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Introductions
Colorado EL Data
Considerations within the Body of Evidence
  - EL student population
  - General assessment considerations
Accommodations
Collaborative Practices
EL Growth Rate in Colorado

- Colorado total PK-12 enrollment growth rate over the last ten years (2003-2013) = 15.7%
- Colorado EL total PK-12 enrollment growth rate over the last ten years (2003-2013) = 38.1%

Updated by Office of Data, Program Evaluation, and Reporting (Jan. 2015); Data Source: 2003-2004 through 2013-2014
Student October: http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/rvprioryearpmdata
English Proficiency Levels for ELs 2013-2014

- NEP 21.13%
- LEP 63.91%
- FEP M1 8.15%
- FEP M2 6.81%

Percentages based on Subtotal of NEP, LEP, FEP Monitor Year 1 and FEP Monitor Year 2 (does not include FELL, PHLOTE, Exited, or Parent Refusal Students)

Updated by Office of Data, Program Evaluation, and Reporting (Jan. 2015); Data Source: 2013-2014 Student October (NEP, LEP, FEP Monitor Year 1 and 2 only; excludes students with missing or duplicate SASIDs)
American Indian or Alaska Native, 0.42%
Asian, 7.48%
Black or African American, 3.64%
Hispanic or Latino, 83.01%
White, 4.70%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 0.24%
Two or More Races, 0.51%

Updated by Office of Data, Program Evaluation, and Reporting (Jan. 2015); Data Source: 2013-2014 Student October (NEP, LEP, FEP Monitor Year 1 and 2 only; excludes students with missing or duplicate SASIDs)
### Top 20 Home Languages Spoken by Colorado ELs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of ELs</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>101,333</td>
<td>83.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chinese, Mandarin</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Amharic</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Karen, Pa'o</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>German, Standard</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chinese, Yue</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tigrigna</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In 2013-2014, English learners (ELs) had 242 home or primary languages other than English.*

Updated by Office of Data, Program Evaluation, and Reporting (Jan. 2015); Data Source: 2013-2014 Student October (NEP, LEP, FEP Monitor Year 1 and 2 only; excludes students with missing or duplicate SASIDs)
Let’s talk......

- How does your current practice consider race and ethnicity in gifted education identification/universal screening?
  - Is there cultural understanding of the race and ethnicity groups within your district?

- How does your current practice consider English language proficiency in gifted education identification/universal screening?
  - Is there understanding of the linguistic backgrounds that are represented?
  - Is there understanding of English language proficiency levels and use of ACCESS for ELLs?
ELs Who Are Also in Other Programs

Percent of ELs That Are Also...

- Title I Students: 57.3%
- Migrant Students: 1.3%
- Homeless Students: 2.8%
- Gifted and Talented Students: 2.3%
- Immigrant Students: 5.1%
- Refugee Students: 1.1%

Updated by Office of Data, Program Evaluation, and Reporting (Jan. 2015); Data Source: 2013-2014 Student October (NEP, LEP, FEP Monitor Year 1 and 2 only; excludes students with missing or duplicate SASIDs)
According to GOTCHA, the gifted EL demonstrates the following characteristics...

School Based

1. Ability to read in native language two grades above
2. Shows high ability in mathematics
3. Is advanced in creative domains
4. Is a leader in multiple settings
Project GOTCHA
Galaxies of Thinking and Creative Heights of Achievement

Language Based

1. Demonstrates language proficiency levels above other ELs
2. Learns multiple languages at an accelerated pace
3. Shows ability to code switch
4. Wants to teach others words from their heritage language
5. Is willing to translate for others
6. Has superior knowledge of phrases and heritage dialects along with the ability to translate them to English
7. Has a grasp on jokes related to cultural differences
Culture Based

1. Balances behaviors in both the heritage and new culture
2. Is willing to share his/her heritage culture
3. Shows pride in his/her culture and ethnic background
4. Demonstrates a global sense of community and respect for cultural differences
Areas for Gifted Identification

- General or Specific Intellectual Ability
- Specific Academic Aptitude
- Visual Arts, Performing Arts, Musical, Dance, or Psychomotor abilities
- Creative or Productive Thinking
- Leadership Abilities
Gathering a Body of Evidence
What do you think should be included in a body of evidence for ELs when considering a referral to SPED?

- Language proficiency levels in all domains
- Grade level proficiency in the content area(s)
- Comparison to peers with similar instructional support systems
- Multiple data points
Body of Evidence

- **Quantitative**
  - Norm-referenced test (e.g., cognitive and achievement)
  - Criterion-referenced test (e.g., state assessments and curriculum-based measures)

- **Qualitative**
  - Rubric
  - Performance
  - Observation
  - Checklist
  - Interview
Body of Evidence

- Creativity
- Problem solving
- Talent aptitude
- Performance assessments
- Hands-on academic content areas like science
- Test scores from country of origin
- Coursework on transcript from native country
- Parent Interviews
- Observations
Factors that may Impact How ELs Perform on Assessments

- Linguistic Factors
- Educational Background Factors
- Cultural/Bias Factors
Different linguistic backgrounds – heterogeneous group
- Consider language backgrounds, when considering native language assessments

Varying levels of proficiency in English
- Cannot assume that oral language skills = literacy skills to perform well on a standardized assessment – i.e., reading directions
- May need longer time to perform assessment tasks – consider level of English proficiency

Varying levels of proficiency in native language
- If using native language assessments, do not assume they have native language proficiency
- Good to keep in mind when considering native language assessments
Varying degrees of formal schooling in native language
- Affects not only native language proficiency/literacy, but also the level of content area skills and knowledge

Varying degrees of formal schooling in English
- Studying English as a foreign language in their country vs only taking ESL classes in USA
- Differences in types of instruction – ESL vs. Bilingual

Varying degrees of exposure to standardized testing
- Cannot assume that students have had exposure to standardized assessments – may have never seen multiple choice, constructed response, etc.
- Could put students at a disadvantage
Cultural/Bias Factors

- Varying degrees of acculturation to US mainstream
- Students may have background knowledge and experiences that are different from those presumed by a test developer. *This can put students at a disadvantage.*
  - May have different assumptions/beliefs/values about test taking
  - May have different assumptions/beliefs/values about education
  - May have different assumptions/beliefs/values about how to respond
    - Cultures that value cooperation
  - Students from economically disadvantage backgrounds may respond to questions differently
Is the assessment valid and reliable? (Is it measuring what it claims to measure?)
- Has it been normed on an EL population?

Consider comparing with EL peer group when interpreting results.
- Consider comparing with common language background peer group.

When interpreting results, do they make sense when considering classroom performance?
Our Education System

Everybody is a genius. But if you judge a fish by its ability to climb a tree, it will live its whole life believing that it is stupid.
Accommodations: practices and procedures that provide equitable access during instruction and assessment for students who have a documented need, including students with a Disability.

The use of accommodations moves us one step closer to ensuring that ALL students in Colorado have a fair and equal chance to receive standards-based instruction and demonstrate mastery.
Assessment Accommodations Considerations

- When provided, accommodations should align with classroom assessment and instruction. Are results valid with or without these?
- Does the assessment allow for accommodations?
Are ELs who demonstrate exceptional progress/growth when provided with ELD services in general education referred to an individual problem-solving process?

Do your ELD teachers collect progress-monitoring data the same as general educators?

Are those data compared to other EL students with a similar background, age and amount of exposure to English acquisition?

Is language acquisition part of the progress monitoring?
Activity
Explaining Equity and Equality

Equality = SAMENESS
Equality is about SAMENESS, it promotes fairness and justice by giving everyone the same thing.

BUT it can only work IF everyone starts from the SAME place, in this example equality only works if everyone is the same height.

Equity = FAIRNESS
EQUITY is about FAIRNESS, it’s about making sure people get access to the same opportunities.

Sometimes our differences and/or history, can create barriers to participation, so we must FIRST ensure EQUITY before we can enjoy equality.
A Collaborative Process
Practices Essential for Developing Collaboration

- Willingness/Openness
  - Vision
- Establishing Team Members
  - Roles and responsibilities
  - Leadership support
- Knowledge of data tracking, dialogues, and fidelity assessment of the interventions implementation
- Norms and Logistics
GT Identification teams should include multidisciplinary team members that span across special education and general education.

- Team should have expertise in English language development
- Team should have expertise in culturally responsive practices that reflect:
  - Instruction – academic and English language development
  - Assessment
  - Family/Community Engagement
Bilingual Staff

- Every effort should be made to have bilingual staff member conduct the assessments
- If one is not available, obtain assistance of a bilingual professional from the district
- If bilingual professionals are not available, consider using bilingual nonprofessionals from the district or community (interpreter/cultural mediator)
- Don’t use family members!!!
Create a Dream Team

- Identify title (not name)
  - i.e – grade level teacher
- Why are they on your team?
- What role do you envision them playing in this process?
Contact Information

- Morgan Cox – cox_m@cde.state.co.us
- Lindsay Swanton – swanton_l@cde.state.co.us