>
<td>7-10 points</td>
<td>10-15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markedly Different:</td>
<td>7-10 points</td>
<td>10-15 points</td>
<td>15-20 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of Linguistic Demand

- Low
- Moderate
- High

Decision?

- Based on the patterns evident on C-LIM and all other data presented, what would your team decide?
Case Study

- Working in small groups, read the Case Study and answer the questions on the Case Study Worksheet.
- We will be coming back together to discuss as a group as we work through the report.

“The beauty of the world lies in the diversity of its people” ~ Unknown
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