

Strategies for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students With Special Needs

Juliet E. Hart

ABSTRACT: The author provides an overview of the prevailing assessment and instructional issues related to culturally and linguistically diverse students with special education needs. Also, the author presents current trends and prevalence rates of students with disabilities who are also English language learners, in addition to general guidelines for the appropriate assessment of such students for special education services. Last, the author describes research-based academic and behavioral strategies for these students, along with web-based resources geared to assist general and special educators working with diverse students with special needs.

KEYWORDS: *culturally and linguistically diverse students, English language learners, special education services*

DURING THE PAST DECADE, the number of students for whom English is a second language (ESL students) has increased considerably, with the country's culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) student population growing at an unparalleled rate (Denham & Lobeck, 2005; Macias, 1998; Smith, 2003). Specifically, the U.S. Department of Education (2003) estimated that more than 3.5 million students in U.S. schools have limited English proficiency (LEP). Although the challenges related to addressing demographic diversity are not new, the effect on U.S. schools is intense (Denham & Lobeck; Fradd, 1997). Currently, it is estimated that approximately 1 million ESL students also exhibit serious learning difficulties that may qualify them for special education placement (Baca & Cervantes, 2004).

The needs of English language learners (ELLs) who also may contend with learning and emotional disabilities present challenges that are only beginning to be addressed (Artiles, Rueda, Salazar, & Higuera, 2005; Fradd, 1997; Klingner et al., 2005). The gravity of these challenges is underscored by the poor academic outcomes of students from language minority backgrounds (Lee, 2002; Mehan, Hubbard, & Villanueva, 1994) and even graver postschool outcomes for students from diverse backgrounds served in special education programs (Ferri & Connor, 2005; Obi,

Obiakor, & Algozzine, 1999). The prevalence figure on diverse students with learning problems in our schools indicates a substantial population that could benefit from bilingual and special education services (Baca & Cervantes, 2004). Unfortunately, it is difficult for most schools to provide adequate services to this unique and growing student population because they generally lack teachers and personnel specially trained in these areas (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Garcia & Ortiz, 2006; Rodriguez, 1998).

Addressing the needs of CLD students with disabilities is a challenging and comprehensive process. In this article, I provide an overview of the prevailing assessment and instructional issues related to CLD students with special education needs. I present the current trends and prevalence rates of students with disabilities who are also ELLs, as well as general guidelines for the appropriate assessment of such students for special education services. Last, I describe research-based academic and behavioral strategies for these students. I also describe web-based resources geared to assist general and special educators working with diverse students with special needs.

Assessment of CLD Students for Learning Problems

The issues of overrepresentation of CLD students in particular high-incidence special education categories (e.g., learning disabilities, mental retardation, emotional disturbance) and their corollary underrepresentation in programs for the gifted and talented have plagued the field for more than 4 decades (Artiles & Trent, 1994; Artiles, Trent, & Palmer, 2004). Although Hispanic students nationwide are only slightly overrepresented in the learning disabilities cat-

Address correspondence to Juliet E. Hart, University of Kansas, Special Education, 1122 West Campus Road, JRP Room 544, Lawrence, KS 66045, USA; hartawk@ku.edu (e-mail). Copyright © 2009 Heldref Publications

egory and are not overrepresented in programs for mental retardation or emotional disturbance, national data fail to account for the wide variability at the state, regional, and local school district levels, suggesting serious overrepresentation and underrepresentation in special education among students in this group, depending on the location (Donovan & Cross, 2002). Because state departments of education do not typically collect information on students' language proficiency, there is only emerging data on the representation of ELLs in special education programs. Notwithstanding, notable instances of overrepresentation across cultural and linguistic populations are evidenced when data are disaggregated by subgroup (Artiles et al., 2005). For example, emerging evidence from urban districts in California suggests this population is significantly overrepresented in high-incidence disability categories (Klingner & Artiles, 2003). More specifically, in a study of within-group variance of the representation of ELLs in special education programming, Artiles et al. found that students identified as having LEP in their native language and in English were concomitantly overrepresented in learning disabilities and speech-impairment programming. One principal cause that is cited for this persistent overrepresentation dilemma is related to biased and problematic assessment practice (Carrasquillo, 1991; Macswan & Rolstad, 2006), as well as to a lack of understanding of the distinction between English language acquisition and actual learning disability among the professionals participating in decision making as part of the child-study team process (Klingner & Harry, 2006).

The use of standardized tests in the assessment of ELLs with and without disabilities has resulted in much debate among psychologists, social scientists, and educators (Arreaga-Mayer, Utley, Perdomo-Rivera, & Greenwood, 2003). Litigation and legislation have been used in an attempt to minimize biased assessment practices (Larry P. et al. v. Wilson Riles et al., 1979; Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975). Numerous standardized assessments (e.g., intelligence, oral language proficiency, achievement tests) may generate valid scores for most students but tend to underrate the potential of CLD students (Abedi, 2002). Issues of test, norming, examiner biases, lack of examiner preparation, and questions about the valid educational use of standardized tests have resulted in many researchers' and educators' recommending alternative forms of assessment to reliably and validly measure diverse students' abilities. Appendix A provides a summary of performance-based and authentic measures that have classroom application in the assessment of diverse students (see Fradd & McGee, 1994; Richard-Amato, 2003). Appendix B shows a self-assessment checklist for students in reading.

Baca and Cervantes (2004) also recommended the following assessment techniques that have particular application for classroom teachers and other school personnel.

Analytic Teaching

Analytic teaching uses the systematic modification of instruction, objective observation, and documentation of results. This method allows teachers to identify which teaching strategies are most effective for a particular student and is an excellent means of analyzing and individualizing instruction (Ovando, Collier, & Combs, 2006).

Curriculum-Based Assessment

Curriculum-based assessment provides teachers with specific information about which curricular content or instructional strategies present the student with the most difficulty. It includes frequently repeated, timed samples of students' performance in skill areas such as reading and math. Data are graphed and monitored in terms of student progress and effectiveness of instructional techniques (Ovando et al., 2006).

Language Sampling

Usually collecting from an interaction with the student, researchers have shown language samples to be sensitive to linguistic differences between normal and language-disordered students. Samples must be collected in natural and multiple contexts, must use a familiar and culturally appropriate conversational partner, should not attempt to elicit specific language forms, should be video or audio taped for later analysis, and should focus on language function as well as form and content.

Narrative Analysis

Narrative analysis is similar to language sampling in that a speaker's productions are transcribed or a written sample is collected, and the result is later analyzed for form, content, and function. The student's extended oral or written monologue, usually obtained by storytelling, is used rather than a dialogue. It is considered useful as a criterion-referenced—rather than comparative or norm-referenced—measure.

Multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) are increasingly working with educators to conduct meaningful assessments to determine appropriate educational programs for the growing number of students who contend with learning difficulties and whose primary language is not English. However, in a comprehensive investigation of the MDT process in a large, linguistically diverse, urban school district, Klingner and Harry (2006) found (a) limited understanding among school professionals of how to distinguish language acquisition issues from disabilities, (b) confusion as to when referral of diverse students was warranted, (c) misinterpretation of lack of English proficiency as subpar IQ or a learning disability, (d) lack of attention to the role of prereferral strategies in the general education setting before referral, and even (e) disconcerting behavior (e.g., expressions of negative and stereotypical assumptions about families based on cul-

tural background) by school professionals toward families. Among their recommendations was the use of response to intervention models for supporting students in the general education setting as well as professional development for all professionals involved in the referral-to-placement process. Salend and Salinas (2003) proposed the following additional recommendations for MDTs:

1. Diversify the composition of the multidisciplinary teams and offer training. (Team members should include family and community members, professionals fluent in the student's native language, ESL teachers, and others.)
2. Compare student performance in both native and secondary languages. (Teams should collect data relating to student's performance in both languages through informal and formal measures, language samples, observations, questionnaires, and interviews.)
3. Consider the processes and factors associated with second language acquisition. (Teams must consider the factors that affect second language acquisition and understand the stages students go through in learning a second language. For a review, see Salend, 2001.)
4. Use alternatives to traditional standardized testing (student-centered assessment).
5. Identify diverse life experiences that may affect learning. (Identify experiential factors affecting learning.)
6. Analyze the data and develop an appropriate educational plan. (Implement and monitor effectiveness of chosen intervention.)

It is widely recommended that schools should continue investigating these and other forms of alternative procedures for conducting linguistically and culturally sensitive assessments (Klingner & Artiles, 2003; Rueda, 1997).

Research-Based Instructional and Behavioral Principles

Special and general educators, classroom teachers, and other professionals working with CLD students may use several research-based instructional and behavioral strategies in the classroom setting. Several of these strategies come from the bilingual studies by Brice (2000), Brice and Perkins (1997), and Roseberry-McKibbin (1995, 1997) and suggest dual-language use in classroom contexts. Monolingual and bilingual special educators will find the following techniques practical and effective.

Maintaining a Flexible Environment

This technique entails a relatively open setting in a formal structure along with permitting the calling out of responses and flexible turn-taking, increasing wait time, increasing opportunities for speaking, and accepting all answers in the home language or English. In this manner, students are rewarded for their effort, and further participation is encouraged.

Demonstrating Appreciation for the Native Language

The use of the native language by teachers conveys an unspoken appreciation for and respect of the students' home language and culture, and a willingness on the part of teachers to engage in an interchange of learning along with students.

Spontaneous Language Use

Students should be permitted to code switch (i.e., to use the alternation of the two languages) to facilitate spontaneous language use (Wyatt, 1998). It has been observed that code switching allows for more extemporaneous language use, which in turn stimulates increased use of English (Brice, Mastin, & Perkins, 1997). Further, the monolingual special educator can use simple words and expressions such as *sí* (yes) and *y que mas?* (and what else?) as prompts to encourage students to continue communicating (Brice & Roseberry-McKibbin, 2001) even when their speech production is limited.

Salend and Salinas (2003) summarized some additional general principles for special and general educators to keep in mind when seeking to differentiate instruction for second language learners. These principles, drawn from the research of Brice and McKibbin (2001), Gersten (1999), and Fuego (1997), included the following:

1. Establish a comfortable learning environment that encourages the use of both languages.
2. Label important items in the classroom in several languages.
3. Encourage and show students how to use bilingual dictionaries.
4. Use reiteration to help students acquire the rhythm, pitch, volume, and tone of the new language.
5. Use simple vocabulary structures and shorter sentences, limiting the use of idioms, colloquialisms, and pronouns.
6. Highlight key terms through repetition, increased volume, and slight exaggeration, and write them on the chalkboard.
7. Use gestures, facial expressions, voice changes, demonstrations, modeling, visuals, props, manipulatives, and other cues to communicate and convey the meaning of new words.
8. Preview and teach new vocabulary, phrases, idioms, and concepts through modeling and hands-on experiences.
9. Supplement oral instruction and descriptions with visuals such as pictures, charts, amps, graphs, and graphic organizers.
10. Offer frequent summaries, and check students' comprehension frequently.
11. Emphasize the communication effort rather than the appropriateness of form.
12. Offer corrective feedback to students indirectly by restating their comments in correct form.

Specific Academic Strategies

There is growing literature on effective instructional strategies to assist second language and special needs students in acquiring academic-content and appropriate-language forms. Consensus in the reading comprehension research literature for students with disabilities suggests several key components of effective instructional intervention. Total physical response (TPR), reciprocal teaching, semantic mapping, priming, marginal gloss, advance organizers, the language-experience approach, and other reading-comprehension techniques are among the specific strategies that have been described in the research literature.

Academic strategies. TPR has a long history in the field of second language teaching, is especially useful for students with little or no knowledge of the target language, and has seen application with students with a variety of language and learning needs (Asher, 2000; Conroy, 1999). In TPR, students not only are exposed to the verbal language but also act out language in meaningful ways. The teacher typically serves as a model for the oral-language and physical response. Putting words and phrases together in tandem with movement increases the likelihood that students internalize the meaning. Although lessons can be grammatically sequenced, grammar should not be the focus of the lesson. Grammatical forms are internalized inductively as students hear words and attach meaning to them. Students not yet at ease with speaking can still participate and internalize concepts simply by copying the physical acts modeled by the teacher and other students. Once they have progressed from the silent period and feel more comfortable speaking, they will produce speech along with their actions. Usually, TPR involves cooperative groups or the whole class, thereby reducing the anxiety students may experience when acting it out individually. Because of its participatory approach, high level of engagement, and provision of multiple pathways to accessing content, TPR appears to be naturally suited to students with disabilities and limited language proficiency.

ESL students often show evidence of more difficulties with reading comprehension than do fluent speakers of English because of differences in background knowledge pertinent to what is read, and because of limited proficiency in English (Clarke, 1980; Klingner, et al., 2005; Lee, 1986). Comprehension strategy instruction has been identified as a promising approach for improving learning opportunities for ESL students, specifically those with learning disabilities (Klingner & Vaughn, 1996). Reciprocal teaching has been used to improve reading comprehension for students who can decode but have trouble comprehending text (Palinscar & Herrenkohl, 2002; Rosenshine & Meister, 1994). In this model, students are taught to use four strategies: prediction, summarization, question generation, and clarification. The teacher models the use of each of these strategies

by “thinking aloud” as she reads through a text. The teacher then engages students in a discussion, assisting them in strategy use, gradually withdrawing the scaffolds as they are no longer needed. As students gain proficiency in applying the strategies, they take turns becoming the “teacher” and taking the lead in discussions about text content. Research has demonstrated this model to be effective in improving the reading comprehension skills of ESL students with learning disabilities, in addition to a range of students of varying ability levels in the classroom (Klingner & Vaughn). Reciprocal teaching is complemented by other reading comprehension strategies found to be effective for ESL students with disabilities including KWL (know, want to know, learned), guided reading, directed reading activity, and directed reading and thinking activities (Schoen & Schoen, 2003).

Semantic mapping is a webbing activity in which students identify interrelated concepts, incorporating their prior knowledge base with novel information presented in the lesson (Foil & Alber, 2002; Fradd & Klingner, 1995). This strategy capitalizes on students’ previous experiences and cultural diversities while reinforcing their understanding of concepts. This procedure has the advantage of requiring minimal amounts of language for successful participation. Ideas and concepts can be easily associated with words and images in meaningful contexts. These webs can serve as a model of the concept development process and as a model from which students can develop their own maps.

It is often important for children with special needs and language challenges to be exposed to activities before they engage in them with their peers. Priming permits the student to be exposed to the new content in a context free of the pressure to perform and links individual instruction to the larger group activities typical of the mainstream setting. This exposure promotes academic engagement while decreasing disruptive behavior; it also levels the academic playing field. It can provide the student with an opportunity to share knowledge about the topic and even to assume an expert role when the content is introduced to the class as a whole (Werner, Vismara, Koegel, & Koegel, 2006).

Marginal gloss is a strategy recommended for students with language deficiencies. It involves the teachers anticipating the difficulties students may experience in comprehending or reading text. Teachers make notes in the margins that explain key concepts, and also underscore important words in the story by highlighting (Leverett & Diefendorf, 1992). Advance organizers provide a framework for learning. These include activities that orient the students to the task and materials, providing basic information and activating the background knowledge of the student (Vaughn, Bos, & Schumm, 2007). The teacher previews the lesson content, summarizes key issues, rehearses vocabulary, and reviews related previous knowledge (Baca & Cervantes, 2004). It is important for all students—but specifically students with

disabilities and limited background knowledge for the task being taught—to be provided with a graphic that alerts and organizes them for learning. Initially, the teacher may complete the organizer along with the students, but as students acquire skills, they may complete the organizer themselves. Last, teachers should use review or retention techniques to reinforce the use of the advanced organizer tool (Baca & Cervantes).

The language experience approach (LEA; Van Allen & Allen, 1967) was originally developed as a predecessor to the whole language movement, and was found to be useful in teaching native speakers to read. Later it was suggested for use with ELLs (Moustafa, 1989). The technique builds on students' previous experiences with language and oral language capacity (Perez, 2000). It allows students to operate within a familiar context and can serve as an avenue for teachers to access students' prior knowledge about topics relevant to them (Dorr, 2006). In this approach, teachers record a student's oral narration verbatim. Students then share their ideas with others in written form. In doing so, students learn that what they say can be written and read by others, including their classmates. Consequently, students come to understand the meaning of print as a form of personal communication and are able to feel a sense of pride in their own work as authors. For many second language learners and students with serious reading and writing difficulties, recording one's words in writing may be a completely novel experience. Such students require numerous experiences with written symbols and pictures before they become conversant with the reading and writing process (Dorr; Fradd & Klingner, 1995). One of the most beneficial features of this approach is that the text generated is appropriate cognitively and linguistically because it derives from the students themselves, and inherently reflects the culture of which the students are a part (Richard-Amato, 2003).

Grouping strategies. Multiple grouping strategies can facilitate the participation of children with language- and special-learning needs in inclusive settings. Cooperative learning groups, classwide peer tutoring, and more general peer tutoring strategies enable children with disabilities and ELLs to participate in class with increased autonomy and more as their peers do. Cooperative learning pairs students or places them into small groups to accomplish a shared goal. This can be an advantageous strategy for the ELLs because the value of interaction with peers and verbal models provided cannot be underestimated. Cooperative learning develops academic knowledge, communication, and social language skills in a social setting. (For steps in cooperative grouping, see Fradd & Klingner, 1995; Leverett & Diefendorf, 1992). Classwide peer tutoring is a specific type of peer-mediated strategy that involves all students working together, taking turns tutoring one another in pairs

on a class-wide basis. Students alternate tutor-tutee roles, practice targeted skills following scripted lessons, monitor each other's performance, and provide reinforcement for correct responses with points (Greenwood, Delquadri, & Carta, 1997). These grouping formations have been shown to increase academic engagement and social interaction of children with and without disabilities (Harrower & Dunlap, 2001; Vaughn, Hughes, Moody, & Elbaum, 2001).

Specific behavioral strategies. The school context may be foreign to the second language learner, particularly if the student is a recently arrived immigrant. The unwritten rules for social interaction in the school context, classroom survival skills, and other norms expected in the mainstream may need to be formally taught to diverse students and those with disabilities. Social skill instruction, self-monitoring techniques, role playing, and other forms of guided practice in classroom behavior expectations and survival strategies are recommended for these students.

Social skill development is critical for academic and interpersonal success of second language learners with special needs. Research has supported the effectiveness of implementing social skills series ranging from *skill streaming* (McGinnis & Goldstein, 2003) to the teaching of classroom survival skills (e.g., listening, cooperating in a group, contributing to discussions) to second language learners with disabilities. Teachers provide a rationale for learning the social skill, review major steps of the target skill using a "think aloud" method, model the acting out of the social skill steps, and provide students with frequent practice of the skill in both role-play and authentic scenarios. Researchers have demonstrated that students provided with formal instruction in these social skill and classroom survival areas improve confidence in school interactions, have materials needed for class, ask more questions, demonstrate attentive listening, work more cooperatively with others, reduce acting out behaviors, and spend more time on task (Baca & Cervantes, 2004; Hart, 2002).

Other forms of instruction may assist in orienting diverse students to the U.S. school and classroom. Videotapes of U.S. school rules, procedures, and expectations build awareness of appropriate academic behavior and expectations, reduce culture shock, and develop familiarity with interaction patterns (Baca & Cervantes, 2004). Moreover, TPR may be used to assist students in understanding classroom rules and procedures. For example, teachers can model raising their hands while pointing to the rule "Raise your hand to speak." Students can participate in role-playing activities to demonstrate appropriate behaviors. Last, students can be exposed to critical environmental language around the school in the form of school signs (e.g., offices, counselors, bathroom, clinic) through walking tours conducted by teachers at the beginning of the school year (Fradd & Klingner,

1995). For more information, Appendix C outlines useful Web sites for educators and families that target diverse students with special needs.

Conclusion

U.S. schools are becoming increasingly diverse. One of the primary educational dilemmas facing educators in the United States is the need for effective instruction for all children, including those who come from diverse backgrounds and who may contend with learning and behavioral disabilities. Second language learners with learning difficulties and disabilities constitute a substantial population requiring specialized programs and strategies. It is critical for all educators to arm themselves with research-based assessment procedures and instructional techniques to enable these students to reach their maximum learning potential, thereby facilitating their success in school and beyond.

AUTHOR NOTE

Juliet E. Hart is an assistant professor in the School of Education at the University of Kansas. Her research interests are linguistic and multicultural issues in special education, emotional and behavioral disorders, and instructional strategies for students at risk and those who struggle to learn in inclusive settings.

REFERENCES

- Abedi, J. (2002). Standardized achievement tests and English language learners: Psychometric issues. *Educational Assessment*, 8, 231–257.
- Arreaga-Mayer, C., Utley, C. A., Perdomo-Rivera, C., & Greenwood, C. R. (2003). Ecobehavioral assessment of instructional contexts in bilingual special education programs for English language learners at risk for developmental disabilities. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 18(1), 28–40.
- Artiles, A. J., Rueda, R., Salazar, J. J., & Higuera, I. (2005). Within-group diversity in minority disproportionate representation: English language learners in urban school districts. *Exceptional Children*, 71, 283–300.
- Artiles, A. J., & Trent, S. C. (1994). Overrepresentation of minority students in special education: A continuing debate. *Journal of Special Education*, 27, 410–437.
- Artiles, A. J., Trent, S. C., & Palmer, J. (2004). Culturally diverse students in special education: Legacies and prospects. In J. A. Banks & C. A. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook on research on multicultural education* (pp. 716–735). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Asher, J. (2000). *Learning another language through actions: The complete teacher's guidebook* (6th ed.). Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks.
- Baca, L. M., & Cervantes, H. T. (Eds.). (2004). *The bilingual special education interface*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Brice, A. (2000). Code switching and code mixing in the ESL classroom: A study of pragmatic and syntactic features. *Journal of the Speech Pathology Association of Australia*, 20(1), 19–28.
- Brice, A., Mastin, M., & Perkins, C. (1997). English, Spanish, and code switching use in the ESL classroom: An ethnographic study. *Journal of Children's Communication Development*, 19(2), 11–20.
- Brice, A., & Perkins, C. (1997). What is required for transition from the ESL classroom to the general education classroom? A case study of two classrooms. *Journal of Children's Communication Development*, 19(1), 13–22.
- Brice, A., & Roseberry-McKibbin, C. (2001). Anticipating differences—celebrating strengths: Providing culturally competent services for students with serious emotional disturbance. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 32(3), 30–37.
- Carrasquillo, A. L. (1991). *Hispanic children and youth in the United States: A resource guide*. New York: Garland.
- Clarke, M. A. (1980). The short circuit hypothesis of ESL teaching—Or when language competence interferes with reading performance. *Modern Language Journal*, 64, 203–209.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Conroy, P. (1999). Total physical response: An instructional strategy for second-language learners who are visually impaired. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 93, 315–318.
- Denham, K., & Lobeck, A. (2005). *Language in the schools: Integrating linguistic knowledge into K–12 teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Donovan, S., & Cross, C. (2002). *Minority students in special and gifted education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Dorr, R. E. (2006). Something old is new again: Revisiting language experience. *Reading Teacher*, 60(2), 138–146.
- Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, 34 C.F.R. § 300 (1975).
- Ferri, B. A., & Connor, D. J. (2005). In the shadow of Brown: Special education and overrepresentation of students of color. *Remedial and Special Education*, 26, 93–100.
- Foil, C. R., & Alber, S. R. (2002). Fun and effective ways to build your students' vocabulary. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 37(3), 131–139.
- Fradd, S. H. (1997). *Language differences of learning disabilities? Identifying and meeting the needs of students from non-English language backgrounds* (Tech. Rep. No. 025081). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 416 685)
- Fradd, S. H., & Klingner, J. K. (1995). *Classroom inclusion strategies for students learning English*. Tuscon, AZ: Psychological Corporation.
- Fradd, S. H., & McGee, P. L. (1994). *Instructional assessment: An integrative approach to evaluating student performance*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fueyo, V. (1997). Below the tip of the iceberg: Teaching language minority students. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 30, 61–65.
- Garcia, S. B., & Ortiz, A. A. (2006). Preventing disproportionate representation: Culturally and linguistically responsive pre-referral interventions. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 38(4), 64–68.
- Gersten, R. (1999). The changing face of bilingual education. *Educational Leadership*, 56(7), 41–45.
- Greenwood, C. R., Delquadri, J., & Carta, J. (1997). *Together we can! Class wide peer tutoring to improve basic academic skills*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.
- Harrower, J. K., & Dunlap, G. (2001). Including children with autism in general education classrooms. *Behavior Modification*, 25, 762–784.
- Hart, J. E. (2002). Social skill development for exceptional second language learners. *Sunshine State TESOL Journal*, 1(1), 43–52.

- Klingner, J. K., & Artiles, A. J. (2003). When should bilingual students be in special education? *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 66–71.
- Klingner, J. K., Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E., Harry, B., Zion, S., Tate, W., et al. (2005). Addressing the disproportionate representation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education through culturally responsive educational systems. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(38). Retrieved June 24, 2007, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa.v13n38>
- Klingner, J. K., & Harry, B. (2006). The special education referral and decision-making process for English language learners: Child study team meetings and placement conferences. *Teachers College Record*, 108, 2247–2281.
- Klingner, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (1996). Reciprocal teaching of reading comprehension strategies for students with learning disabilities who are learning English as a second language. *Elementary School Journal*, 96, 275–293.
- Larry P. et al. v. Wilson Riley et al., C-71-2270 RFP (D. Northern California 1979).
- Lee, J. (2002). Racial and ethnic achievement gap trends: Reversing the progress towards equity. *Educational Researcher*, 31, 3–12.
- Lee, J. F. (1986). Background knowledge and L2 reading. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 350–354.
- Leverett, R. G., & Diefendorf, A. O. (1992). Students with language deficiencies. *Teaching Exceptional Children* 24(4), 30–35.
- Macias, R. F. (1998). *Summary report of the states' limited English proficient students and available educational programs and services, 1996–1997*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Macswan, J., & Rolstad, K. (2006). How language proficiency tests mislead us about ability: Implications for English language learner placement in special education. *Teachers College Record*, 108, 2304–2328.
- McGinnis, E., & Goldstein, A. P. (2003). *Skillstreaming the elementary school child: New strategies and perspectives for teaching prosocial skills*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Mehan, H., Hubbard, L., & Villanueva, I. (1994). Forming academic identities: Accommodation without assimilation among involuntary minorities. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 25, 91–117.
- Moustafa, M. (1987). Comprehensible input PLUS the Language Experience Approach: A long-term perspective. *Reading Teacher*, 41, 276–286.
- Obi, S. O., Obiakor, F. E., & Algozzine, B. (1999). *Empowering culturally diverse exceptional learners in the 21st century: Imperatives for U.S. educators* (Tech. Rep. No. 307730). Frankfort: Kentucky State University, Division of Educational and Human Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 439 551)
- Ovando, C. J., Collier, V. P., & Combs, M. C. (2006). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Palinscar, A. S., & Herrenkohl, L. R. (2002). Designing collaborative learning contexts. *Theory Into Practice*, 41, 26–32.
- Perez, S. A. (2000). Teaching second language learners in the regular classroom. *Reading Improvement*, 37, 45–48.
- Richard-Amato, P. A. (2003). *Making it happen: Interaction in the second language classroom*. White Plains, NY: Pearson.
- Rodriguez, R. F. (1998). *Project BESTT: Bilingual/ESL special education teacher training* (Tech. Rep. No. 309046). Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 462819)
- Roseberry-McKibbin, C. (1995). *Multicultural students with special language needs*. Oceanside, CA: Academic Communication Associates.
- Roseberry-McKibbin, C. (1997). Understanding Filipino families: A foundation for effective service delivery. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 6(3), 5–14.
- Rosenshine, B., & Meister, C. (1994). Reciprocal teaching: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 64, 479–530.
- Rueda, R. (1997). Changing the context of assessment: The move to portfolios and authentic assessment. In A. J. Artiles & G. Zamora-Duran (Eds.) *Reducing the disproportionate representation of culturally diverse students in special and gifted education* (pp. 7–25). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Salend, S. J. (2001). *Creating inclusive classrooms: Effective and reflective practices* (4th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Salend, S. J., & Salinas, A. (2003). Language differences or learning difficulties: The work of the multidisciplinary team. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 35(4), 36–43.
- Schoen, S. F., & Schoen, A. A. (2003). Action research in the classroom: Assisting a linguistically different learner with special needs. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 35(3), 16–21.
- Smith, D. D. (2003). *Introduction to special education: Teaching in an age of opportunity* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2003). *Key indicators of Hispanic student achievement: National goals and benchmarks for the next decade*. Washington, DC: Author. Available from <http://www.ed.gov/pub/hispanicindicators>
- Van Allen, R., & Allen, C. (1967). *Language experience activities*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Vaughn, S., Bos, C. S., & Schumm, J. S. (2007). *Teaching exceptional, diverse, and at-risk students in the general education classroom*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T., Moody, S. W., & Elbaum, B. (2001). Instructional grouping for reading for students with LD: Implications for practice. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 36(3), 131–137.
- Werner, G. A., Vismara, L. A., Koegel, R. L., & Koegel, L. K. (2006). Play dates, social interactions, and friendships. In R. L. Koegel & L. K. Koegel (Eds.), *Pivotal response treatments for autism: Communication, social, and academic development* (pp. 199–216). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Wyatt, T. (1998). Children's language development. In C. M. Seymour & E. H. Noyer (Eds.), *Introduction to communication disorders: A multicultural approach* (pp. 59–86). Newton, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

APPENDIX A
Summary of Performance-Based Assessment for English Language Learners

Assessment/measure	Description and purpose
Portfolios	Exemplary illustrations of individual or group work collected over time and from many different sources, such as homework samples, pages from student journals, quizzes, projects, class notes, and audio or video tapes. May also contain the teacher's observations and student self-evaluations.
Self-reports/inventories	Written or oral reports of problem-solving experiences requiring students to reflect on performance and self-reports of accomplishments, preferences, and limitations.
Student-completed checklists	Task-focused checklists that enable students to record, monitor, and report progress in accomplishing learning goals. Checklists may consist of pictorial and written items.
Structured interviews	Two types: (a) specific questions embedded at critical points in a task so that students must reflect on and respond about what they have done, what they are doing, and what they plan to do; and (b) general questions structured to encourage students to reflect on overall performance and to gain insight into their accomplishments, attitudes, and capabilities.
Hands-on performance-based tasks	Require students to complete a task or demonstrate a skill. Performance measurement can include the process of task completion and the final product.
Observations	Specific focused examination of task performance. Objective documentation of events and contexts in which events occurred. Accomplished through the use of checklists during specified time segments.
Rating scales/performance checklists	Used to document demonstrated skills in a variety of areas (e.g., language development, listening, speaking). May be used to informally see the types of profiles that emerge for students and how they change longitudinally. (See self-assessment reading assessment checklist example adapted from P. A. Richard-Amato, 2003.)

APPENDIX B
Self-Assessment Reading Checklist (Adapted from P. A. Richard-Amato, 2003)

Name of student _____ Date _____

Check the box that best tells how often you do the things below.

When I read, I . . . *Usually* *Sometimes* *Not very often* *Comment*

Understand what the author is saying.				
Understand most of the details.				
Understand the vocabulary.				
Read without stopping a lot.				
Guess the meaning of a word by looking at the words around it.				
Connect what I read to my own life.				
Connect what I read to what I already know.				
Ask for help when I need it.				

After I read, I . . . *Usually* *Sometimes* *Not very often* *Comment*

Am able to tell someone else about what I've read.				
Feel comfortable discussing the reading with others.				
Feel comfortable writing about what I've read.				

My strengths appear to be:

Areas where I can improve:

APPENDIX C
ESL and Bilingual Education Internet Resources

Site name	Address	Description
Beach Center on Families and Disability	http://www.beachcenter.org	Conducts research and training to enhance empowerment of families and disseminates information to families and the public on disabilities. Provides national network of parent-to-parent support programs.
Bilingual Special Education Resources Network	http://www.vesid.nysed.gov/lsn/bilingual/home.html	Provides staff development, technical assistance, and tuition assistance for teachers working with disabilities who speak a language other than English in Pre-K through Grade 12.
Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students	http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/index.html	Aims to include various elements of school reform in programs designed to assist the language minority agenda.
National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition	http://www.ncela.gwu.edu	Funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Bilingual and Minority Language Affairs to collect, analyze, and disseminate information related to the effective education of linguistically and culturally diverse learners in the United States.
National Council on Disability	http://www.ncd.gov	Aims to promote policies, programs, practices, and procedures that guarantee equal opportunity for all individuals with disabilities and those from diverse cultural backgrounds.

PREVENTING SCHOOL FAILURE
EXECUTIVE EDITOR BIOGRAPHIES

William Evans received his master's and doctoral degrees from the University of Florida. He is a professor in the Department of Special Education at the University of West Florida in Pensacola. He has taught elementary, middle, and high school students, and has worked in clinical settings with children and their families. Dr. Evans has authored numerous articles and books on assessment, classroom management, and the use of data in instructional planning. He works with several policy development groups, and has served as an expert witness and consultant to school districts.

Robert A. Gable is the Constance F. and Colgate W. Darden Professor of special education at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, VA. He received his doctorate in special education from the George Peabody College at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, TN. He has been a classroom teacher and principal and has been on the faculty at Vanderbilt University and the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Gable has written extensively about differentiation of instruction, functional behavioral assessment, social-skills instruction, and professional collaboration. He is codirector of a nationally recognized distance-learning project, and he serves as a consultant to school division and states department of education throughout the United States and abroad.

Robert A. Gable is the Constance F. and Colgate W. Darden Professor of special education at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, VA. He received his doctorate in special education from the George Peabody College at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, TN. He has been a classroom teacher and principal and has been on the faculty at Vanderbilt University and the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Gable has written extensively about differentiation of instruction, functional behavioral assessment, social-skills instruction, and professional collaboration. He is codirector of a nationally recognized distance-learning project, and he serves as a consultant to school division and states department of education throughout the United States and abroad.

S E R V I C E S F R O M



heldref PUBLICATIONS

Advertising • Archives
Back Issues • Bulk Orders
Meeting Room Rental
Reprints • Sample Copies
Subscriber List Rental

HELDREF PUBLICATIONS
Subscription Office:
PO Box 830350,
Birmingham, AL 35283-0350
T: 866.802.7059
F: 205.995.1588
heldref@subscriptionoffice.com

Editorial Office:
1319 Eighteenth St., NW
Washington, DC 20036-1802
T: 800.365.9753
F: 202.296.5149
www.heldref.org



Preventing SCHOOL Failure

Alternative Education for Children and Youth

Guidelines for Authors

Preventing School Failure is a journal for educators and parents who seek strategies for promoting school success for children with learning and behavior problems. The journal welcomes articles that present programs and practices that help children with special educational needs. The newly expanded scope of PSF will provide a forum for the examination of emerging preempirical and evidence-based best practices in nontraditional education settings. As a rare source of information on quality alternative models, the journal is essential reading for educators, policymakers, researchers, and administrators and practitioners in environments such as charter, magnet, and residential schools; schools-without-walls; and educational centers.

We invite authors to submit manuscripts that contain information that is practical and has direct applicability with regard to this diverse population. We review manuscripts that contain critical and integrated literature reviews, objective program evaluations, evidence-based strategies and procedures, program descriptions, and policy-related content. As appropriate, manuscripts should contain enough detail that readers are able to put useful or innovative strategies or procedures into practice.

Preventing School Failure accepts author submissions only via Manuscript Central. Please submit separate files for figures and tables. To submit a manuscript to *Preventing School Failure*, visit <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/psf>. Manuscripts should be sent exclusively to *Preventing School Failure*. Cover letter should include the title of the article and names of the authors with their academic affiliations, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses. Also, the cover letter should state that the article is being submitted exclusively to *Preventing School Failure*. Each article should be submitted separately for a blind review.

All quotations and references to research results or scholarly findings must be cited in the text by the author–date system and as references at the end of the manuscript, according to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA; 5th ed., revised 2001). All manuscripts require an abstract and 3–4 keywords. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of their material. Tables, graphs, and figures need to be printed on separate sheets of paper. Manuscripts will be edited for clarity and readability, and changes may be made so that the text conforms to the journal's style.

Copyright of Preventing School Failure is the property of Heldref Publications and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.