The Access Center
Improving Outcomes for All Students K-8

STATE TO STATE SHARING COMMUNITY

Meeting Summary and Resources

October 11 and 12, 2004
Washington, DC

IDEAs that Work
U.S. Office of Special Education Programs

American Institutes for Research®

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATE-TO-STATE INFORMATION SHARING COMMUNITY

MEETING AGENDA, OCTOBER 11, 2004

at the American Institutes for Research
1000 Thomas Jefferson St. NW, Washington DC

8:00–8:30	Registration & Breakfast
8:30–9:00	Welcome and Introductions by Don Dailey and Judy Shanley of Access Center and Jane Hauser OSEP Project Officer
9:00–10:00	Overview of School Improvement and Effectiveness by Steve Fleischman of Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center
10:00–10:15	Break
10:15–11:30	Facilitated Discussion on School Improvement Efforts in States
11:30–12:15	Lunch
12:15–1:15	Overview of Research Regarding Effective Math Strategies for Students with Disabilities at the Middle School Level by Dr. Shanon Hardy of George Mason University
1:15–2:15	Facilitated Discussion and State Sharing of Math Initiatives
2:15–2:30	Break
2:30–3:30	Writing Strategy Instruction for Students with Disabilities by Dr. Charles MacArthur of University of Delaware
3:30–4:15	Facilitated Discussion and State Sharing of Writing Initiatives
4:15–4:30	Wrap Up

STATE-TO-STATE INFORMATION SHARING COMMUNITY

MEETING AGENDA, OCTOBER 12, 2004

8:00–8:30	Breakfast
8:30–9:00	Welcome and Overview of Day One by Judy Shanley of Access Center
9:00–10:00	Overview of Research Regarding Effective Reading Strategies for Adolescents with Disabilities by Dr. Elizabeth Sturtevant of George Mason University
10:00–10:15	Break
10:15–11:30	Facilitated Discussion and Sharing of State Reading Initiatives
11:30–12:15	Lunch
12:15–1:15	Limited English Proficient Students with Disabilities: What Can We Do Now for Better Referrals, Evaluations and Instruction by Dr. Peggy McLeod, consultant
1:15–2:15	Facilitated Discussion and Sharing of State Initiatives for Limited English Proficient Students with Disabilities
2:15–2:30	Break
2:30–3:15	Planning for Next Steps and How Access Center Can Assist Your State
3:15–3:30	Wrap Up

STATE TO STATE INFORMATION SHARING COMMUNITY: MEETING SUMMARY AND RESOURCES

INTRODUCTION

The Access Center: Improving Outcomes for All Students K–8 is charged with improving educational outcomes for elementary and middle school students with disabilities. The Center is dedicated to building the capacity of Technical assistance (TA) systems, states, districts, and schools, to help students with disabilities learn from the general education curriculum.

To that end, the Access Center—in collaboration with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)—has established a mechanism through which states and districts may exchange information and learn about best practices for providing access to the general education curriculum. Through the Access Center's state-to-state Information Sharing Community (ISC), participating state representatives and state teams share experiences, identify successes and challenges, find topical resources, and problem-solve in a variety of content areas.

The state-to-state ISC representatives met for the second time on October 11 and 12, 2004, to continue the sharing process that was established last year. Participants heard presentations from nationally recognized content specialists and researchers on school improvement, literacy, mathematics, writing, and limited English proficient students with disabilities, then discussed the most effective ways to implement research-based programs, practices, and tools in these areas. Meeting participants and Access Center staff also shared applicable tools and resources available to assist states in their efforts to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities.

To support and maintain the ISC's collaborative efforts that were initiated at the face-to-face meeting, the Access Center uses distance technology activities to sustain ongoing contact and connection among the community, such as:

- Maintaining a listserv and Web-based tools for sharing effective practices;
- Coordinating conference calls among state teams for information sharing, problem- solving, and providing mutual support; and
- Developing written articles, conference proceedings documents, and case studies of effective efforts to improve access to the general education curriculum for students with disabilities.

Following is a review of each presentation given during the October meeting, as well as descriptions of the tools and strategies that states are using to improve access for students with disabilities, and a list of additional resources that states can use to establish and refine their effective practices.

For more information about the October meeting, or about ISC's in general, contact: Susan Skipper at 202-403-5193 or *sskipper@air.org*; or Jacki Bootel at 202-403-5512 or *jbootel@air.org*.

The Access Center for Improving Outcomes for All Students K–8 is a national technical assistance center funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Drawing from national legislation, such as the *No Child Left Behind Act* and *IDEA '97*, the Center is designed to connect states and districts with research-based practices, tools, and materials that can help students with disabilities access the general education curriculum. The Center specializes in helping decision-makers use data to improve instruction and services for students with disabilities through a variety of technical assistance strategies, including direct assistance, Web-based services, and an information sharing community program.

INFORMATION SHARING SESSION
OCTOBER 11, 2004
SESSION 1

PRESENTATION BY DR. STEVE FLEISCHMAN

School Improvement and Effectiveness

Under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) passed by Congress in 2001, schools are being held increasingly accountable for the academic achievement of their students, including those with disabilities. In order to document this achievement, the law requires annual testing of children in grades 3 though 8 (at a minimum) in reading and math. States are allowed to design and select their own tests. While some states have already developed such tests, the law gives states until the 2005–2006 school year to develop and implement the math and reading tests in grades 3 though 8; science must be assessed by the 2007–2008 school year.

In addition, NCLB requires schools to show adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward meeting the goal of 100% proficiency in reading, math, and science for ALL students by 2012. If a school does not show annual progress toward meeting this requirement, the Education Department classifies it as a "Low Performing School," and certain changes in programming or personnel must be made. Although NCLB authorizes financial and technical assistance to school districts to help them improve student achievement at low performing schools, how does a school avoid that classification altogether?

The answer is to implement strategies that "really work, and that are sustainable" in more than one setting, according to a representative of the Comprehensive School Reform Quality (CSRQ) Center. "We need to make sure that, for any school reform program, there is empirical evidence that the program works," says Steve Fleischman, CSRQ Center Director, during his presentation on School Improvement and Effectiveness. The evidence that a program is effective must be based on scientifically designed research combined with professional wisdom. Without these two factors, Fleischman explained, education cannot adapt to local circumstances, or operate intelligently in the many areas in which research evidence is absent or incomplete.

Districts that are successful in the area of school reform exhibit several common identifying qualities:

- They focus first and foremost on student achievement and learning;
- They enact comprehensive, coherent reform policies;
- They have a theory of action for how to effect improvements and establish clear goals;
- They have educators that accept personal responsibility for improving student learning, and receive support to help them succeed;
- They commit to professional learning at all levels and provide multiple, meaningful learning opportunities;
- They monitor student progress regularly and intervene if necessary; and
- They use data to guide their improvement strategies.

In addition, successful districts focus their attention on:

- Partnership/stakeholder involvement
- District-school collaboration/shared responsibility and autonomy
- Resource acquisition and allocation
- Customized/tailored support for schools

Fleischman identified a variety of Internet-based resources on effective programs, including the *Educators' Guide to Schoolwide Reform*, from the American Association of School Administrators; the Florida Center for Reading Research; the *What Works Clearinghouse*, from the U.S. Department of Education; and information on substance abuse from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

However, he added, we need to know more about how these resources evaluate effectiveness. Are the assessments based on the impact these programs have? Is the quality of research noted and rated? How do we know these programs are effective? According to Fleischman, the research must exhibit evidence of the following:

- To allow replication, there should be sufficient detail on the implementation of the intervention. "The approach is only practical if it can be conducted by you in your school."
- A detailed description of the study sample should be available so one can decide, "Is the sample that was studied relevant to you?"
- An indication that the program—and not some other factor— is the likely source of change in students' outcome should be apparent.
- There should be an indication that the findings reported are based on appropriate methods of statistical analysis. "What is the margin of error for the study?" "How is the statistical significant reported? How does this finding fit into the body of other findings? What is the study's theoretical framework?"
- There should be an explanation of the research findings.

When judging the effectiveness of a program, Fleischman explained, we need to look at a set of factors that can influence the casual relationship between the intervention and the outcomes, including the fidelity of the implementation; whether the groups are roughly equivalent at the beginning and end of the study; evidence of contamination or disruption to the study; the timing of the testing— improvement can take time…it may take several years for results to be shown; and the properties of the measures.

Fleischman discussed several resources for judging the efficacy of research that has been conducted, as well as resources on school improvement that AIR has developed.

Following Fleischman's presentation, several meeting participants pointed out that most teachers are not researchers and do not have the time to do program evaluation on each strategy they are presented with. The challenge is to give teachers dependable sources of information they can use that scientifically reviews the research available on a given topic.

FACILITATED DISCUSSION

School Improvement and Effectiveness

North Carolina

In elementary education, there is an overrepresentation of special education students throughout the state, with over 14% of students identified as having disabilities. This is a result of achievement gaps not being addressed in regular education. The state has developed two model programs, which are funded through special education, for use in the general education classroom:

1. An instructional consultation support teaming model, designed by the University of Maryland, which has been implemented in four schools. This is an intervention based upon curriculum-based measurement.
2. A problem-solving team of regular and special education personnel, whose focus is prevention of identification

Ohio

Math Initiative: Developed model teacher training lessons in math (geometry and algebra) for K–3 and middle school teachers who were not adequately qualified.

Reading Initiative: The state conducted a data analysis to identify areas in which students were not achieving. Representatives strived to work more collaboratively with the Ohio Board of Regents to train teachers— especially those in the middle grades— and to redo the reading certification process. Since students are being tested to identify their reading skills in grades 3 through 8, teachers need to be trained to use diagnostic tests and other information to minimize students' identification in special education.

The Ohio Department of Special Education has liaisons in content areas who assist teaching staff in their efforts to reduce the number of students identified as needing special education, and ensure that those students who are in special education are working with the general curriculum, using standards-based instruction. The liaisons also provide assistance with identifying and implementing allowable accommodations for students who need them.

Ohio's State Improvement Grant focuses on those districts that have failed to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) under NCLB. They target these districts through 16 regional offices. Each school must implement a reading plan that is grounded in research-based instruction and positive behavioral instructional supports. Ohio is trying to send a message that implementing standards-based reform is not a way to identify students for special education. The state needs to keep an eye on academic standards, but it also needs to find ways to close the standards and achievement gap for all children. The state is creating a CD that will help align students' IEPs with academic standards.

North Carolina

It is critical to use diagnostic information to know a school's status in their standards-based reform (SBR) efforts. An environment needs to be created in which teachers understand what SBR is and know how to use SBR in the classroom.

States' School Improvement Efforts

California

In grades K through 8 (but not at the high school level), schools have a standards-aligned curriculum. Local districts are responsible for designing and implementing the new curriculum, but the state has to give its seal of approval.

The issue of access is huge in California because of a current legal case that asks how schools can test students with disabilities if they are not given access to the curriculum. About 20% of students with disabilities have postponed taking their high school exit exam. The state would like to know what other states are using as alternatives to exit exams, alternative exams, and diploma options.

California will be holding a high school summit, using Ohio's CD as a springboard to revise their IEPs to be more aligned with standards. They will be focusing on English language learners at this year's summit, on speech/language issues at next year's summit, and science and other topics in subsequent years. California also will be holding an IDEA summit, and asking 50 individuals to develop a paper on writing.

Pennsylvania

In previous years, the message from different departments (special education, assessment, and curriculum) has been different. So, having one voice coming from the administration concerning school reform has helped. The state has developed an operating plan to focus on a unified plan for training. All departments are now required to know what other departments are doing. Video conferences have been held to share information between departments so that everyone is on the same page and speaking the same language. Pennsylvania has strong technical assistance regions and is building an umbrella of professional development that focuses on multiple areas, as well as special education. The state has been training regular and special education personnel on reading and positive behavioral instructional support (PBIS) using the train-the-trainer model. There are plans to hold a week-long conference on reading, and another conference on math.

Kentucky

The entire state department of education got together for a week, and as a result, an atmosphere of collaboration developed.

Washington

The state department initiated a 5-year professional development plan and offered the districts financial and logistical assistance to implement the plan. They have conducted institutes for 2 years.

More than 6,000 regular and special educators have participated in the institutes as school improvement teams. The professional development angle is key.

Alabama

After conducting a pilot test, they have started training in standards-based education. The state has put together training teams of both regular and special education personnel who are teaching toward the same standards in each school. The special education department began this initiative and recruited regular education personnel. This initiative is supported from the top down and the bottom up; everyone is working together.

Louisiana

They are bringing parents, teachers, administrators, and school board members together to form powerful committees that communicate well with each other.

INFORMATION SHARING SESSION
OCTOBER 11, 2004
SESSION 2

PRESENTATION BY DR. SHANON HARDY

Effective Math Instructional Strategies

Are the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards equally applied to all students? Guiding the goals of the NCTM standards are five basic principles:

1. Equity (mathematics is for all students);
2. Effective teaching (mathematics teaching includes understanding the development of the child and instructional techniques);
3. Curriculum (mathematics curriculum should be viewed as an integrated whole);
4. Problem-solving (mathematics should create good problem solvers);
5. Continual assessment (mathematics should acquire feedback for student progress); and importance of technology (tools for use in mathematics).

According to Dr. Shanon Hardy, some of the principles are consistent with goals for students with disabilities. However, some principles will require the implementation of accommodations or interventions to reach these goals. Research has shown that processing difficulties associated with memory, language, and communication disorders, as well as poor self-esteem, attention deficits, and organizational skills, pose some special challenges to achieving these goals in mathematics instruction.

Dr. Hardy presented several interventions that have been found to be effective for teaching students with disabilities, including the use of:

- Manipulatives, such as physical objects to learn number sense, patterning, etc.
- **C**oncrete-**S**emi-concrete-**A**bstract Instruction, or **CSA**. Through this intervention, teachers would develop the math concept with a manipulative, move to the representational or semi-concrete stage by drawing objects, then advance to the abstract stage by symbolically writing numbers and words to symbolize the objects and drawings. It is important to for students to master 80% of the material in each stage. This sets the stage for problem-solving with practice.
- Direct Instruction. This very scripted teaching process is a widely researched component of math instruction and has been found to be effective.
- Demonstration Plus Permanent Model. This practice includes teacher demonstration of a concept, creation of a model, and a permanent display in the classroom or in mathematics notebooks.
- Mnemonics. This is an effective strategy, particularly when teaching a math problem-solving process.
- Meta-cognitive strategies such as self-monitoring and self-instruction. A checklist strategy can prompt or remind students of the next steps in the problem-solving process.

- Computer-assisted instruction with software such as *Geometry Sketchpad* and *Making Equations*. Research is not well-established on this topic since specific computer software is difficult to evaluate when the manufacturer conducts the research. The available evidence shows that when students set their own goals, performance increases.

Dr. Hardy proceeded to focus on difficulties students with disabilities have with algebra and algebraic concepts. Algebra is perceived by students as difficult because it is more abstract and based upon manipulation of symbols. Students who normally have difficulty translating a word problem, have additional difficulties translating an algebraic problem with abstract variables and unknowns. One difficulty for students with disabilities is distinguishing relevant and irrelevant information in an algebraic problem. In order for students to succeed in algebra, students must learn new terminology and be fluent in basic operations with numbers. Success in algebra is essential as a gateway to higher level math courses, as a requirement for high school graduation, and for many professions.

Some resources that may be of interest to teachers and administrators are listed below:

- The NCTM Web site (*http://nctm.org*) provides lists of journals, books and publications, problems, and lessons. Interventions like CSA are not built into the textbooks, but teachers still need to be aware of the strategies for students with disabilities.
- Hands-On-Algebra provides a strategy for instruction. The research on this strategy is limited, but it is still worth the time to investigate and apply this technique.
- Research by Cawley, Parmar, Yan, & Miller (1996) on students with disabilities in mathematics can be useful to those who work with this population.
- Effective instructional strategies to teach algebra skills to students with disabilities (CSA, direct instruction, computer-assisted instruction, strategy instruction, structured worksheets, meta-cognitive strategies, and graphic organizers) can be applied in various settings.
- Star Strategy for algebraic problem-solving (search the problem, translate the words into an equation in picture form, answer the problem, review the problem for accuracy and reasonableness) is helpful to all mathematics students.

How can teachers make a change in teaching algebraic concepts? Teachers can use principles of effective instruction in algebra such as: designing structured lessons with a focus on goals to achieve before (provide a review and objective for the concept), during (model, prompt, provide lots of practice and feedback), and after the lesson (assess performance).

Dr. Hardy concluded her discussion with the following recommendations for teachers and administrative staff:

- Continue to instruct secondary math students with mild disabilities in basic arithmetic.
- Use think-aloud techniques when modeling steps to solve equations.
- Allot adequate time to teach specific strategies.
- Provide guided practice before independent practice so that students can understand what to do and comprehend the reasons for each step.
- Provide a physical and pictorial model, such as hands-on materials, illustrations, or diagrams for each problem.
- Relate problems to real-life events.
- Continue to encourage students to practice, practice, practice.

FACILITATED DISCUSSION

Effective Math Strategies for Instruction

Alabama

Alabama's Math Standards Technology Initiative (*AMSTI*) is fully funded in three in-service regions. Teachers have two weeks of intensive training with manipulatives and models provided in kits, and are taught strategies for writing out in words, drawing, and explaining math problems. Schools, administrators, and staff must buy into the program (about 80%). Preliminary results of the *AMSTI* schools indicate an increase in scores for math. Math specialists, who are teachers from the district, provide models and follow-up training to K–12 teachers. The Master site director, from the University of Alabama, provides guidance to the initiative. This is a marriage between the university and school district. A train-the-trainer model provides demonstration to teachers in proper use of manipulative kits for the classroom and mathematics lesson. Since test scores were lacking in previous years, all 7th- and 8th-grade regular and special education teachers will be trained in both content standards and manipulatives. Teachers' manipulative kits are distributed (and refreshed) with appropriate grade level manipulatives and lesson plans. Kits are built around grade level content standards. Teachers must be willing to change their instructional techniques in mathematics. For more information, participants can go to: *www.amsti.org*.

Facilitator: The NCTM standards encourage using manipulatives and CSA for both special education and general education classes.

North Carolina

A variety of programs exist in North Carolina to provide improvement in algebra for students with disabilities. Some special and general education teachers received training in Making Algebra Child's Play and thought it was great. The State Improvement Grant (SIG) addressed mathematics in one of the counties, but the data has not shown improvement for children with disabilities. The state is taking the route of better preparing teachers to teach algebra. This summer, general education algebra teachers were trained in strategies on teaching algebra to all students through training and scripting what a teacher should say in the adopted algebra textbook. As a result, teachers did a better job of teaching and student performance improved. Currently, a team of regular and special education teachers in the state are coming together to discuss and develop a math plan. The effort to remove LD students from algebra (by the LD association) is about access to the general education curriculum. The publication, Math is Reading Too shows that mastering math is about learning to read and use symbols, just like reading is about learning to use letters.

Pennsylvania

PAttan training conferences, which emphasized reading in the past, are now turning their focus to mathematics as well. The math conferences through PAttan offered 5 days of training on 5 major mathematics concepts, focusing on monitoring mathematics and using the CBM Web site. PAttan is a technical assistance network that supports large and small efforts in school districts through regional offices by offering a train-the-trainer model. For more information, participants can access the Web site at *www.pattan.k12.pa.us*.

Kentucky

Changes to the teaching strategy in mathematics is in the planning stages in Kentucky. Some programs that receive federal funding are developing a statewide mathematics initiative.

Louisiana

Because of the lack of highly qualified math teachers, some regional training for scripted programs such as *Strategic Instruction Model* has been initiated for teachers of students with disabilities.

Washington

The mathematics initiative that started this year includes a mathematics education training core of teachers for special education. However, the special education department is not part of this initiative.

California

California districts have directed their programs over a 2-year period to focus on all students using an accelerated math program and technical assistance with developed resources and strategies. Discussion of hands-on strategies versus direct instruction have encouraged special education and regular education teachers to teach and work together. Team teaching, co-teaching in regular classes, and extended instruction to special education classes for further teaching have been initiated in the schools.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J. R., Reder, L. M., & Simon, H. A. (1995). *Applications and misapplications of cognitive psychology to mathematics education.* Pittsburgh: Carnegie Mellon University, Department of Psychology. Retrieved October 1, 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://act.psy.cmu.edu/personal/ja/misapplied.html.

Cawley, J. F., & Miller, J. H. (1989). Cross-sectional comparisons of the mathematical performance of children with learning disabilities: Are we on the right track toward comprehensive programming? *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 22,* 250–259.

Cawley, J. F., Parmar, R. S., Yan, W. F., & Miller, J. H. (1996). Arithmetic computation abilities of students with learning disabilities: Implications for instruction. L*earning Disabilities Research and Practice, 11,* 230–237.

Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Math and Science. Retrieved October 2, 2004 the World Wide Web: http://www.enc.org/.

Feigenbaum, R. (2000). Algebra for students with learning disabilities. *The Mathematics Teacher, 93*(4), 270–276.

Howard, P., Perry, B., & Tracey, D. (2004). Mathematics and manipulatives: Comparing primary and secondary mathematics teacher's views.

Ives, B., & Hoy, C. (2003) Graphic organizers applied to higher-level secondary mathematics. *Learning Disabilities Practice & Research, 18*(1), 36–51.

Jitendra, A. K., & Xin, Y. P. (1995). *Schema-based instruction on word problem solving performance of students with learning disabilities.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 381 990).

Ma, L. (1999). *Knowing and teaching elementary mathematics: Teachers' understanding of fundamental mathematics in China and the United States.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Maccini, P., & Gagnon, J. (2001). Preparing students with disabilities for Algebra. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 34,* 8–15.

Maccini, P., & Hughes, C. A. (2000). Effects of a problem-solving strategy on the introductory algebra performance of secondary students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 15,* 10–21.

Maccini, P., McNaughton, D., & Ruhl, K. L. (1999). Algebra instruction for students with LD: Implications from a research review. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 22,* 113–126.

Mastropieri, M., Scruggs, T., & Shiah, S. (1991). Mathematics instruction with learning disabled students: A review of research. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 6,* 89–98.

MATHCOUNTS. Retrieved October 1, 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://mathcounts.org.

Mercer, C. D., & Miller, S. P. (1992). Teaching students with learning problems in math to acquire, understand and apply basic math facts. *Remedial and Special Education, 13,* 19–35, 61.

Montague, M., & Applegate, B. (2000). Middle school students' perceptions, persistence, and performance in mathematical problem solving. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 23,* 215–227.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (1989). Principles and standards for school mathematics. Reston, VA: Author.

National Research Council (1989). *Everybody counts: A report to the nation on the future of mathematics education.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Tyson, H., & Woodward, A. (1989). *Why students aren't learning much from textbooks. Educational Leadership, 47*(3). 14–17.

Van Garderen, D., & Montague, M. (2003). Visual-spatial representation, mathematical problem-solving, and students of varying abilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 18*(4), 246–254.

Witzel, B. S., Mercer, D. D., & Miller, M. D. (2003). Teaching algebra to students with learning difficulties: An investigation of an explicit instruction model. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 18,* 121–131.

Witzel, B., Smith, S. W., & Brownell, M. T. (2001). How can I help students with learning disabilities in Algebra? *Intervention in School & Clinic, 37*(2), 101–105.

INFORMATION SHARING SESSION
OCTOBER 11, 2004
SESSION ?

PRESENTATION BY DR. CHARLES MACARTHUR

Writing Strategy Instructions for Students with Disabilities

When teaching writing to students with disabilities, a method known as cognitive strategy instruction can be very effective. The method, according to Dr. Charles MacArthur from the University of Delaware, involves showing kids how to engage in the cognitive processes involved in writing. Research has demonstrated that well-designed strategy instruction, which teaches specific strategies for planning, as well as self-regulation strategies, can produce substantial gains in writing quality for struggling writers. What these writers are missing is guidance on how to get started and how to write well, Dr. MacArthur noted. They have not had much instruction on the specific processes that good writers use.

The research foundations of strategy instruction are based on cognitive models of expert and developing writers. Researchers asked good writers to talk through the process they follow as they write. Strategy instruction involves taking what we know good writers do and teaching a simplified version of that to less sophisticated writers.

Dr. MacArthur provided a contrast between proficient writers and struggling ones.

- Proficient writers engage in a planning process that involves setting goals and subgoals based on audiences and tasks. This is an important part of deciding what you are going to say and how you are going to say it.
- Proficient writers have ways to generate content and to get their thoughts flowing.
- They are able to organize their writing using their knowledge of text structure and of how different genres of writing are organized. For example, knowing how research papers are organized helps good writers get going and know what they want to say.
- Proficient writers also have a rich set of knowledge about what makes writing good, and therefore, are better at editing and revising.
- Proficient writers are also aware that many things are going on at once during the writing process and have developed extensive self-regulation strategies. Thus, they are more able to break tasks down into more manageable parts.
- They recognize that writing is a recursive process and that parts often overlap.

Dr. MacArthur began his description of what struggling writers do with the quote, "Writing is easier for those who aren't very good at it."

- Struggling writers engage in a very short writing process. They do very little planning—shortly after they are given a task, they will begin the task; shortly after they begin, they will be done.

- They have a difficult time deciding what to say, coming up with sentences, and managing sentences.
- Struggling writers tend to spend a lot of time thinking about spelling and mechanics, rather than the more complicated parts of the process.
- Struggling writers also do very little revising, may not be able to read what they wrote, and likely are not asking the more sophisticated questions about writing.
- Struggling writers have difficulty both regulating their performance and coordinating what they do know about writing.

Dr. MacArthur acknowledged that this paints a very challenging picture and will be a long-term process for teachers. Despite this, strategies do exist that teachers can use to assist struggling writers. Teachers can teach students specific strategies for planning and revising their writing based on what good writers do. This involves teaching students to self-regulate through setting goals, coping with difficulties, and engaging in self-evaluation. With practice, and over time, students' writing will improve.

One of the most effective techniques that teachers can implement is teaching planning strategies based on text structure. Using knowledge of text structure or genres to plan writing is something that good writers do. Knowledge of text structure is important to good writing because it is connected to a purpose for writing, it helps to generate content and to organize a paper, and it helps with self-evaluation.

Mnemonics is an effective way to teach planning strategies. For example, Dr. MacArthur explained, teachers can use the mnemonic TREE to help students plan for persuasive writing. In TREE, the T stands for topic sentence, the R for reasons, the first E for examining reasons, and the second E for ending. Teachers should also work to connect writing to real life situations by encouraging students to think about who persuades them and why, and who they try to persuade and why. For example, elementary students know about persuading. They persuade their parents and younger siblings for any number of reasons.

Another planning mnemonic that Dr. MacArthur highlighted was CSPACE, which can be used for planning stories. In this mnemonic, C stands for characters, S stands for setting, P represents the problem, A stands for the action, C stands for conclusion, and E stands for emotion. Dr. MacArthur suggested that teachers should use a pre-test activity before introducing strategy instruction. Then, teachers can introduce a strategy like TREE or CSPACE and model thinking through each step with the students. Teachers must model repeatedly in order for students to get the idea. Students will become more involved with each modeling session until they are able to go through the process independently. Teachers can then give the pre-test writing sample back to the students and ask them what corrections or changes they would make to their writing.

Dr. MacArthur pointed out that research has shown that teaching evaluation criteria along with revision is effective. Teachers can show kids how to use evaluation criteria in the context of writing. When teaching kids evaluation criteria, teachers can also show them how to evaluate their own writing and to make the appropriate corrections. For example, to explain how to include details when writing, a teacher could show students an example of writing, and go through the story with the students, looking for examples of good detail and examples of where the writer could have used more detail. Dr. MacArthur emphasized that self-evaluation, teacher evaluation, and accountability assessments should be aligned. He also pointed out that peer revising strategies must be taught, but

although the strategy is commonly used, it is not often effective. Students do not know how to help one another; they do not want to criticize each other; and they often do not know what the teacher's evaluation strategy is. When these things are known, peer revising is much more effective. (For examples of a peer revising strategy and how to apply that to stories, see the PowerPoint presentation included in the Resources section of this document.)

After giving examples of strategies to use with struggling writers, Dr. MacArthur discussed how teachers can introduce strategy instruction in the classroom. One of the keys to effective strategy instruction is placing meaningful writing in a social context. Students are much more interested in writing if it involves people or things they know. Having a real or tangible audience is important in order for kids to understand what they are doing and why they are doing it. Dr. MacArthur also encouraged teachers to be more explicit when giving direct explanation and modeling.

Another key to effective strategy instruction is to teach students self-regulation strategies, such as self statements—things you say to yourself to stay on track or when you are confused. Teachers should include these statements in the modeling process, and personalize the statements for each student. Students should learn how to evaluate their own work and to make use of the strategies. Goal-setting is an important part of the process as well. For example, teachers could work with students to set daily goals, such as including three reasons in an essay they are working on, or to finish the conclusion that day. Teachers should be aware that it is an extended process that takes extensive guided practice.

This instruction should also be based on mastery learning. Teachers should not feel as though they must cover a lot. Instruction should be focused on the students who are having the most difficulty. Dr. MacArthur stated that four strategies taught in a year's time would be a reasonable goal, since teachers do not want to leave a strategy without students mastering it first, because then it becomes one more thing the student will struggle with in their writing. Teachers should focus on sending optimistic messages that the students can adopt, like "I couldn't do that before, but now I can because I have a strategy that I know how to use." Students must be able to see that the strategy worked, that they can use the strategy, and that their writing is better because of it.

Dr. MacArthur highlighted research done by Steven Graham. Dr. Graham conducted a meta-analysis of 39 studies and found an effect size of 1.25 in students' writing quality. Cognitive strategy instruction has been found to be effective in both classroom and tutoring situations. Specifically, the Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) model has shown to be more effective than other models—having a 1.6 effect size.

Dr. MacArthur concluded his presentation by discussing some of the implementation issues and challenges:

- Teachers should teach a few strategies intensively, and take one strategy at a time.
- Strategy instruction can and should be coordinated across teachers, grades, and subjects. For example, strategies for report writing can easily translate across disciplines.
- Strategy instruction also works well with process approaches that emphasize the social context and fits into a curriculum based on genre or purposes for writing (e.g., to persuade).

One of the challenges involved with strategy instruction is the idea that getting from single strategies to strategic learners is a long-term process. Getting kids to maintain, generalize, and integrate

strategies takes a long time and is a demanding approach for teachers. It requires explicit explanation and monitoring, and teachers also need to provide appropriate support to each student. As a result, teachers must constantly evaluate and must know their students well enough to know just how much support each one needs at any given time.

FACILITATED DISCUSSION

Writing Strategy Instructions

Ohio

This team mentioned that there has been an emphasis in their state to encourage students to focus on the content of their writing and just "getting it out," and that using creative spelling is okay. The team asked for thoughts on this issue from the other participants. Dr. MacArthur responded by saying that kids will do what we teach them; if we want them to spell correctly, we need to teach spelling. Handwriting, Dr. MacArthur says, also matters in writing. If we want kids to be good writers, they must be able to write at a level where they are not totally focused on their handwriting.

The team acknowledged that writing and spelling skills are important, but they are faced with the challenge of older students who have difficulty with spelling, and also have a hard time revising and editing their work because there is so much text on the page. In Ohio, they are finding that secondary teachers are pointing blame at elementary teachers for not having taught the basics. However, it seems as though spelling and content instruction need to continue to be developed together—we can't wait until spelling is proficient to start teaching content strategies. The principles surrounding why words are spelled the way they are need to be taught. Spelling is a developmental process, though more research is needed in the area. Anecdotally, it seems as though struggling spellers can only be taken so far, and spelling is one of the hardest areas to remediate.

The participants also brought up the fact that providing effective accommodations on writing assessments has been an area of great weakness across states. It seems as though states are doing a disservice to our students who are highly organized, but cannot get their thoughts into text because of motor or other issues.

Resources Mentioned

- The *Writing Without Tears* handwriting program has been very successful in Louisiana. It makes use of a variety of specialty papers that provide cues or prompts for students.
- Cognitive Strategy Instruction is most appropriate for all learners in elementary grades, and for struggling learners in secondary grades.
- Dr. MacArthur provided a list of references for strategy instruction in writing.
- The "6 + 1 Traits" writing framework mentioned in the discussion can be found at NWREL's site: *http://www.nwrel.org/assessment/department.asp?d=1*
- Note: this is not a research-supported program.
- Washington State University has an online writing lab, The OWL (Online Writing Lab). More information can be found on their site at: *http://owl.wsu.edu/*.
- Writer's Window (*http://english.unitecnology.ac.nz/writers/home.html*) is another online site to which students can submit their writing for feedback. Note: this site is based in New Zealand.

REFERENCES

De La Paz, S. (in press). Teaching historical reasoning and argumentative writing in culturally and academically diverse middle school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology.*

De La Paz, S., & Graham, S. (1997). Strategy instruction in planning: Effects on the writing performance and behavior of students with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 63,* 167–181.

Englert, C., Raphael, T., Anderson, L., Anthony, H., Steven, D., & Fear, K. (1991). Making writing and self-talk visible: Cognitive strategy instruction writing in regular and special education classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal, 28,* 337–373.

Graham, S., & Harris, K.R. (2003). Students with learning disabilities and the process of writing: A meta-analysis of SRSD studies. In L. Swanson, K.R. Harris, S. Graham (Eds), *Handbook of learning disabilities* (pp. 323–344). NY: Guilford.

Graham, S. & MacArthur, C. (1988). Improving learning disabled students' skills at revising essays produced on a word processor: Self-instructional training. *The Journal of Special Education, 22,* 133–152.

Harris, K.R.., & Graham, S. (1996). *Making the writing process work: Strategies for composition and self-regulation.* Cambridge, MA: Brookline.

Hayes, J., & Flower, L. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. Gregg & E. Steinberg (Eds.), Cognitive processes in writing (pp. 3–30). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hillocks, G. (1984). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching.* Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communications Skills.

MacArthur, C., Graham, S., Schwartz, S., & Schafer, W. (1995). Evaluation of a writing instruction model that integrated a process approach, strategy instruction, and word processing. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 18,* 276–291.

MacArthur, C., Schwartz, S., & Graham, S. (1991). Effects of a reciprocal peer revision strategy in special education classrooms. *Learning Disability Research & Practice, 6,* 201–210.

MacArthur, C., Schwartz, S., Graham, S., Molloy, D., & Harris, K.R. (1996). Integration of strategy instruction into a whole language classroom: A case study. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 11,* 168–176.

Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1986). Written composition. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. (3rd Ed., pp. 778–803). New York: MacMillan.

Sexton, R. J., Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (1998). The effects of self-regulated strategy development on essay writing and attributions of students with learning disabilities in a process writing setting. *Exceptional Children, 64,* 295–311.

Troia, G. A., Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (1999). Teaching students with learning disabilities to mindfully plan when writing. *Exceptional Children, 65,* 215–252.

Wong, B. Y. L., Butler, D. L., Ficzere, S. A., & Kuperis, S. (1997). Teaching adolescents with learning disabilities and low achievers to plan, write, and revise compare-and-contrast essays. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 12,* 2–15.

INFORMATION SHARING SESSION
OCTOBER 11, 2004
SESSION ?

PRESENTATION BY DR. ELIZABETH G. STURTEVANT

Improving Reading for Young Adolescents with Disabilities

Who is an adolescent? An adolescent is any individual between the ages of 10 and 19 years. According to the 2000 United States Census, there are 40,747,962 adolescents in the United States, noted Dr. Elizabeth G. Sturtevant from George Mason University. They come from diverse families, communities, and schools; they also have individual and cultural differences. In terms of reading achievement, the 2002 NAEP results indicated that 8th grade reading scores for White, African-American, and Hispanic youth increased between 1992 and 2002, although 12th grade scores decreased (NCES, 2003).

Dr. Sturtevant stated that although these statistics are generally encouraging, we still must be concerned about adolescent reading skills, especially since demands are increasing for post-secondary education and employment in the current "information age" (Alvermann, 2002). As a result, adolescents must become more sophisticated readers of many types of texts (IRA/NMSA, 2002). A lot of students start to have difficulty in grade 4, most likely because of the dramatic change in reading aptitude needed at this grade.

Dr. Sturtevant introduced *Principled Practices for Adolescent Literacy*, which was developed to guide educators and policymakers in effective instruction. The team[1] wanted to describe what is similar across successful classrooms, so they identified successful classrooms and then visited and observed them. Based upon these observations, the team came up with the following eight principles that guide adolescent success in literacy:

1. Adolescents need active learning environments that offer clear and facilitative literacy instruction. Teachers need to be prepared to help students engage in, and understand the reading.

2. Adolescents need respectful environments characterized by high expectations, trust, and care. A positive environment is an environment in which students learn more effectively.

3. Adolescents need opportunities to engage with both print and nonprint texts for a variety of purposes. Teachers' expectations should match the student's ability level and should be geared toward student needs. For example, teachers can provide students with opportunities

[1] The author team included Donna Alvermann (University of Georgia), Fenice Boyd (University of Buffalo), William Brozo (George Mason University), Kathleen Hinchman (Syracuse University), David Moore (Arizona State University-West), and Elizabeth Sturtevant (George Mason University). The team of consultants for the project included Patricia Anders (University of Arizona), Thomas Bean (University of Nevada), Judith Irvin (Florida State University), Gay Ivey (James Madison University), Elizabeth Moje (University of Michigan), Richard Vacca (Kent State University), and George Hruby (University of Georgia). Support for the project was provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and all participating universities.

to engage with electronic text if that interests the students and is appropriately matched to their ability levels.

4. Adolescents need opportunities to generate and express rich understandings of ideas and concepts. Students need to speak and write with each other and be part of a community.

5. Adolescents need opportunities to demonstrate enthusiasm for reading and learning. It is important that students enjoy the reading activities that teachers provide, because students have to do a lot of reading in order to be a good reader; the better they get, the more they will want to learn and read on their own.

6. Adolescents need opportunities to assess their own reading and learning in order to direct their future growth. Teachers still need to assess students and then guide their instruction by the results, but students should also be forced to think about their own learning, and become more meta-cognitive. Teachers can provide opportunities for continual self-assessments, like allowing students to listen to recordings of themselves reading aloud at the beginning, middle, and end of the year to gauge their progress.

7. Adolescents need opportunities to connect reading with their lives and their learning inside and outside of school. Teachers can help themselves and their students by becoming acquainted with their students lives outside of school, and connecting those experiences to reading.

8. Finally, adolescents need opportunities to develop critical perspectives toward what they read, view, and hear. Teachers need to encourage students to use reading in their own lives and to empower students not to accept everything they read as truth without questioning it critically.

Dr. Sturtevant then reviewed the first of several case examples that demonstrate some of the good things happening in classrooms.

> ***School Example #1:*** *This school was studying the industrial revolution. Teachers in math, science, English, social studies, special education, and ESL collaborated to facilitate a 7th grade project in which students became part of an assembly line that made toys for disadvantaged children. A committee of teachers and students was set up at the beginning of the project. Students were asked what job they would like to have on the assembly line. Some students were assigned as supervisors to ensure that safety rules were being followed and production was occurring at an appropriate rate. Reflective writing was included on what it felt like to participate in an assembly line. Toys were delivered to the community after their production.*

After describing the middle school project, Dr. Sturtevant introduced the importance of strategies in instruction. Teachers not only need to know strategies that will assist every student in the classroom to read, but they also need thorough education on these strategies. According to a recent Rand report, students need to learn a repertoire of strategies that are imbedded in subject area instruction (Snow et al., 2002). Students do not always know how to connect a strategy they used in one class to another class. If teachers work across disciplines and use the same strategies, they will serve struggling students better.

Students that have problems in reading tend not to use the "self-questioning" strategy. That is, they tend not to ask themselves if the content makes sense while they are reading it. Instead, they just want to finish the assignment.

Another strategy that should be used with and taught to struggling readers is the use of graphic organizers. This strategy needs to be explicitly taught and broken down, as kids may not be able to get themselves organized right away. Teachers can create part of the organizer and explain their thought process as they do so. The focus should be on "catching" ideas and then seeing how they fit together. Students should then be able to practice putting together a graphic organizer. The skill of outlining can also be taught using a graphic organizer. An organizer can make sure the ideas make sense and are appropriate ones to be included in an outline.

Adolescents who struggle with literacy often think that good writers do not need to organize their thoughts before writing. Therefore, it is helpful to point out that good writers also use these strategies.

Summarizing is another strategy with which students often struggle. It is a difficult skill and needs to be taught explicitly, starting with short passages of text. Instead, teachers often have students write summaries without teaching the skill, under the assumption that they know how to summarize. This can lead to students simply copying information. However, if students are taught how to summarize and what to look for, they can gain greater comprehension of the text.

Another important strategy for struggling readers is to be able to identify text structures. Teachers should expose students to different text structures and model how to approach different types of text.

> ***School Example #2:*** *In a summer program serving 6th graders with serious difficulties in reading and writing, graduate students served as tutors. Each elementary student had his/her own tutor. Tutors asked the students what they wanted to study and work on, and the students were motivated to study their topic because they chose it. Some of the topics students chose were family heritage, sports, animals, and cooking. The tutors worked on strategies and skills within each project, and found instruction to be effective because the students were so motivated by their topics. Students and tutors also worked on other activities, such as reading, and computers were available for students to use to access needed material.*

> ***School Example #3:*** *In this 8th grade classroom, which served students both with and without disabilities, a theme was chosen every year. In this example, the theme was volunteerism. Students had to pick a service volunteer to interview. The students were taught how to do historical research and how to conduct and then transcribe the interviews. The transcriptions were analyzed by the students to find similarities among the volunteers interviewed, as well as the positives and negatives of being a volunteer. Students conducted and shared the activity in their community.*

Dr. Sturtevant concluded her presentation with a summary of the main points:

- Teachers at the middle school and high school levels need to talk to each other, because students are traveling between multiple classrooms.
- Teachers need to concern themselves with the level of textbooks to which students are exposed. Students also need support accessing text such as audiotapes, and support from special education teachers or graphic organizers. Students cannot be denied the opportunity

to learn from these texts. Additionally, students need to be able to read text at their reading level that is interesting and enjoyable. This will allow students to be engaged in fluent reading of text. This practice in reading will help students grow as readers.

- Teachers need to take courses in reading strategies and plan together to provide a unified effort.
- Teachers need to monitor the interest level of their students in the material they are covering.
- Teachers should connect reading to purposeful activities for the students.

Seven Final Notes

1. Adolescents with disabilities are similar to other adolescents.
2. Adolescent students with disabilities need extra support and instruction.
3. All students need to learn to read and use multiple types of texts for multiple purposes.
4. Students who struggle with reading need support for reading difficult texts, and they need texts they can read easily.
5. Teachers of all subjects need to explicitly teach reading strategies within their content areas.
6. Engagement and motivational issues must be taken seriously.
7. Literacy improves when used for real purposes in the school, home, and community.

FACILITATED DISCUSSION

State Reading Initiatives

Washington

The state has developed *K–10 Grade Level Expectations* for reading, which includes research-based strategies that encompass essential academic learning requirements. A manual has been developed for standards-based IEPs. Washington would like the Access Center to review the manual before it is disseminated. The three-tiered model is covered on the Web site: *www.k12.wa.us*. Graphic organizers and a list of supplemental reading programs are available on this Web site as well.. The target students for these materials are tier 2 and 3 students.

Kentucky

The state's Reading First Grant trains all teachers, including special education teachers, on the five essential components of effective reading instruction. The Universal Design Learning project focuses on getting technology into the schools, providing students with access to the curriculum, and providing an accessible assessment for students. Students have been tested online using familiar technology. The Kentucky Assessable Continuum Consortium was developed to put all texts in PDF format so everything in the PDF matches the textbook exactly. The digital text network was established so textbooks could be scanned and read to students. The database can be reviewed for assessable digital formats available. Student participation has increased due to these programs. Students with disabilities are allowed to have text read aloud to them during high stakes testing.

Pennsylvania

The state conducted a randomized assignment pilot of computerized assessment in mathematics last spring. This was not implemented for reading because they did not feel they could have the text read to students.

Ohio

The state has started focusing on middle grades and the teaching of reading. Workshops will be provided to middle school teachers, and training will be provided to personnel at correctional facilities. Reviews of schools are occurring to gain understanding of progress gains. Ohio is also using the SIRI program as part of its reading initiative, as well as Battelle for Kids, which uses data analysis to see where students are not achieving. The Ohio Department of Education is also working more collaboratively with the Board of Regents to train teachers, particularly in the middle grades, and is redoing its certification requirements.

Challenges and Implementation Issues That Relate to These Initiatives or Promising Practices

Ohio is concerned about students who are struggling in the general education classroom, but do not qualify for special education.

California indicated that students who need support, but do not qualify for special education services can receive support from the resource specialist and resource room. Collaboration between a special education teacher and general education teacher occurs and services can be provided. Collaborative models are available through Bill Tollestrup's resources on "never streaming" at www.calstat.org.

Louisiana is struggling with the fact that IEPs address the student's functional level, but not their goals on grade level curriculum. Given the future of high stakes assessments, this does not seem to meet these students' needs. Research on how to close the achievement gap is needed. Information on alternative assessments is needed.

North Carolina's alternative academic assessment inventory is available for students in special education. The inventory has been accepted into the NCLB state plan. Students are promoted based on passing specific measurements, and this inventory can be used as one of these measurements. The inventory can be found at www.ncpublicschools.org. This assessment is not for the 1% of students allowed to take an alternative assessment; there is a separate assessment for that group of students. After three attempts, North Carolina has also received a Reading First grant. There was dichotomy at the state level about what should be happening in reading instruction.

Susan Skipper from the Access Center provided information on Professional Learning Communities and on the pyramid of interventions. Rick DuFour and Adlai Stevenson High School (Lincolnshire, IL) are good resources.

Steve Fleishman of the Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center added that a good program should provide professional development for teachers on effective instruction.

Other Supports Needed:

- Support to bridge the transition period; a guidance document to acknowledge the many students who are not fluent readers at the secondary level
- Fluency probes for middle and high school
- Resources to teach middle and high school students how to read
- A research-based continuum of effective reading resources that documents what reading programs should be tried with students struggling to read
- Literacy coaches to work with teachers to assist with adjusting the curriculum
- Teacher preparation for middle and high school teacher candidates

Resources:

- Louisa Cook Moates' reading research evidence at *www.sopriswest.com*

- Information on the three-tiered intervention model can be found on Washington state's web page: *www.k12.wa.us*
- Bill Tollestrup's "never streaming" resources at: *www.calstat.org*
- North Carolina's alternative academic assessment inventory is available at *www.ncpublicschools.org*
- Guided tours of the Access Center Web site are available by contacting any of the Access Center staff: *www.k8accesscenter.org*
- Education Week has synthesized the efficacy of Reading Recovery. For more information on Reading Recovery, it may also be useful to look at Success for All schools/districts.

INFORMATION SHARING SESSION
OCTOBER 11, 2004
SESSION ?

PRESENTATION BY DR. PEGGY MCLEOD, DMP ASSOCIATES

English Language Learners with Disabilities

Dr. Peggy McLeod's presentation focused on students who are English language learners and who are also suspected of having disabilities. Her presentation focused on what districts and states can do to promote more effective referrals, evaluations, and individualized education plans (IEPs).

The terms *English language learner* (ELL) and *limited English proficient* (LEP) are used interchangeably, but the term LEP is used in federal law. Although every state has a definition of LEP, it is not consistent across states.

There are over 5.5 million LEP students in the United States, according to the U.S. Department of Education. Spanish is the most common language of LEP students (80% of LEP students). Other languages include: Vietnamese, Chinese, Hmong, Khmer, Navajo, Haitian Creole, Korean, Arabic, Urdu, Russian, Tagalog, Lao, and Japanese. The state of California has the largest variety of languages of any other state. In addition, 77% of LEP students come from low-income families. So, poverty is another compounding factor for LEP students.

LEP students are among the most segregated students because they are often concentrated in schools that are linguistically homogenous and have high numbers of low-income students. More often, LEP students also attend schools with unqualified teachers, inadequate resources, and crumbling facilities.

Is there a disproportionate representation of English language learners in special education? It is difficult to say, Dr. McLeod explained, because there is not sufficient national data to answer this question. The question of how disproportionality is determined differs based on whether it is being examined at the state, district, school, or classroom level. Most recent data reported from states to the Department of Education is by race and does not include ELL/LEP designation. The Senate's bill to reauthorize IDEA '97 includes the provision to report students with disabilities who are also LEP. This would be useful information to have in answering the question of whether English language learners are disproportionately represented in special education. National data from 1997 indicates that 5.5% of LEP students received special education services; in 2001-2002, the percentage increased to 9%.

Dr. McLeod suggested that there are things that administrators can do before LEP students are referred for special education. The first strategy is to collaborate with each other and build a schoolwide intervention based upon teachers (general, special, or bilingual education) working together. This strategy also needs to include the appropriate language supports for the student. Teaming would mean that all teachers learn to work together and draw from their expertise to more appropriately support all students. The second immediate strategy is to involve both parents and the

community. Dr. McLeod suggested this could include learning more about a student's background by talking with the parents so that schools can better understand the students.

Dr. McLeod stated that general education teachers need to be trained for diverse student populations (ELL, diverse cultural backgrounds, poverty, etc.). This would entail improving teacher training to prepare teachers for these populations. However, Dr. McLeod also stated that it is not realistic to expect general education teachers to be specialists. If general education teachers could do it all, there would be no need for specialists (special or bilingual education). General education teachers are responsible for teaching ELL or students with disabilities in collaboration with specialists.

Additional pre-referral strategies include:

- Child study teams
- Informal problem solving
- Observation
- Parent interviews

However, Dr. McLeod noted there may be a need to begin testing immediately, and that in some cases, it is not appropriate to delay the process. Dr. McLeod dismissed the "myth" of the 2-year rule. She stated there is no rule that requires a school to wait 2 years before a LEP student can be tested for having a disability.

Dr. McLeod suggested a means for classifying English language learners that could be useful in analyzing the language in which the evaluation should be conducted. She proposed separating English language learners into the following groups:

- Limited English proficient— recent arrival (less than 1 year)
- Limited English proficient— 1 to 3 years
- Long-term limited English proficient— over 3 years (regardless of services)

Dr. McLeod said that it is common practice to perform a speech and language evaluation for LEP students, but she suggested that this is not needed in every case. Speech and language evaluations should be based on a suspected disability, not because the student is LEP. If language is part of the suspected disability, then it is appropriate to do this evaluation. If language is not part of the suspected disability (e.g., health impairment, orthopedic impairment, visual impairment, emotional disturbance), language testing is not necessary. Moreover, information about the child's English proficiency is already available from the Bilingual Education Department. Multidisciplinary teams should work with the bilingual education staff to share information and make decisions.

In what language should evaluations be conducted? The answer depends upon the ELL classification and whether the suspected disability has a language component. Dr. McLeod recommended testing all students who are recent arrivals in their native language. All other ELL students should be tested in both languages (native language and English), if appropriate and depending upon the suspected disability. If the disability has a language component to it (e.g., learning disability, speech and language, mental retardation, autism, traumatic brain injury, deaf or hard of hearing, deaf/blind etc.), it is necessary to test in the child's native language. In this case, the

same testing would be done as with non-LEP students, but the testing is done in both languages. Dr. McLeod stressed that these guidelines should be viewed in the context of individual information, not hard rules.

Some other strategies that Dr. McLeod suggested for the evaluation were:

- Gather as much background information (academic records and observations) on the student as possible;
- Conduct parent interviews;
- Use bilingual personnel or trained interpreters; and
- Use instruments normed on a sample that includes children similar to those being evaluated (e.g., if testing a child from El Salvador, sample should include children from El Salvador).

Because it is seldom possible to find instruments with exact sample matches (language and country), results should never be reported as scores, but should be reported descriptively as approximate measures. Item difficulty and language loading (amount of complexity of language) are other important considerations when interpreting the results, which is where bilingual staff can assist. It is difficult to find enough trained and qualified bilingual personnel, so it is important to use interpreters and train evaluation personnel in how to work with interpreters. Dr. McLeod believes that trained evaluation personnel working with trained interpreters could produce better results. Although she has no data to support this, data on interpreters working with the deaf, show it produces better results.

Once the eligibility determination has been made, Dr. McLeod suggested:

- Linking the evaluation results to developing the IEP
- Linking the language(s) of the evaluation to the language(s) of the services
- Continuing to provide language support services (e.g., bilingual instruction or ESL services)

Dr. McLeod also suggested that the delivery of special education and related services be based upon a team approach, especially for students that need special education services and language support services.

Dr. McLeod cautioned that if LEP students are not receiving appropriate services, then referrals to special education will increase. Schools that have appropriate language supports will find it easier to attract bilingual staff.

FACILITATED DISCUSSION

English Language Learners with Disabilities

California

The state has English language development standards. When an English language learner becomes proficient, they participate in regular English classes. The challenge is that there is no alternate assessment for English language learners, so California uses multiple measures. They are currently revising their handbook about providing services to students with disabilities who are English language learners. The Office of Civil Rights has advised districts that it may never be appropriate for students with significant disabilities, who are also English language learners, to be reclassified. These students may need to use their native language to thrive.

Ohio

The Ohio team shared that their state has two LEP consultants who work with the Special Education Department. These consultants contribute to the development of standards and assessment. The Ohio Department of Education has produced family guides in English, Spanish and Samoan, which inform parents of what their children should be able to do at each grade level.

Louisiana

The Louisiana team mentioned that they have a small LEP population in their state, with the largest population being Vietnamese. Louisiana conducted a 3-day summer training that focused upon effective assessment practices and procedures. A handbook based upon this summer training is being developed.

North Carolina

The North Carolina team said that they are the second-fastest growing state for Hispanic population. The state assessment is used for English language learners. The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction has ELL consultants, but they are not part of the special education department. These consultants review every test item on the state assessment for vocabulary and language loading of test items. This year, North Carolina plans on having a 2-day conference on English language learners with disabilities. Resources will be available after the conference.

Kentucky

The Kentucky team shared that their department of education has two LEP consultants.

Challenges:

- There is limited research on this topic.
- Research needs to be put into accessible format for educators or administrators.

- Resources on how to work with all English language learners and other diverse students needs to be made readily available.
- Teachers should continue to be train so they can be more effective in dealing with the cultural diversity of students.
- Bilingual and special education staff need to collaborate and communicate to provide the best support for LEP students with disabilities.
- The appropriate language supports should be given to children even when children are found to have a disability.

Resources:

- WestEd has developed a handbook on English language development. It clearly defines English language development and English language acquisition.
- John Miller developed a guide on how to get a language sample.
- California has produced key performance indicators. This information is available on the California Department of Education Web site at *http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/*.
- North Carolina has produced a state report card that can be found on the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction Web site at *http://www.ncreportcards.org/src/*.
- National Center for Culturally Responsive Education Systems is an OSEP-funded Technical Assistance Center. For more information go to *http://www.nccrest.org*.
- The phone company assists in finding translators to translate phone conversations.
- National Association Bilingual Educators produced a guide to help determine appropriate referrals of English language learners to special education. This guide and other links are available on their Web site at *www.nabe.org*.
- Dr. Sandra Fradd from University of South Florida developed a manual on how to train interpreters. The guide provides additional resources on English language learners with disabilities and can be found at *http://tapestry.usf.edu/Fradd/outline.html*.
- The Bueno Center at the University of Colorado at Boulder has resources about interpreter training and multicultural education resources available at *http://www.colorado.edu/education/BUENO/html/home.html*.
- Collinswood Elementary School in Charlotte, NC is a magnet school with a dual language Spanish immersion program. Information about the school and this program is available at *http://www.cms.k12.nc.us/allschools/jump/jump.asp?Courier=344*.

FACILITATED DISCUSSION

Next Steps or Plans for State Teams

Kentucky

They plan to take this information to supervisors, content consultants, and division directors within the state. The division directors will decide how to best disseminate the information.

Ohio

Their next steps will be to pair English/Language Arts content specialists with special education consultants to determine how to assist students with language and reading difficulties, especially to become more proficient in writing. The same pairing will be made with math content specialists and special education consultants. The work these teams do will be disseminated to regional improvement teams in the late spring/summer. The regional teams will disseminate this information to buildings via training and workshops. Follow-up will be conducted to determine the impact.

Washington

They have finished a manual about connecting systems, which is a summation of the work based upon aligning IEPs with state standards. They are trying to determine how to disseminate this manual and conduct training on connecting systems. This product is based upon the seed that California planted for them at last year's meeting.

California

The California team plans to disseminate information learned from the meeting through articles in the SIG grant publication. California has plans for a special education summit and a high school summit. The associations in California are another means that will be used to disseminate the information from the meeting. A toolkit has been developed and is being rolled out.

Louisiana

State staff are currently giving presentations on scientifically based research. They will incorporate information from the meeting into these presentations. Louisiana disseminates information through their regional service centers. The state would like further information on strategies and school improvement plans.

Alabama

They gleaned a lot of information from the meeting and plan to incorporate this information into their trainings. The state is developing training on standards-based instruction. They will use a train-the-trainer model to get this information to schools and teachers. They plan to gather the feedback from the training and see what impact it has.

North Carolina

They plan to share the material and information with state and district administrators. Information from the meeting will be shared at an annual conference and through regional meetings.

How can we get this information to principals and teachers so that there will be school-level impact?

- Contact Principal Associations about disseminating the information via conferences, regional meetings, newsletters, e-mail, and listserv.
- Develop a training module (presentation and notes) that can be disseminated.
- Develop a CD.
- Replicate an Information Sharing Community in your state for both administrators and teachers to share information and help build a sense of community.

LIST OF PRESENTERS

Steve Fleischman
American Institutes for Research, CSRQ Center Director
sfleischman@air.org

Shanon D. Hardy
George Mason University
Shandhardy@aol.com

Charles MacArthur
University of Delaware
macarthu@UDel.Edu

Elizabeth G. Sturtevant
George Mason University
esturtev@gmu.edu

Peggy McLeod
DMP Associates
mmcleoddc@starpower.net