



Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for English Learners

Julie Esparza Brown, Ed.D.
Linda Cavazos, Ph.D.
Letti Romero Grimaldo, Ph.D.



MTSS *for* ELS



Overview

- Overview of Model Demonstration Projects
- Evidence Based Practices
- Data Based Instructional Practices
- Effective Tiered Instruction
- Job-Embedded Professional Development for Enhancing Practice
- Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Practice
- Questions



Components of Model Demo Projects

Each project includes:

a framework that includes, at a minimum, universal screening, progress monitoring, and effective tiered instruction;

culturally responsive principles within each component of the framework;

scientifically-based interventions that meet the needs of ELs and ELSWDs;



Components of Model Demo Projects (cont.)

valid and reliable practices that ensure appropriate identification of ELs who may have learning difficulties or disabilities;

standardized measures of literacy outcomes when applicable, and teacher and systems outcomes, when appropriate;

measures of language proficiency in the child's first language and English;

measures of the model's social validity



OSEP Model Demo Projects

Project ELITE

<https://www.elitetexas.org/>



Project ELITE - H326M160005

Project ELLIPSES

<https://mtssclt.ning.com/>



OSEP GRANT NUMBERS
Project ELLIPSES - H326M160003

Project LEE

<http://projectlee.org/>





MTSS for ELs Website

<https://www.mtss4els.org/>

Multitiered Systems of Support for English Learners

Model Demonstration Research sponsored by the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education



In September of 2016, OSEP funded three projects focusing on tiered approaches to improving reading and language outcomes for English Learners (ELs). These projects are developing and implementing culturally and linguistically responsive models for multitiered systems of support for ELs, including those with or at risk of having a disability.

Features of these models include:

- Appropriate research-based reading instruction and intervention for ELs
- Culturally responsive teaching strategies and principles
- Professional development and strategic coaching for teachers
- Linguistically aligned progress monitoring and screening measures
- Data-based educational decision making

Model Demonstration Grantees

Watch for updates

Evidence Based Practices





Evidence Based Practices

An activity, strategy or intervention that demonstrates a statistically significant effect on improved student outcomes or other relevant outcomes based on either strong, moderate, or promising evidence from research studies.

Every Student Succeeds Act



What Works Clearinghouse

strong
evidence

at least 1 well designed and well-
implemented experimental study

moderate
evidence

at least 1 well designed and well-
implemented quasi-experimental study

promising
evidence

at least 1 well designed and well-
implemented correlational study with
statistical controls for selection bias



Evidence Based Practices for ELs

- Academic Instruction
 - Provide ELs the opportunity to develop academic oral language while simultaneously teaching literacy and other content areas
 - Teach vocabulary across content areas
 - Provide instruction and/or instructional support in the primary language as needed
 - Provide appropriate interventions for ELs who need support beyond Tier 1 instruction
 - Implement culturally responsive instruction

Richards-Tutor, Aceves, Reese, 2016



Evidence Based Practices for ELs

- Progress Monitoring
 - Implement purposeful and appropriate assessment practices taking into account ELs' primary language, English-language proficiency, and ongoing linguistic and academic progress
 - Utilize curriculum-based measurement to determine risk and monitor progress across tiers with ELs as part of a school site or district's comprehensive MTSS model
 - Employ an ecological approach when evaluating ELs' possible learning difficulties and to develop appropriate and culturally responsive supports

Richards-Tutor et al., 2016



Academic Content and Literacy for ELs

Intensive academic vocabulary instruction

Oral and written English instruction in content-areas

Structured opportunities to develop writing skills

Small-group interventions in literacy and English



Foundational Reading Skills

- Academic language skills (inferential and narrative language, and vocabulary knowledge)
- Awareness of segments of sounds in speech and letters
- Decode words, analyze word parts, and write words
- Read connected text daily for accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

Foorman et al., 2016



Supporting the Needs of ELs

- Explicit instruction
- Differentiated instruction
- Frequent opportunities to use language
- Structured academic discussions
- Student-centered instruction
- Accountable talk
- Paraphrase student responses
- Model correct responses
- Sentence stems and frames, graphic organizers, etc.

Data Based Decision Making



MTSS *for* ELS



Key Components of Data Based Decision Making for ELs - Screening

All students:

- receive universal screening
- are assessed with tools for literacy that match the language(s) of instruction

EL Students:

- language assessment data are collected and used for instructional planning in literacy
- if possible, tools for literacy assess students' native language literacy skills (regardless of whether the language is taught in the school)

Source: CLR - Response to Intervention within MTSS: Fidelity of Implementation Rubric (nd)



Key Components of Data Based Decision Making for ELs – Progress Monitoring

For all students:

- Progress monitoring tools include sufficient alternate forms, specify acceptable growth, are valid and reliable for the population
- tools are available in all languages of instruction

For EL students:

- Progress is compared to “true peer” cohort as well as benchmarks (Brown & Doolittle, 2008; Brown & Sanford, 2011)

Source: CLR - Response to Intervention within MTSS: Fidelity of Implementation Rubric (nd)



Key Components of Data Based Decision Making for ELs

For all students:

- decision making is data-driven and based on validated methods
- teams include a broad base of stakeholders
- decision rules are operationalized and clearly established
- a data system is used and easily accessible

For EL students:

- the team must include EL specialist in all team meetings
- data are collected and analyzed by different groups (e.g., language, race, SES)

Source: CLR - Response to Intervention within MTSS: Fidelity of Implementation Rubric (nd)



Data Meetings

Tier 3:
Individual Problem Solving Meetings
FEW STUDENTS


Every 8-12 weeks

Tier 2/3:
20% Meetings
SOME STUDENTS

@ every 8 weeks

Tier 1:
100% Meetings
ALL STUDENTS

How is it working?



3 times/year

*2 times month
(PLCs/SATs)*




20% Meetings

The Problem Solving Process

How is it working?

What is the problem?



What are we going to **do** about the problem?

Why is the problem occurring?



Example: Data-Based Instructional Planning

Project LEE: School A – Teaming Structure


3 times a year	*100% meetings	EBIS team	*Analyze grade level trends in reading - *identify foundational skill focus *Identify instructional agreements * implementation plan	differentiated supports
Quarterly	* 20% Meetings	EBIS team	*How to analyze data *problem solve for intensive student by focusing on ICE	differentiated supports



Example: Data Based Decision Making

Understand your student groups – big picture

Project LEE – School A



Continual Improvement Plan Academic Focus

Data Review → Academic Emphasis → Goals → High Leverage Actions → PD/Action/Evidence Plan

Academic Area of Emphasis/Problem of Practice

After a thorough review of school *perception, implementation and outcome* data/evidence, the academic area of emphasis and our Problem of Practice is specific to **Reading** with a more in-depth focus on :

1. **A healthy core (80% on benchmark, Accuracy and Composite) across grade levels**
2. **Explicit instruction routines used daily with fidelity, with a focus on Vocabulary.**



English-only and TWI Fall ORF and FLO

Two TWI and English-only classes per grade level

3rd Grade English-only


	Fall Benchmarking		Current Benchmarking		*Goal for next Benchmarking:	
	All	ELL	All	ELL	All	Hispanic
% At or Above Benchmark	58%	36%				
% Below Benchmarks	16%	18%				
% Well Below Benchmark	26%	45%				

All students

Composite

	Goal	Average	Intensive	Strategic	Core
Fall	220	224	15	9	33

Composite = accuracy, fluency, DAZE (district does not collect retell so they use an average replacement score)



3rd Grade TWI

70:30

3rd grade English (TWI)

ORF	Previous Benchmarking	
	All	Hispanic
% At or Above Benchmark	45%	37%
% Below Benchmarks	10%	8%
% Well Below Benchmark	45%	55%

3rd Grade Spanish TWI

	Previous Benchmarking	
	FLO	
	All	Hispanic
% At or Above Benchmark	51%	56%
% Below Benchmarks	13%	13%
% Well Below Benchmark	36%	31%



100% Meetings – Snapshot of Fifth Grade TWI

Spanish screening data

English screening data

SPEID	ELL	Span. level	First Name	Last Name	Fall DIBELS CWPM	Spring Growth Goal CV Total +CWPM Needed Overall	November CV
	X				22	58.3	29.7
	X				36	72.3	43.7
	X				40	76.3	47.7
X	X				43	79.3	50.7
	X				56	92.3	63.7
	X				58	94.3	65.7
	X				66	102.3	73.7
	E				66	102.3	73.7
					70	106.3	77.7
					73	109.3	80.7
					76	112.3	83.7
	X				78	114.3	85.7
					81	117.3	88.7
	X				82	118.3	89.7
					82	118.3	89.7



100% Meetings – Snapshot of Fifth Grade TWI

SPED or EL Status

Growth rates based on district norms

SPED	ELL	Span. level	First Name	Last Name	Fall DIBELS C	M. Exp .or ambitious	Spring Growth Goal C\ Total +CWPM Needed Overall	November C\
	X		A			2 amb. 1.1	58.3 36.3	29.7
	X		B			6 amb. 1.1	72.3 36.3	43.7
	X		C			0 amb. 1.1	76.3 36.3	47.7
X	X		D			3 amb. 1.1	79.3 36.3	50.7
	X		E			6 amb. 1.1	92.3 36.3	63.7
	X		F			8 amb. 1.1	94.3 36.3	65.7
	X		G			6 amb. 1.1	102.3 36.3	73.7
	E		H			6 amb. 1.1	102.3 36.3	73.7
			I			0 amb. 1.1	106.3 36.3	77.7
			J			3 amb. 1.1	109.3 36.3	80.7
			K			6 amb. 1.1	112.3 36.3	83.7
	X		L			8 amb. 1.1	114.3 36.3	85.7
			M			11 amb. 1.1	117.3 36.3	88.7
	X		N			2 amb. 1.1	118.3 36.3	89.7
			O			2 amb. 1.1	118.3 36.3	89.7



100% Meetings – Snapshot of Fifth Grade TWI

Spring Growth

Additional PM of low benchmark

SPEID	ELL	Span. level	First Name	Last Name	Fall DIBELS CWPM	Exp .or ambitious	Spring Growth Goal CV To	CWPM Needed Over	November CV
	X		A		22	amb. 1.1	58.3	36.3	29.7
	X		B		36	amb. 1.1	72.3	36.3	43.7
	X		C		40	amb. 1.1	76.3	36.3	47.7
X	X		D		43	amb. 1.1	79.3	36.3	50.7
	X		E		56	amb. 1.1	92.3	36.3	63.7
	X		F		58	amb. 1.1	94.3	36.3	65.7
	X		G		66	amb. 1.1	102.3	36.3	73.7
	E		H		66	amb. 1.1	102.3	36.3	73.7
			I		70	amb. 1.1	106.3	36.3	77.7
			J		73	amb. 1.1	109.3	36.3	80.7
			K		76	amb. 1.1	112.3	36.3	83.7
	X		L		78	amb. 1.1	114.3	36.3	85.7
			M		81	amb. 1.1	117.3	36.3	88.7
	X		N		82	amb. 1.1	118.3	36.3	89.7
			O		82	amb. 1.1	118.3	36.3	89.7




What did the data tell us about....

- Core instruction in English
- Core instruction in Spanish
- Next steps?

We (usually) don't blame the fish!

Focus on “the water”-

- Instruction
- Curriculum
- Environment




Effective Tiered Instruction





Culturally and Linguistically Responsive RTI Model





Tier 1 Characteristics

Focus	Instruction	Setting	Assessment
All students (including students with disabilities and learning differences)	District core curriculum and instructional practices that are research based and incorporate differentiated instruction	General education classroom	Screening, continuous progress monitoring for some students, and outcome measures or summative assessments

Center on Response to Intervention, 2012



What is Tier 1: Core Instruction for ELs?

High-quality, scientifically based instruction, differentiated to meet the needs of all students who are screened on a periodic basis to identify struggling learners who need additional support

Includes daily linguistic accommodations and language support in English and native language, if possible



Tier 2: Supplemental Instruction

Focus	Instruction	Setting	Assessment
Students identified through screening, and verified with others assessments, as at risk (not meeting grade level cut-score)	Targeted, supplemental instruction delivered to small groups in addition to Tier 1	General education classroom or other general education location within the school	Progress monitoring, diagnostic

Center on Response to Intervention, 2012



What is Tier 2: Supplemental Instruction for ELs?

Evidence-based intervention(s), including programs and/or practices, of moderate intensity that address the learning challenges of most at-risk students

Includes daily linguistic accommodations and language support in English and native language, if possible

Center on Response to Intervention, 2012



Tier 3: Intensive Intervention

Focus	Instruction	Setting	Assessment
Students who have not adequately responded to core- and supplemental instruction (Tier 2)	Intensive intervention (Tier 3) delivered to small groups (two or three students) or individually by highly skilled specialists	Intervention classroom, other general education location within the school	Progress monitoring and diagnostic assessments (e.g. running records, skilled based math tests)

Center on Response to Intervention, 2012



What is Intensive Intervention for ELs?

Intensive intervention is designed to address severe and persistent learning difficulties.

Intensive interventions should be:

1. Driven by data
2. Characterized by increased intensity (e.g., smaller group, expanded time) and individualization of academic instructional supports
3. Proven effective for ELs

Includes daily linguistic accommodations and language support in English and native language, if possible

Job-Embedded Professional Development for Enhancing Practice





Essential Features of JEPD for Teachers of ELs

Develop a partnership with an instructional leader in the schools who works closely with teachers of ELs to build capacity through PD.

Create opportunities for teachers of ELs to provide input in the dissemination of the PD plan to build relationships and establish buy-in.

Engage in various PD activities (e.g., classroom observations, feedback sessions, team teaching, coaching, peer observation, self-videoing with self-reflection).

Provide opportunities for discussion around refining EL best instructional practices and establishing next steps.




JEPD for Enhancing Practice

Ongoing job-embedded support that is responsive to educator needs that includes:

- PD with modeling
- Coaching
- Classroom observations
- Demonstrations as needed
- Virtual support
- Data and planning meetings
- Mini-workshops (virtual- mini lessons on strategy, mini videos for anytime learning; *i.e. making connections, inferencing*)



JEPD Recursive Cycle: One Example



Promotion of teacher-leadership within grade-level teams

Building on teachers' instructional strengths to enhance literacy instruction for ELs

Additional Features of JEPD

High-quality educator tools and resources: clear, user-friendly, and engaging

Framework for "anytime" educator support: video models; web-based tools and trainings



Critical Attributes for Successful JEPD


- Leadership is key.
- Capitalize on existing structures.
- Take an iterative approach to implementation.
- Plan collaborative JEPD to support sustainability such as the following:
 - Implementation, team teaching, and coaching
 - Self-observation and peer observation
 - Sharing of findings
 - Planning of next steps
- Foster self-reflection.
- Build capacity by supporting teacher leadership.

Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Practice





Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Model





CLRP Instruction

Teachers know their students well and establish strong relationships with them and their families.

Teachers have high expectations of all students, providing them with needed supports to reach their potential.

Teachers use linguistic scaffolds to ensure access to rigorous curricula and instruction.

Curricula and instruction validate literacy practices and funds of knowledge from students' homes and communities.



CLRP Data-Based Decision Making

- Strengths-based data analysis
- Shift the unit of analysis toward *Instruction*
- Build and apply knowledge of language proficiency
 - TELPAS/WIDA
 - Language Proficiency
- Students' educational history:
 - Review of educational opportunity in L1 and L2
 - Language and literacy trajectories

STEP 1: Team reviews student data and identifies overall trends.

PROCEDURE

- Identify students' performance relative to established benchmarks
- Cross-analyze literacy data with language proficiency data (i.e., TELPAS data).
- Consider data from hearing and vision tests, and schedule if gaps exist.

DISCUSSION PROMPTS

- "Let's analyze how our students are doing on [benchmark skill]."
- "What are our students' strengths? What areas of need do the data show?"
- "How many ELs do I have in my class? What are their proficiency levels for each language domain?"
- "Is there a disproportionate number of ELs identified as being at risk?"



CLRP Professional Development





CLRT RTI Fidelity Rubric

Data-Based Decision Making

Data-based decision-making processes are used to inform instruction, movement within the multilevel system, and disability identification (in accordance with state law).

Measures	1	3	5
Decision- Making Process	<p>The mechanism for making decisions about the participation of students in the instruction/ intervention levels meets no more than one of the following criteria: The process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) is data driven and based on validated methods; (2) involves a broad base of stakeholders; and (3) is operationalized with clear, established decision rules (e.g., movement between levels or tiers, determination of appropriate instruction or interventions). 	<p>The mechanism for making decisions about the participation of students in the instruction/intervention levels meets two of the following criteria: The process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) is data driven and based on validated methods; (2) involves a broad base of stakeholders; and (3) is operationalized with clear, established decision rules (e.g., movement between levels or tiers, determination of appropriate instruction or interventions). 	<p>The mechanism for making decisions about the participation of students in the instruction/intervention levels meets all of the following criteria: The process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) is data driven and based on validated methods; (2) involves a broad base of stakeholders; and (3) is operationalized with clear, established decision rules (e.g., movement between levels or tiers, determination of appropriate instruction or interventions).
	<i>Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Decision-Making Process</i>		
	Data are not collected or analyzed by different student groups (e.g., by language, race, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or other relevant groups).	Data may be collected , but are not regularly analyzed by different student groups (e.g., by language, race, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or other relevant groups).	Data are collected and analyzed by different groups (e.g., by language, race, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or other relevant groups).



CLRT RTI Fidelity Rubric

<i>Intensive Intervention—Individualized with a focus on the academic needs of students with disabilities and those significantly below grade level (Tier III)</i>			
Data-Based Interventions Adapted Based on Student Need	Intensive interventions are <u>not more intensive</u> (e.g., no increase in duration or frequency, change in interventionist, change in group size, or change in intervention) than secondary interventions.	Intensive interventions are <u>more intensive</u> than secondary interventions based only on preset methods to increase intensity (e.g., sole reliance on increased duration or frequency, change in interventionist, decreased group size, or change in intervention program).	Intensive interventions are <u>more intensive</u> than secondary interventions <u>and</u> are <u>adapted to address individual student needs</u> in a number of ways (e.g., increased duration or frequency, change in interventionist, decreased group size, change in instructional delivery, and change in type of intervention) through an iterative manner based on student data.
	<i>Cultural and linguistic match of intervention to students</i>		
	The intervention <u>does not align with</u> students' linguistic, cultural, and instructional needs.	The intervention <u>inconsistently aligns</u> with students' linguistic, cultural, and instructional needs.	The intervention <u>consistently aligns</u> with students' linguistic, cultural, and instructional needs.

QUESTIONS

