Fall 2019

The Roles of School-Based Language Specialists: Implications for ELL Teacher and Speech-Language Pathologist Collaboration

Erica R. Solorio

THE ROLES OF SCHOOL-BASED LANGUAGE SPECIALISTS: IMPLICATIONS

FOR ELL TEACHER AND SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST

COLLABORATION

By

Erica R. Solorio

A capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching.

Hamline University

Saint Paul, Minnesota

September 2019

Primary Advisor: Michelle Benegas
Secondary Advisor: Sara George
Peer Reviewer: Leah Soderlund

To my capstone committee, a sincere thank you for your time and patience as you all guided me through the process of completing my capstone. I am grateful to work with such gracious, intelligent women who are strong advocates for ELLs in Minnesota. To my parents Randy and Tammy, thank you for your encouragement, support, and love as I worked through my first few years of teaching which inspired me to complete my capstone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Background of the Researcher

As an undergraduate Latinx student in California, I was drawn away from my initial major in Chemistry by the field of Linguistics. I was fascinated by the study of the complexities in the English language as well as other languages spoken around the world. I loved learning about syntax, phonology, phonetics, and my most favorite topic of all was sociolinguistics. My specific focus within Linguistics was Teaching English as a Second Language, so my intention was to teach English to adults just like my mother. I found that I appreciated learning about languages and cultures. Through the exploration of world languages and cultures, I gained an understanding of the world around me and established my role as a global citizen. My path to becoming an educator took a turn when my family and I moved to Minnesota. I finally decided to pursue a K-12 English as a Second Language license at a local midwestern university, and I was employed shortly thereafter.

I immediately took to the responsibilities of establishing positive working relationships with my co-workers and advocating for the needs of the English Language Learners (ELLs) we both taught. Generally, I was never made to feel as if my role as an ELL teacher was insignificant or ineffective. Any time I questioned a certain practice I was careful to ask "Can you explain why we do that?" and I always got a thorough response that I would generally agree with because I knew that I lacked experience as an educator and still needed to grow professionally. I consider myself to be a thoughtful

person, but I was curious and always wanted to learn more in order to improve myself personally and professionally.

I can recall an interesting remark made by my colleague two years ago, who is a Speech Language Pathologist (SLP), during our lunch break for a day-long professional development meeting. "I don't know why they always reference ELL teachers as the only language experts, we're language experts too!" Her frustration was apparent in the tone of her voice and body language. Meanwhile, I was feeling rather nonchalant about the comment when I responded with "Yes, that's true." SLPs are also language experts in public schools because they have extensive training in "language development, the phonological system, vocabulary, sentence structure, and comprehension" (Powell, 2018, p. 142). Her comment is etched in my memory. I found myself revisiting her words when another situation arose that would elicit my equally passionate and frustrated response.

Last year, there was an ELL in Kindergarten who spoke Mandarin Chinese as her primary language. She had an Oral Language Composite level of 3 (Developing) according to the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards (WIDA, 2016). This student, who I will refer to as Mei, was also an enthusiastic learner and enjoyed coming to school. Mei would mix up her gendered pronouns and often used the wrong verb tense. I attributed this due to interference from her first language. Chinese does not have gendered pronouns and verbs have a single tense. I did not have any concerns, because I knew that she would eventually grasp these concepts with my help.

I was surprised when I saw the aforementioned student pulled out of the class by the SLP and she was given an articulation screener. When I inquired about the matter

with the classroom teacher, she told me that it was difficult to understand Mei and she didn't sound like the other student in our class who also spoke Mandarin Chinese, so she consulted with the language expert, our school's SLP. I was frustrated with the general education teacher because 1) I had been co-teaching with her for the past three years and had established a good working relationship and 2) I was also a language expert in regards to the second language acquisition process for ELLs.

I found myself even more incensed when I found out that the screener used was norm-referenced for monolingual speakers of English and based on the stages of phoneme acquisition for monolingual English speakers. The SLP told me she was concerned about the student's missing sounds. I explained that Mei spoke a language that did not necessarily share the same phonemes as English. I worked to provide additional research on the different phonetic systems of Mandarin Chinese and American English. I also suggested that we would need to include a bilingual interpreter or consult someone who was an expert in the language in order to determine if there was a concern. Otherwise, Mei would acquire these sounds over time and there was no reason to be alarmed. When I explained the situation to the classroom teacher, she said: "Well, I found a concern and she's with me all day long, so this needs to be taken care of before it gets worse." My fellow ELL teachers agreed with my approach and concerns, but I felt as if my role as a teacher of ELLs was diminished. I was not being taken seriously despite my knowledge and the research I had to support it. The situation ended with a tense conversation. By the end of the school year, Mei had acquired those missing sounds.

Since then, I have found myself questioning my role as a teacher of ELLs. I wondered about students who had qualified to receive Speech Language and ELL services. Other situations arose where we found incoming Kindergarteners qualified as Developmentally Delayed and in need of Speech Language services. When we inquired whether an interpreter was used as a part of the assessment process, no one could give me or my ELL colleagues a concrete answer or we were told that an interpreter wasn't used. We found ourselves concerned by this revelation and the educational outcomes for our multilingual students because they need to receive services that are appropriate for their specific language needs (Zacarian, 2011),

These past experiences have led me to my current area of focus in my research. I found that I wanted to learn more about the assessment process for culturally and linguistically diverse students. Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education (IDEA) Act (2006) places mandates on schools to ensure that the evaluation process for multilingual students must include multiple measures and these measures must not be must not be racially or culturally discriminatory and assessments used must be provided in the language best known by the child. I want to explore the preparation, practices, and perspectives of SLPs and ELL teachers who work with culturally and linguistically diverse students. There were clear mandates and procedures in place, but it seemed as if these were ignored in the situation involving Mei. Additionally, past research has only focused on SLP's level of comfort working with culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) populations and I also want to be able to gain additional insight from ELL teachers with similar questions.

It is apparent that both SLPs and ELL teachers are the language experts currently working with schools, so it is in their best interests to work together to ensure that the correct decisions are made in the screening and assessment process. Both of their areas of expertise deserve to be validated and considered, especially when it involves CLD students. It is my hope that my research will lead to implications that SLPs and ELL teachers need to build a strong collaborative relationship in order to provide language services to culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Rationale

The field of education is dynamic due to the ever-changing demographics of the society it seeks to serve. This change is especially apparent in schools in the United States. Children in school are becoming more culturally and linguistically diverse "through the increasing numbers of students learning English as an additional language in schools" (Kangas, 2018; National Center for Education Statistics, 2018). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2018), "the percentage of public-school students in the United States who were ELLs was higher in fall 2015 (9.5 percent, or 4.8 million students) than in fall 2000 (8.1 percent, or 3.8 million students)." With these rapid changes, it is up to schools and educators to rise to the occasion of meeting the complex academic and linguistic needs of these growing CLD populations.

Vast amounts of research are dedicated to the intersections of Special Education and English Language learners (ELLs) and this is most certainly a worthwhile area of study (Artiles, Rueda, Salazar and Higareda, 2005; Chu and Flores, 2011; Huang, Clarke, Milczarsky and Raby, 2011). This research has focused on the overrepresentation of ELLs, who are typically labeled as learning disabled, because their language differences

share many of the same characteristics as a student with a learning disability (Chu & Flores, 2011). Additionally, Huang et al. (2001) showed that assessments used to determine if ELLs qualify for Special Education are linguistically and culturally biased, which places ELLs at a disadvantage when taking them and may not be true representations of their skills. In order to prevent these instances of disproportionality, researchers suggest including multiple measures of assessment, providing professional development about students' strengths, needs, and cultural differences, and collaboration amongst all educational stakeholders, especially the ELL teacher, to ensure that a student is fairly assessed (Artiles et al., 2005; Chu & Flores, 2011; Huang et al., 2011).

However, other research demonstrates a growing area of concern within the field of Speech Language Pathology and how SLPs must be able to differentiate between language disorders and language differences and whether they have received the appropriate training to do so (Guiberson & Atkins, 2012; Kohnert et al., 2003; Kritikos, 2003; Levey & Sola, 2013; Paradis, 2005; Paradis, Schneider, & Sorenson, 2013; Prezas & Jo, 2017; Roseberry-McKibbin & O'Hanlon, 2005; Roseberry-McKibbin, Brice, & O'Hanlon, 2005). For second language learners, the process of language acquisition is complex. For instance, "differences in sentence structure, speech sound production, vocabulary, and the pragmatic uses of language are to be expected when a child learns a new language" and as a result, language differences are often interpreted as language disorders" (Roseberry-McKibbin, 2015). This is problematic because second language acquisition should not be seen as a disorder or impairment. Moreover, if an English language learner does have a language disorder, then will be manifest itself in all the languages spoken and not just in English alone.

The process of determining a language disorder in CLD students is complex. There are established procedures set in place that include avoiding the use of assessments norm-referenced to monolingual speakers of English, employing the help of a bilingual interpreter, and collaborating with a bilingual or ELL teacher (American Speech-Language Hearing Association, 2006; Paradis et al, 2011; Paradis et al, 2013). However, much of the past research doesn't elaborate on the role of the ELL teacher in this process and often references the assistance of bilingual teachers. Perhaps this is possibly due to the fact that many of the schools at the time of the research may not have had an ELL teacher available. Little did I know that these pervasive issues would begin to affect me personally as a teacher of ELLs. For the sake and rights of ELLs, it is necessary that more research is needed that focuses on the experiences of ELL teachers and SLPs and a collaborative relationship is pursued (Castañeda v. Pickard, 1981; Civil Rights Act of 1964; Equal Education Opportunities Act of 1974; Lau vs. Nichols, 1974). As a result, this notable gap in the literature has led to my current research questions:

1. *What do ELL teachers focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?*
2. *What do SLPs focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?*

Summary

In this chapter, I discussed my background and experiences as an ELL teacher who recently dealt with the conundrum of determining whether an ELL had a speech-language disorder which led to my current research focus. I also provided additional

rationale for my paper in regards to past research conducted in relation to this topic. In

Chapter 2, I will examine the current literature and research that has been conducted in

relation to this topic. Chapter 3 summarizes the research paradigm that was used in this

study, which includes rationale for the methods selected as well as the ethical processes

followed prior to collecting the data. Chapter 4 presents the results of my survey as well

as the results from the follow-up interview that was used to gain additional insight into

the perspectives of SLPs and ELL teachers. In Chapter 5, I will reflect upon my research

and discuss the limitations, implications and recommendations to be taken into

consideration for future studies.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Introduction

The research questions for this study are:

1. *What do ELL teachers focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?*

2. *What do SLPs focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?*

The goal of this literature review is to identify a foundation of research that will assist in explaining the various factors that are related to answering these questions. The first section of this literature review primarily focuses on explaining the correct terminology to use when referring to individuals and the language learning process, and the legal definition of English Language learners (ELLs) in the state of Minnesota. The next section focuses on the second language acquisition (SLA) process and the diversity present within that process, as well as the language proficiency screeners used to determine whether a CLD student needs ELL services. In order to help build an understanding about the importance of differentiating between language differences and language disorders, the next section focuses on identifying the different types of speech-language disorders, previous research on speech-language disorders in CLD students, as well as instances of disproportionality. The third section discusses the role of the language professionals in public schools: ELL teachers and SLPs. This section will also elaborate on the challenges both language professionals face when attempting to work with the populations they serve. Finally, the last part of this chapter focuses on

researched-based practices for evaluating CLD students for language disorders, which includes suggestions about building a collaborative relationship between SLPs and ELL teachers.

Defining English Language Learners

There are various terms and acronyms that have been used to refer to culturally and linguistically diverse students and many of them exist because they reference a specific context. According to TESOL (2018), some of these terms may be English as a Second Language (ESL), English as an Additional Language (EAL), and English Language Learner (ELL). It is important to define and use the correct terminology because of the variety of contexts within language learning.

Research shows that *dual-language learners* is an appropriate term that can be used because it takes into account several variables that can affect language learning. (Paradis, Genesee and Crago, 2011; WIDA, 2018). Paradis et al. (2011), explains that dual-language learners differentiate from each other based on two factors: "1) whether they are members of a majority ethnolinguistic community or a minority ethnolinguistics community and 2) whether they have learned two languages simultaneously from infancy or have learned a second language after their first language was established" (p.5). A majority of the ethnolinguistic community is one where a majority of the members of the community share a common language and ethnic background, while a minority ethnolinguistic community is one that lives within the majority community, but members of that community share a common language and ethnic background. Membership for each community depends on the region where the individual lives, and it can affect their

attitude towards learning the language of the majority ethnolinguistic community or vice versa.

Dual-language learner can serve as the overarching term that includes the categories *simultaneous* and *sequential bilinguals* (Paradis et al., 2011 p.6). A child who has learned two languages simultaneously since birth and is given equal opportunities to develop and use both languages is referred to as a simultaneous bilingual. A child who has made "significant progress towards learning one language when they begin learning a second language" is called a second language learner or a sequential bilingual (Paradis et al., 2011, p.6). Using these terms correctly can be helpful when trying to determine the progress a child has made towards acquiring an additional language. More about the factors affecting SLA will be examined later.

Culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) is another term that is used that can be used to reference ELLs. CLD can also be used to refer to "students from homes and communities where English is not the primary language of communication" and who also "speak a variety of languages and come from diverse social, cultural, and economic backgrounds" (Gonzalez, Pagan, Wendell, and Love, 2011).

However, in the state of Minnesota, the terms ELL and ESL are used in state definitions and legislation instead of the term culturally and linguistically diverse and will be referenced as such when defined (English Learner Definitions, 2018). Otherwise, the acronym CLD will be used in the rest of the research. With this foundation in place, the following research will focus on defining ELLs in Minnesota and the screening assessments used to determine if they qualify for ELL services as well as the process of SLA.

Definition. In the state of Minnesota, an English language learner is defined as a

student in kindergarten through grade 12 who meets a specific set of criteria. These

criteria include:

a. the pupil, as declared by a parent or guardian first learned a language other than

English, comes from a home where the language usually spoken is other than

English, or usually speaks a language other than English; and

b. the pupil is determined by a valid assessment measuring the pupil's English

language proficiency and by developmentally appropriate measures, which might

include observations, teacher judgment, parent recommendations, or

developmentally appropriate assessment instruments, to lack the necessary

English skills to participate fully in academic classes taught in English. (English

Learner Definitions, 2018)

Additionally, the Learning English for Academic Proficiency and Success (LEAPS) Act

of 2014 revises the current Minnesota state statutes to include support for ELs who are

enrolled in pre-kindergarten (Minnesota Department of Education [MDE], 2018b)

ELLs in Minnesota are a diverse group of individuals with differing life experiences

ranging from the recently arrived immigrant, the student with interrupted formal

education, to the second-generation multilingual student (MDE, 2018a). Additionally,

Kohnert et al. (2003) refers to these differences through the use of the term *breadth of*

diversity which refers "to the range or scope of variation within a particular grouping

variable, such as language or culture" (p.259). Ultimately, it is necessary to keep this

definition of ELLs and the notion of breadth of diversity that exists within this group in

mind to fully account for their personal language experiences when comparing them to others within the same group who might or might not have a language disorder.

Second Language Acquisition

There is an abundance of research on the process of SLA and it is important to understand the characteristics of this process in order to understand why they shouldn't be qualified as a language disorder. SLA is the process by which an individual acquires an additional language after their first language has been established. Typically, the process of SLA goes through several stages, not to mention the amount of time it takes for an individual to progress through these stages depends on several factors. Tabors (2008) identifies four stages of early SLA. The first stage is "home language use." In this stage, the child insists on using their first language (L1) in the classroom, until they realize that other children don't speak the same language. In the second stage, "nonverbal period" the student barely produces any language in the second language (L2), although they are still developing their receptive vocabulary in the L2. This period can go on for several weeks to months. The third stage consists of "formulaic language use" in which the child is producing short, repetitive word sequences that have been memorized. In the final stage, the child has acquired enough language so they are able to produce sentences that go beyond the memorized word sequences. However, children in this stage will still make errors in pronunciation, word choice, and grammar (as cited in Paradis et al., 2011, p.111-112).

Achieving Native-like Proficiency. A major question that many educators and other professionals ask is how long does it take for a CLD students to acquire the language and achieve native-like proficiency? Often, educators may positively remark

about a CLD students' oral language skills because they "speak the language so well",

which can be deceiving (Paradis et al., 2011). In this case, the child may have developed

their Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS), but they need to continue to

develop their Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) (Cummins, 1979).

CALP is something that all students, multilingual and monolingual alike, develop

throughout their education. Typically, educators are concerned when a CLD student is

not making significant progress in their L2 acquisition. While research states that is will

typically take around 5-7 years to achieve L2 proficiency, there are still other important

factors to take into consideration (Cummins, 1979; Paradis et al., 2011).

Factors Affecting L2 Acquisition. There is also a breadth of diversity within the

process of L2 acquisition and it this process will vary for each child based on their

motivations, personality, age of language acquisition, and first language acquisition

(Kohnert et al., 2003). In terms of motivation and personality, a child who is highly

motivated to learn the language, especially if a majority of their peers speak English and

they are also moderately extroverted. On the other hand, if the child is shy and has no

desire to communicate with their peers, then L2 acquisition may take a longer amount of

time (Paradis et al., 2011). The age of a child is another factor to take into consideration

when the child begins the process of L2 acquisition. This factor presents equally

complex results that are dependent on the individual child. Research shows that middle

elementary school years are the best time for L2 acquisition because "older children's

more developed cognitive skills give them an advantage in learning strategies over

younger children" (Paradis et al., 2011). It is also important to gather information about

the child's first language development from birth up until they started school because it

will help educators and language professionals understand any issues that arise, so they can be attributed to language acquisition or a potential developmental delay (WIDA, 2013).

English Language Learner Screeners

In the United States, there are a variety of English language proficiency tests that can be used to determine if a child has the necessary English language skills to access and comprehend the grade-level content being taught in the general education classroom without English Language Development instruction or support. Minnesota State law also mandates that "developmentally appropriate assessment instruments" be used to determine the English language proficiency of a student.

Currently, the state of Minnesota is part of the WIDA consortium. The WIDA consortium is, "...made up of 39 U.S. states and territories dedicated to the research, design and implementation of a high-quality, culturally and linguistically appropriate system to support ELLs in K-12 context" (WIDA, 2018a). As a result, the Minnesota Department of Education has approved three English Language proficiency screeners: the WIDA screener, the Kindergarten W-APT, and the Kindergarten MODEL. Currently, in the district where the author works, only the WIDA screener and Kindergarten MODEL assessment are used and will be explained more thoroughly.

WIDA Screener. This assessment helps the ELL teacher determine whether a student will need ELL services. It assesses the English language skills of a student within the domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. This assessment is designed to be administered to students in grades 1 through 12 and is broken down into grade level clusters: 1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-12. After the student completes the assessment, a score is reported for each language domain and it also provides composite scores: Oral Language, Literacy, and Composite. In the state of Minnesota, a student qualifies for English Language services if they do not achieve an overall composite score of 4.5 with no language domains below a 4.0 (Minnesota Dept of Education, 2017; WIDA, 2018c).

Kindergarten Measure of Developing English Language. In the state of Minnesota, the Kindergarten Measure of Developing English Language (K-MODEL) assessment is given to students from age 4.5 through the first semester of grade 1 (Minnesota Dept of Education, 2017; WIDA, 2018b). This assessment measures the English Language proficiency skills of a student within the domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. This test is divided into two main sections: Narrative and Expository. Within each section, there are 3 parts and each part consists of 5 levels that correspond to the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards. A student does not qualify for English Language services if they achieve an overall composite score of 5.0 and all language domains must be equal to or greater than a 4.0.

*pre*LAS: **English Language Proficiency Assessment for Early Learners.** The preLAS is an English Language Proficiency Assessment given to students in Pre-Kindergarten and may be administered to children between the ages of 3 to 6. The assessment is scored on five performance levels ranging from 1 (non-English speaker] to

level 5 (fluent English speaker). It assesses oral language skills (expressive and

receptive) as well as pre-literacy skills in order to determine if the student will benefit

from additional language support in the classroom. The pre-literacy skills assessed

include letter, number, and color recognition, shapes, basic prepositional terms, reading

and writing 2-3 letter sight words, and writing their name (PreLas: The English Language

Proficiency Assessment for Early Learners, 2019).

Language Disorders

In order to have a better understanding of the differences between the process of

SLA and language disorders, it is essential to know what exactly constitutes a language

disorder (ASHA, 2006; ASHA, 2010; Gress and Hill, 2018). In the next section, the

research will focus on defining language disorders, the screening and assessment process

for determining a language disorder, language disorders in CLD students, as well as

instances of disproportionality.

Definition. The American Speech-Language and Hearing Association (1993)

defines a *language disorder* as the:

impairment comprehension and/or use of a spoken, written, and/or other symbol

system. The disorder may involve 1) the form of language (phonology,

morphology, syntax) 2) the content of language (semantics) and/or 3) the function

of language in communication (pragmatics) in any combination. (Communication

Disorders section, para B)

The form of language focuses on the sounds within words, the words themselves,

and the structure of sentences. The content is made up of the knowledge of vocabulary,

objects, and events. Language focuses on the goals or functions of the language and how

these goals are achieved and the rules used to participate in these conversation (Lahey, as cited in Paul, Norbury, & Gosse, 2006). Other researchers (Chapman, 1992; Miller, 1981; Miller & Paul, 1995) identify and define language disorders within broader terms as they contextualize the modalities of comprehension and production. Their interpretation of language disorders includes how the aforementioned modalities are affected, which also includes how the modalities are affected in regards to form, content, and use (as cited in Paul et al., 2006).

     Notably, the specific terms used to refer to language disorders have evolved over time as well. Some of these terms include "language disorder, language impairment, language delay, language deviance, congenital aphasia or dysphasia" (Paul et al., 2006, p.8). The use of the terms, such as language disorder, language impairment, language delay, language deviance congenital aphasia or dysphasia, is particularly controversial in that they insinuate that the problem is within the individual themselves, when there are many factors to take into consideration. For example, congenital aphasia and dysphasia are rarely used by SLPs because of their ties to neurological disorders. Much like the WIDA Can-Do Descriptors, Paul et al. (2006) aim to "move away from labeling individuals and focus on building a profile of strengths and needs," but note that the terms language impairment, language disorder, and language disability are synonymous and can be used interchangeably (p.10).

     The ASHA (2018a) further differentiates between language disorders that are not associated with the following: autism spectrum disorder (ASD), intellectual disabilities (ID), developmental disabilities (DD), attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD),

traumatic brain injury (TBI), psychological/emotional disorders, and hearing loss. A language disorder can either be spoken or written, any time a language disorder that is not a result of the aforementioned conditions, it is called a specific language impairment.

Screening and Assessing for Language Disorders. According to the ASHA (2018b), before proceeding with the assessment process, screening must be completed if it is suspected that a child has a language disorder. The screening process includes: collecting information about the child's language and skills in the languages they speak from parents and teachers and, "...administering formal screening assessments that have normative data and/or cutoff scores and demonstrated evidence of adequate sensitivity and specificity" (ASHA, 2018b). If the screening indicates that a more comprehensive assessment is needed, ASHA recommends that the, "...assessment of language skills should be culturally relevant and functional and involve the collaborative efforts of families/caregivers, classroom teachers, SLPs, special educators, and other professionals as needed" (ASHA, 2018b).

Test of Narrative Language: Second Edition. This assessment is a way to measure a child's ability to understand and tell stories. It also helps differentiate between a language disorder that is language-productive based or productive-receptive based. It is important to assess narration because it is the "one form of discourse that provides clues about a child's ability to integrate knowledge across all language domain simultaneously" (Gillam and Pearson, 2017). This test is used for children between the ages of 4 years and 14 years and 11 months and it assesses their ability to comprehend and tell three types of stories: scripts, personal narratives, and fictional narratives. The Test of Narrative Language: Second Edition (TNL-2) is a form of dynamic assessment as the

adult provides a narrative model of the story that the child listens to and answer comprehension questions (Gilliam & Pearson, 2017).   Afterwards, the child produces a similar narrative of their own. The administrator of the assessment scores the students based on coherence, complexity, temporal and causal conjunctions, grammatical accuracy and character dialogue.

   Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals-5. This assessment was "designed to assess a student's language and communication skills in a variety of contexts, determine the presence of a language disorder, describe the nature of the language disorder and plan for intervention or treatment" (LEADERS Project, 2014). The CELF-5 consists of 18 subtests (see Appendix A) that are divided into 4 levels that examine language content, structure, and use. Level One measures language ability, determines if there is a language disorder, and the appropriateness of the service provided. Level Two describes the language disorder itself more thoroughly in regards to receptive and expressive language. Level Three measures the "phonological awareness, automaticity of speech, naming skills, and working memory" and Level 4 elaborates on how the "language disorder may be affecting classroom performance through completion of the Observational Rating Scale and a pragmatic profile" (Paslawski, 2005, p. 129-30).

Speech Sound Disorders

   According to ASHA (2019a) speech sound disorders is a term used to refer to "any difficulty or combination of difficulties with perception, motor production, or phonological representation of speech sounds and speech segments" and it is divided into two different categories; organic speech sound disorders and functional speech sound disorders. Organic speech sound disorders are due to motor/neurological disorders,

structural abnormalities such as cleft palate, and also hearing impairment (ASHA, 2019a). Functional speech sound disorders consist of either articulation disorders or phonological disorders. Articulation involves errors in producing speech sounds while phonological disorders "focus on predictable rule-based errors that affect more than one sound" (ASHA, 2019a, Functional Sound Disorders Section).

      Screening and Assessing for Speech Sound Disorders. Screening and assessing for Speech Sound disorders is a complex process similar to the one used for language disorders. AHSA (2019b) also highlights that the SLP must select assessments that are culturally and linguistically sensitive and that they must take into account the cultural and linguistic speech differences across languages. This includes an awareness of the phonetic and phonological differences in languages and dialects as well as "differences among speech sound disorders, accents, dialects, and patterns of transfer from one language to another." (ASHA, 2019b, Comprehensive Assessment Section).

Language Disorders in Dual-Language Learners

      One important task that SLPs must face is how to differentiate between a language difference and language disorder. According to Pieretti and Roseberry-McKibbin (2015), "language differences are commonly observed among second-language learners. Differences in sentence structure, speech sound production, vocabulary, and the pragmatic uses of language are to be expected when a child learns a new language" (p.118). This is why the process for determining a language disorder in CLD students is complex and challenging. Paradis (2005) mentions that it is often difficult to differentiate between "errors" that are a part of the SLA process or are in fact, a language disorder. In fact, past research has noted that language differences are often

mistaken for language disorders (Paradis, 2005; Paradis, Schneider, & Sorenson, 2013; Prezas & Jo, 2017).

However, it should be known that if a CLD student has a language disorder, then that disorder will be present in both languages. (Prezas & Jo, 2017). Paradis et al. (2011) expand upon this concept in their own research. The researchers mention that they prefer to use the term dual-language learners in order to discuss both simultaneous bilinguals and second language learners (who are also called sequential bilinguals) who have speech language disorders. When analyzing a group of 7-year-old French-English bilingual children in Montreal, they found that these children showed "equivalent levels of morphosyntactic proficiency and profiles" in comparison to their monolingual peers who also had speech language disorders (p.204). Other researchers compared the errors made between Spanish-English bilingual children with language disorders and their monolingual peers with language disorders. They also found that the errors made were very similar between both groups of children.

Another concern regarding CLD children is whether language delays and impairments present in the L1 of the child will manifest in the L2 currently being acquired (Paradis et al., 2011, p.206). The research conducted by Paradis (2008, 2010a, 2010b) and Rothweiler, Chilla, & Clahsen (2009) revealed that these delays in the L1 manifested themselves in the L2, but as the children resolved the delays in their L1, this transferred over to the L2 as more of that language was acquired. Furthermore, these studies proved that the development of English in a child with a speech language disorder was the same, regardless if it was the child's L1 or L2 (p.206).

The research about CLD students with language disorders has focused on bilingual Spanish-speakers. In fact, Paradis et al. (2013) also made this observation and noted that this limits the scope of research conducted by others since CLD students in Canada and the United States come from a variety of language backgrounds (p.978). Their study looked at whether they could differentiate between CLD students with language impairment (LI) and their typically developing CLD students' peers by comparing student performance on English standardized tests and using the information obtained about first language acquisition from a parent questionnaire (p.972). The results found that it could be possible to distinguish CLD students with LI among CLD students with diverse language backgrounds using the aforementioned measures. (p. 979).

Other research about CLD students with language disorders have focused on providing guidelines for SLPs to follow when proceeding through the evaluation process in order to ensure that CLD students are not misidentified as having a language disorder. Additionally, Prezas & Jo (2017) point out that CLD students are either over or under-identified for speech and language services. According to the National Education Association, this is known as "disproportionality" (p.6).

Over-identification. CLD students are often mistaken for having a language disorder because of their limited language abilities when they are going through the SLA process (Paradis, 2005; Paradis et al., 2013; Prezas & Jo, 2017). These limited language skills can also transfer to academic performance and classroom teachers will have concerns about their ability to be successful learners. According to Levey & Sola (2013) "stereotypes result from a lack of awareness of language differences and can affect our ideas or beliefs about speakers of different dialects" (as cited in Delpit,

2002). Furthermore, if a SLP lacks the training or experience working with linguistically and culturally diverse children, then they could negatively affect the results of any qualifying language assessments that are given to these children.

   Under-identification. Conversely, there is also the possibility of ignoring signs of a language disorder in a CLD student because they are acquiring an additional language. Prezas & Jo (2017) state that if a CLD student has a language disorder, then their language skills will be low in both languages (as cited in Prezas, 2015). Additionally, Paradis et al. (2013) also mention the negative implications of waiting until CLD students possess proficient English oral language skills in order to provide the appropriate service to CLD students who might have a language or learning difficulties (p.971).

   Cheng (2007) describes how precautions must be taken when determining whether an individual is going through the normal process of SLA or if there is in fact, a language disorder. (p.36). This process will help prevent the student from missing out on the necessary services for their language needs. According to Cheng (2007), our general lack of information about the "cultural, linguistic, and social imperatives of our diverse populations makes us very vulnerable and incapable of detecting potential speech and language disorders," as a result, we will be unable to provide the appropriate interventions for a student (p.36).

Language Professionals in Schools

   The research demonstrates that ELL teachers and SLPs are both language experts in schools; each with their specific areas of expertise developed through methodical training that provides them with the necessary skills to work with students who are in

need of their services (AHSA, 2016; Harper & DeJong, 2009; MINN. Stat. 148.515, 2018; Prezas & Jo, 2017; Teachers of English as a Second Language [TESL], 2017). However, both face some challenges in serving CLD students within different capacities.

English Language Learner Teachers. The Minnesota Professional Educator and Licensing and Standards Board (MN PELSB) refers to ELL teachers as Teachers of English as a Second Language, but for this research they will be referred to as ELL teachers (MN PELSB, 2018). In the state of Minnesota, an ELL teacher is an individual who is authorized to provide English language instruction to students from Kindergarten to grade 12 (TESL, 2017). These students have demonstrated that their English language proficiency is not sufficient so that they are able to comprehend the content being taught in the mainstream general education classroom (TESL, 2017).

The ELL teacher is responsible for screening multilingual children in order to determine whether they qualify for ELL services. They must also "understand the fundamentals of the first and SLA processes and their similarities and differences" (TESL, 2017). Furthermore, ELL teachers serve as a bridge for CLD students and their families by helping them navigate the differences between their home culture and the culture of the school.

As for instruction in the classroom, ELL teachers not only help CLD students learn English but they also help them by scaffolding the language used in the classroom in specific content areas. According to Genesee & Harper (2010) "planning and providing instruction on the basis of ESOL students' existing cultural experiences and competencies provides a solid foundation for extending their skills and knowledge in new

directions" (p. 13). ELL teachers are also aware of the difficulties of that state

standardized tests present for CLD students, since these tests are normed based on the

majority culture (Kohnert, Kennedy, Glaze, Kan and Carney, 2003). Until 2002, there

were not any specific standards for ELL teacher preparation. According to Harper and

deJong (2009), the standards for ELL teacher education programs were developed by the

professional organizations Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)

and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). This was a

significant contribution that helped legitimize the role of the ELL teacher because it

acknowledged the "distinct professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions of ELL

educators of grade-level DLLs" (Harper & DeJong, 2009, p. 139). Recent research

shows that some ELL teachers feel that their role as an ELL teacher has been diminished

in some capacity (Harper & DeJong, 2009).

   Diffusion and devaluation of ELL teacher expertise. Research by Harper &

deJong (2009), chronicled the complex journey of the role of the ELL teacher when they

examined "external (legislative and policy) pressures and internal (professional and

curricular) developments within the field of ESL that have subsumed the teaching of

ELLs with general education" which in turn diffused and devalued the role of the ELL

teacher (p.138). In general, they found that legislative policy, such as No Child Left

Behind (NCLB) brought attention to the specific needs of CLD students and sought out to

improve academic achievement for these students, but this was done by bringing about an

increased focus on reading skills and strategies and as a result, many CLD students were

placed in remedial reading classes, which were not designed to meet their needs (Harper

& deJong, 2009).

In fact, it appeared that there has been a continuous disturbing trend of implementing universal solution mentality towards addressing the academic needs of CLD students in which ELL teachers found themselves being relegated to reading teachers and their skills and expertise were reduced down to simplistic approaches that were termed "best practices" (Harper & deJong, 2009). The study, which was based in Florida, also found that ELL teachers were generally disappointed because they had to focus only on reading skills instead of addressing integrated language skills within the content and professional development around working with CLD students had to be simplified to focus on "behaviors and actions rather than ideas and attitudes" (Harper & deJong, 2009, p.143). According to Harper & deJong, 2009, some teachers felt as if the academic and linguistic needs of CLD students were not taken into full consideration, especially when they were designated as "best practices." The teachers felt that this view does not provide CLD students with the high-quality education they deserve because pre-service and current teachers only learn about their surface level needs (Harper & deJong, 2009, p.143). Instead, it was proposed that ELL teachers must be able to use their expertise and skills and be a part of "mainstream educational discourse" in order to provide an effective education for CLD students.

Speech-Language Pathologists. In order to receive an ASHA Certificate of Clinical Competence in Speech-Language Pathology, these professionals must have at least a Master's, doctoral, or other post-baccalaureate degree and this is also true for the state of Minnesota (AHSA, 2016; MINN. Stat. 148.515, 2018). SLPs are specialists who are trained to diagnose and identify children when there is a concern about their language

use (Prezas & Jo, 2017). In order to address these concerns, SLPs must complete a process of observation, identification, assessment, and treatment of children.

Additionally, SLPs can also help assist with concerns related to voice, fluency, and swallowing (American Speech-Language-Hearing, 2010, as cited in Prezas & Jo, 2017). They also have an extensive training in "language development, the phonological system, vocabulary, sentence structure, and comprehension" which makes them valuable assets in any public school as they, like ELL teachers, are also language experts (Powell, 2018). Equally important is the fact that SLPs must also provide culturally and linguistically appropriate services and consider the breadth of diversity within their potential caseloads when investigating potential speech and language disorders (ASHA, 2016, p.5; Kohnert et al., 2003).

Level of comfort working with culturally and linguistically diverse students. The level of comfort working with a linguistic and culturally diverse students varies based on the experiences of the SLP. Previous studies have shown that a majority of SLPs in the United States are white and this demographic hasn't shifted for several years (Guiberson & Atkins, 2012 Kohnert et al., 2003; Kritikos, 2003).

Consequently, another factor that must be taken into consideration is that the level of cultural and linguistic diversity varies around the United States and has changed rapidly over time, which may coincide with the type of professional studies or development provided to SLPs. Kohnert et al. (2003) highlighted the state of Minnesota as an example of this dramatic shift in demographics due to immigration (p.260). Prior to 1990, Minnesota was a relatively homogenous state and their survey results indicated that the lack of cultural diversity training for SLPs was a result of this previous homogeneity

and training programs also did not offer any courses related to working with CLD
students (p.262).

Research following the 1990's has shown that there has been a shift in SLPs level
of comfort working with CLD students. In examining the results of their survey, Kohnert
et al. (2003) found that SLPs realized that there was a complex diversity within the
languages spoken by different cultures and that "information related to serving culturally
and linguistically diverse populations should be required for all future professionals
(p.265).

Conversely, a 2012 survey by Guiberson & Atkins, examined the diversity
training and professional perspectives of 154 SLPs in Colorado and they noticed that
there was a shift in their result in comparison to a survey administered in 1996. This
survey found that 72% of the respondents indicated that they had "received specialized
training in providing services to individuals with diverse cultural and linguistic
backgrounds" and 67% of them had taken coursework that discussed the topics of SLA
and language difference vs. language disorder. (p. 172). Respondents also indicated that
while they had received training about these topics, they still weren't comfortable
working with linguistically diverse populations and preferred to collaborate with
professionals who were experts in bilingualism.

Moreover, Levey & Sola (2013) found that even though a course in bilingualism
is typically required for all pre-service Speech-language pathologists, only 77% of the
participants in their survey had taken a bilingual course to help them better understand
CLD populations. This revelation highlights the importance of ensuring that pre-service
courses on bilingualism, SLA, and distinguishing between language differences and

language disorders "so that students are better prepared to provide evidence-based assessment" (p.12).

In summary, research has shown that changes have been made regarding the course work and training required for SLPs so they have a better understanding of how to work with CLD populations. However, SLPs still feel "more confident when collaborating with colleagues who had developed additional expertise in cultural and linguistic diversity" (Kohnert et al, 2003, p.265). ELL teachers have received training about how to work with CLD populations. Their educational experience requires that they comprehend the process of SLA, differentiating and understanding cultural norms, and communicating with multilingual families. They are the experts in understanding the breadth of diversity within linguistic and cultural groups (Kohnert et al, 2003, p.259). Previous research only highlights the importance of developing a collaborative relationship between SLPs and ELL teachers.

Research-Based Practices for Evaluating CLD students with Potential Language & Speech Disorders

Research has stressed the importance of ensuring that appropriate procedures are followed before determining whether a CLD student has a speech-language disorder. (Guiberson & Atkins, 2012; Kohnert et al., 2003; Kritikos, 2003; Levey & Sola, 2013; Paradis, 2005; Paradis et al.,2013; Prezas & Jo, 2017; Roseberry-McKibbin & O'Hanlon, 2005; Roseberry-McKibbin, Brice, & O'Hanlon, 2005). Some of this research only focused on these implications within the context of bilingual speakers. Within the context of this study, these research-based practices will mainly focus on CLD students. Without the necessary training and knowledge regarding differentiating between

language disorders and language differences, a CLD student may be misidentified as having a disorder. On the other hand, a CLD student, might not receive the speech-language services they need because of the assumption that their language needs are language differences. However, there is research and federal legislation that supports implications for best practice when determining whether a CLD student has a language disorder in order to provide them with the appropriate language services based on their needs.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is a federal law that requires schools to serve the needs of students who may have disabilities. While English language learning is not a disability, the initial iteration of this law contributed to CLD students being misidentified as having a disability such as emotional-behavior disorder or speech-language disorder because the assessments that were used were culturally and linguistically biased against these individuals (Zacarian, 2011, as cited in Colorin Colorado, 2011).

However, the Part B amendment for IDEA was passed in December 2004 and this took into consideration the needs of CLD children. Foremost, the evaluation process must use a variety of measures to determine if a student qualifies for Special Education (SPED) services. Additionally, the multiple measures must not be racially or culturally discriminatory and assessments used must be provided in the language best known by the child. Furthermore, this amendment also clearly states that a child cannot be referred for SPED services because of limited English language proficiency (IDEA Part B, 2006, as cited in American Speech Language-Hearing Association [ASHA], 2006).

This federal law highlights the importance of following appropriate evaluation measures for CLD children when determining if they have a language disorder. (ASHA, n.d.). According to Levey & Sola (2013) SLPs need to understand that language and dialect variations of CLD students should not be seen as deficits. Otherwise, SLPs run the risk of violating these legal mandates if they do not use appropriate interventions for culturally and linguistically children (Roseberry-McKibbin, 1995, as cited in Levey & Sola, 2013).

Assessment of CLD students. Children in school are becoming more culturally and linguistically diverse "through the increasing numbers of students learning English as an additional language in schools" (Kangas, 2018; National Center for Education Statistics, 2018). Many of these children are now bilingual or multilingual. Research has shown that these factors prove challenging for SLPs who need to provide assessment and intervention for these children who also have language disorders (Grech and Dodd, 2007, p.85). There are also additional challenges presented in regards to overidentification and under identification of language and learning disabilities.

One significant problem presented in research shows that the language tests used have been norm-referenced to monolingual children, which is not an equitable practice when one takes into consideration that not all CLD students have the same language learning experience. It has been suggested that these tests should be translated in multiple languages, but considering the large number of languages spoken by CLD students, this would be an insurmountable task to achieve (Paradis et al., 2011; Grech & Dodd, 2007).

Additional issues with language testing have shown that the tasks within the test itself may also be culturally-biased. Each individual has different life experiences and some of them might not encounter different topics that are discussed on the assessment.   Another factor to be considered is the child-adult relationship is not the same in every culture. For example, the expectations might be that a child remains silent in the presence of adults and the adults might not typically engage in "question and answer" routines with their children (Paradis et al., 2011, p.216). If a child has not had exposure to the culturally-specific content or question style in that test, then their performance is not an accurate representation of what they can do.

A potential solution to this dilemma is using authentic language samples from both of the languages that the child speaks. If the SLP does not speak the child's primary home language, then they could request the assistance of a proficient interpreter, who in turn could help determine if there are any errors made in the other language. Additional information can be gathered through the use of an extensive parent questionnaire about the language experiences of their child (Paradis et al., 2011; Paradis et al., 2013; Paradis, Emmerzael, and Sorenson Duncan, 2010).

For example, Paradis et al., (2010) analyzed whether a parent questionnaire (The Alberta Language and Development Questionnaire) could help differentiate between CLD students with typical development and those with language disorders. This questionnaire consisted of four sections: early milestones, current first language abilities, behavior patterns, and activity preferences. It was found that this questionnaire was helpful in discriminating between the 2 groups. However, it is also helpful to include specific questions about language exposure because the length of time learning a

language, quality and quantity of input influence children's acquisition rates" (Paradis et al., 2011, p.219). As a result of the breadth of diversity that exists within the language experiences of each CLD student, it is critical that multiple measures and additional sources of information are used when assessing students so as not to misinterpret their use of the English language as disordered (Kohnert et al., 2003).

  Response to Intervention. Within the context of potential speech and language disorders in CLD students, an important question that SLPs and ELL teachers often ask is how long they need to wait before proceeding with the process of determining if a student has a disorder. Of course, research and federal mandates state that specific steps, which includes gathering meaningful and varied data, need to be taken before proceeding with the assessment process. It is crucial that general education teachers, SLPs, and ELL teachers work together in order to ensure that a CLD student is receiving the appropriate services that will help them be successful learners. One way to alleviate any instances disproportionality for CLD students is through the use of the Response to Intervention (RTI) framework. RTI is a multi-tier approach to provide early detection and support for children who may present academic and behavioral struggles in the classroom (RTI Action Network, n.d.). Many schools have adopted this framework because it allows teachers to gather meaningful data about their students and provide interventions for students that are specially targeted to help alleviate their struggles.

  Cramer believes (as cited in Johnson, Harrison, Tuttle, and Shell, 2018) the framework is also seen as a measure that will help "promote more equitable outcomes by providing evidence-based, data-driven strategies for assessment, screening, and progress

monitoring for struggling students." Buffman, Mattos, Weber, and DuFour (2008) defines RTI systems as follows:

> RTI systems are characterized by 1) instruction and programs matched to student needs often in tiers of instruction that differ in frequency and tendency, and 2) frequent progress monitoring to examine student progress and to inform teachers' adjustments to instructional plans. (p.28)

In this process, the students receive higher levels of support, or interventions as they progress through higher tiers. If the student is not making adequate progress with intensive and targeted interventions, then with the data collected, stakeholders can begin a more formal evaluation process for referral to SPED services. However, RTI models can vary depending on the schools but there are two main forms that these programs take on: the protocol system and the problem-solving system (Buffum et al., 2008). In the protocol system "students qualify for existing intervention programs according to pre-established criteria and the nature of the deficiency" and there is focused training for teachers in regards to the established interventions to ensure validity and fidelity when implementing the specific interventions. (Buffum et al., 2008, p.29). In contrast, the problem-solving system "utilizes staff members' input to identify highly individualized student plans" and is less rigid than the protocol system in the sense that it goes beyond the pre-established criteria in order to determine the student's specific learning needs (Buffman et al., 2008, p.29). It is also suggested that RTI models implement a combination of both systems that best serve the needs of the school and the students (Buffman et al., 2008, p.29).

All instruction should also be enhanced to help the CLD students be successful. Service can be provided by general education teachers, SPED teachers, ELL Teachers, and other specialists and all should be present during the decision-making process. Interestingly enough, some research has only referred to the inclusion of the SLP when talking about the language needs of CLD students (Prezas & Jo, 2017; Roseberry-McKibbin & O'Hanlon, 2005). ELL teachers also need to be a part of these important conversations because they are the professionals who have been trained to talk about the specific language and academic needs of CLD students. This includes second language development and effective ELL teaching strategies (Guiberson & Atkins, 2012, p.171).

The RTI framework helps teachers make data-based decisions that students are receiving the appropriate services for their current needs, which is beneficial for CLD students who are often labeled "at-risk" because they do not have the necessary English language proficiency to access the content of the classroom. However, ELL service is not an intervention. It is a right because it "provides access to core instruction" (George and Kulinski, 2018). This only emphasizes the importance of including the ELL teacher during any conversations about CLD students that are focused on their academic and language needs.

Using Home Language Interpreters. It is our responsibility as schools and educators to ensure that a home language interpreter is provided for the multilingual families who are a part of our school community. This mandate is a part of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which states:

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national

origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

This part of the law has been interpreted to include parents with limited English language proficiency (LEP.gov, n.d.). Within the context of this research, such a parent would need to have an interpreter present during a parent-teacher conference and also during meetings about the evaluation process for SPED or Speech-Language Services. This responsibility was further emphasized when President Bill Clinton signed Executive Order No. 13,166 (2000) which mandates federal agencies to review the services they provide and establish a means of providing necessary communication to individuals with limited English proficiency.

Despite the fact that home language interpreters are a federal right for all parents with limited English proficiency, whether they are actually used depends on various factors. SLPs already face the enormous challenge of working with a growing CLD student population. As a result, many of them aren't proficient in the primary language spoken by the student so they are unable to communicate directly with families nor are they able to administer bilingual assessments (Kritikos, 2003; Levey & Sola, 2013). Additionally, with the growing number of languages spoken in the United States, it is very likely that educators will encounter a language that they do not understand (Kritikos, 2003). While there is currently a lack of bilingual SLPs, being a bilingual doesn't always indicate that the professional is culturally competent, especially when one takes into consideration the breadth of diversity present within languages and cultures (Kohnert et al., 2003; Levey & Sola, 2013; Roseberry-McKibbin et al., 2005).

Other studies have shown that SLPs don't always use a home language interpreter when discussing potential speech-language disorders with parents who have limited English language proficiency. While the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (2006) recommends that SLPs should employ the use of an interpreter when making referrals or evaluating CLD students. Nevertheless, not all SLPs use an interpreter for assessments. Guiberson and Atkins (2012) found that 60% of the 154 respondents used an interpreter, but only 25% of them felt competent to assess a child's language development with the help of an interpreter (p.173). It is vital for SLPs to follow research-based practices when gathering information about a CLD student who might have a language disorder (Guiberson & Atkins, 2012; Kohnert et al., 2003; Kritikos, 2003; Levey & Sola, 2013; Paradis, 2005; Paradis et al., 2013; Prezas & Jo, 2017; Roseberry-McKibbin & O'Hanlon, 2005; Roseberry-McKibbin et al., 2005). One way they can do this is by employing the use of a home language interpreter in order to obtain more information about the student's language use.

Collaborative Relationships between SLPs and ELL teachers

If a CLD student qualifies for both ELL and Speech-Language services, it is important that the student receive services from both the SLPs and ELL teachers in order to help them develop their language skills. One of the most important and beneficial ways for these language professionals is through collaboration. According to Cook and Friend, (as cited in Dove and Honigsfeld, 2010) collaboration "is a style of interaction between at least two coequal parties voluntarily engaged in decision making as they work toward a common goal" (p.5.)

Previous studies exploring the intersections of CLD students with learning disabilities have found that often ELL teachers and SPED teachers fall into the *specialization trap* (Kangas, 2017a, as cited in Kangas, 2018). This trap is exemplified by the attitude that each educational professional is solely responsible for the specific needs of the student that is based on their specialty, when in reality, both should be working collaboratively to address the whole child.   It does not make sense for educators to work separately when their goal is to improve the educational outcomes for the child.

A survey by Kohnert et al., (2003) indicated that SLPs "felt confident when collaborating with colleagues who had developed additional expertise in cultural and linguistic diversity" (p.265). With this knowledge in mind, it would be beneficial for ELL teachers to work alongside SLPs, especially during the process of assessing a CLD for a speech-language disorder. This would serve the best interests of the student and the SLP, since the ELL teacher has an understanding of the variables in SLA, "such as shifts in language proficiency over time, language loss, language fossilization, cross-linguistic influences on language development, and other variables that have an impact on bilingual and ELL language development" (Guiberson & Atkins, 2010, p. 175). Conversely, the SLP has their own area of expertise that the ELL teacher might not be aware of and understand clearly. According to Kangas (2018) "...having all parties perspectives...promotes a broader understanding of students as individuals" (p.37). It helps provide more equitable procedures for assessment, fosters a stronger sense of working toward a common goal, and it encourages teachers to extend their repertoire by reflecting and improving their own practice.

Research and federal legislation have demonstrated implications for best practice when determining whether a CLD student has a language disorder in order to provide them with the appropriate language services that they need (Civil Rights Act of 1964; Executive Order No. 13,166; Guiberson & Atkins, 2012; IDEA, 2006; Kohnert et al., 2003; Kritikos, 2003; Levey & Sola, 2013; Paradis, 2005; Paradis et al., 2013; Prezas & Jo, 2017; Roseberry-McKibbin & O'Hanlon, 2005; Roseberry-McKibbin, Brice, & O'Hanlon, 2005). These research-based practices are an inherent part of the research questions:

> 1. *What do ELL teachers focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?*
>
> 2. *What do SLPs focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?*

because it must be determined what practices are actually being implemented in schools today.

Summary

The chapter established a foundation of research that assisted in creating an understanding of the various factors that are related to the topics within the research question of this study. This chapter defined and explained SLA and language disorders; both of which are extremely complex language processes and if not carefully examined on the behalf of CLD students, can lead to instances of disproportionality. Additionally, this chapter reviewed the research-based practices for evaluating CLD students for language disorders. As the research demonstrated, ELL teachers and SLPs play an important role in schools because of their specific areas of language expertise. So, it is

essential that they work together in order to build a collaborative relationship to help provide the appropriate services for the students they serve. The next chapter will describe the methodology of this study used in order to study the preparation, practices, and professional perspectives of SLPs and ELL teachers and how these factors affect their service of CLD students.

CHAPTER THREE

Methods

Introduction

This chapter discusses the focus of this study and how the process for carrying out this study will be conducted. Furthermore, the chapter includes the research methods that were chosen and the rationale behind the selection of those methods, the setting and participants of this study, the initial pilot study, and how the data was gathered and analyzed. Lastly, this chapter includes information about the IRB process and ethical considerations that were taken to protect the identities of the participants of this study. The research questions are:

1. *What do ELL teachers focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?*

2. *What do SLP teachers focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?*

Research Paradigm and Methods

A mixed methods case study design is the paradigm that was used for the research. Mixed methods are defined as "research in which the investigator collects and analyzes data, integrates the findings, and draws inferences using both qualitative and quantitative approaches or methods in a single study or a program of inquiry" (Tashakkori and Creswell, 2007, p.4). A mixed methods case study design is used to "generate cases based on both quantitative and qualitative results and their integration" and it typically uses one of the following core designs: convergent, explanatory, and exploratory (Creswell and Creswell, 2018, p.230). The core design that was used for this

methodology is convergent. Convergent mixed methods focus on combining the results of quantitative and qualitative data that will be gathered in order to thoroughly analyze the research problem. The rationale for employing this type of methodology is because it revealed additional understandings beyond the information found from quantitative or qualitative data in isolation (Creswell & Creswell, 2018, p.4). For the nature of the research, it was necessary to explore the preparation, practices, and perspectives of SLPs and ELL teachers who work with CLD students. The aforementioned factors were analyzed by quantitative methods, but this method is limited in that it would not provide the necessary in-depth perspectives from SLPs and ELL teachers and their personal experiences that could be obtained using qualitative methods.

Hammersley (1996) mentions that the methods used to obtain data can be classified based on three different processes used to interpret the data. One of these processes is the complementary interpretation is when "two different sets of data are employed to address different but complementary aspects of an investigation" (as cited in Brennan, 2004, p.314). This was in reference to how the quantitative and qualitative data can address the research question, but from a slightly different angle, which is why it was necessary to gather both types of data. As a result, this research used quantitative methods to gather information about the preparation, practices, and professional perspectives of SLPs and ELL teachers, and qualitative methods in order to gain more insight into the perspectives and personal experiences of the language professionals in schools.

Data Collection

Setting. The site for the interview was a school located in a third-tier suburb in a midwestern city. The school is a public elementary school that serves students from Kindergarten to 5th grade.   Based on the enrollment form upon which parents relf-reported their child's racial and ethnic identity, seventy percent of the students were reported as being White, 10% as being African-American or Black, 9% as being Asian, 6% as Hispanic/Latino, and 6% as two or more races. In terms of Special Populations, 14% of the students qualify for free and/or reduced lunch, 9% are English Language Learners, and 14% of the students qualify for Special Education services, which would include Speech/Language services. The Special Education population is significant in that there are three Communication Interaction Disorder (CID) classrooms. This program is designed for students with significant communication disorders, social skill needs and sensory processing needs. The school also has two classrooms dedicated to serving students with Developmental Cognitive Disabilities (DCD).

The following information was obtained from the Minnesota Report Card website (2018). During the 2017-18 school year, the school employed 50 teachers and licensed professionals. 71% of the teachers have Master's degrees and 23% only have a Bachelor's Degree. The school also contains an experienced teaching staff since 73% of the teachers have 10 or more years of teaching experience. Twenty-five percent have been teaching for 3-10 years and 3% have taught for fewer than 3 years. The racial and demographic profile of the teachers was not included on the Minnesota Report Card, but from personal observations at the school, all of the staff would identify as White with the exception of two staff members who would identify as Hispanic/Latinx.

Participants. The initial voluntary questionnaire was web-based and sent out to SLPs and ELL teachers. The number of participants included 3 ELL teachers and 3 SLPs. Names of the participants were collected only if they were willing to participate in the follow-up interview, however the results and names of the participants were kept confidential. Afterwards, one SLP and one ELL teacher, both of whom had worked more than four years as a language professional, were selected to participate in the follow-up interview on a time and day of their choosing. The interview took approximately 30 minutes to complete. The responses, names and other identifying features of the interview participants were not used in the results.

Materials

Artifact Collection. The first source of qualitative data was obtained through artifact collection. The artifacts collected are publicly-available information about current graduate-level university program requirements to become a SLP or ELL Teacher in the state of Minnesota. University program requirements to become a SLP were obtained from the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities through the Department of Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences website while university program requirements in order to acquire a K-12 ESL licensure in the state of Minnesota were obtained from the Hamline University website.

Questionnaire. The quantitative data was collected through a questionnaire. A questionnaire is defined as "any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they react either by writing out their answers or selecting from existing answers" (Brown, 2001). Questionnaires can also be referred to

as "inventories, forms, and surveys" (Dornyei, 2003, p.5). For the purpose of this study, questionnaires will be the term used for this quantitative method of data collection.

According to Creswell & Creswell (2018) a questionnaire "provides a quantitative description of trends, attitudes, and opinions of populations, or tests for associations among variables of a population by studying a sample of that population" (p.147). Prior research referenced or used quantitative methods that collected information about SLPs' preparation, practices, and professional perspectives through a questionnaire (Guiberson & Atkins, 2012 Kohnert et al., 2003; Kritikos, 2003). This research focused on examining the SLPs' backgrounds, assessment practices, and level of confidence working with CLD students as well as what school-based language professionals focus on when working with CLD student.   However, it was noted that previous research did not include the perspective of ELL teachers, despite the fact that they can also provide language services for CLD students. As a result, the questionnaire was designed in order to include their perspectives.

 A questionnaire as a method of data collection is useful in that it can provide comparable information from the participants (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p.94). For the research, the compared experiences of SLPs and ELL teachers who work with CLD students and a questionnaire is a tool that will help me accomplish this goal.

In developing the questionnaire for this study, the questionnaire was modeled after the one used in the study by Guiberson & Atkins (2012), but with some slight modifications based on the information that is relevant to the research questions. This questionnaire was organized into three sections: background information, diversity training, and professional perspectives. The questions included yes-no, multiple-choice,

and Likert-type scale responses. According to Mackey and Gass (2005), having a variety

of different question structures is useful because "questionnaires can provide both

qualitative insights and quantifiable data, and thus are flexible enough to be used in a

range of research" (p.96).   The questionnaire can be found in Appendix C of this

research paper.

   Interview. Within the field of education, many factors should be taken into

consideration when analyzing teacher's personal perspectives and practices. For this

research, it was necessary to gather rich and detailed information about what SLPs and

ELL teachers do when they work with CLD students. Interviews are regularly used to

gather qualitative data (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p 173).   Qualitative methods are typically

characterized by the following: rich description, natural and holistic representation, few

participants, emic perspectives, cyclical and open-ended processes, and possible

ideological orientations (Mackey & Gass, 2005). These characteristics match the goals of

the research being conducted. In order to capture the full breadth of the research focus,

qualitative data will be gathered through interviews with SLPs and ELL teachers.

   In the questionnaire, the participants rated their level of comfort working with

CLD students and they identified some potential challenges around working with these

students. However, it was essential to gain a better understanding of what the

participants are actually experiencing as the language experts in the school and how this

impacts their current practices.   In accordance with the research question, the questions

were designed so the participants were able to elaborate on the personal perspective and

practice aspect of the initial questionnaire. A semi-structured interview model was used

so a pre-prepared list of questions was referenced, but there was an opportunity to ask

additional follow-up questions in order to elicit a more thorough response (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 173). There was one set of questions used for both SLPs and ELL teachers (See Appendix D).

Moreover, when employing a convergent mixed methods case study, themes will arise from the data gathered in the questionnaire and one-on-one interviews. In the convergence of the data that was gathered, it was important to triangulate this information in order to add to the validity of the study (Creswell and Creswell, 2018, p.200).

Procedure

An initial recruitment email was sent out to the personal email addresses of the ELL Teachers and SLPs who work at a public elementary school. The recruitment email sent to them contained a letter explaining the purpose of the study and indicated if they were interested in participating in the research process. When the participants indicated their interest in participating, they were sent a follow-up email containing a link for the online questionnaire. In the questionnaire, the participants were asked to respond to eleven questions about their training and professional perspectives and experiences working with CLD students. Responses for this questionnaire were confidential and the names of teachers were collected if they indicated they were willing to participate in a follow-up interview. The questionnaire results were examined in order to determine which participants indicated that they are willing to be a part of the interview and have worked as an ELL Teacher or SLP for more than 4 years. Afterwards, the names were deleted and the participants identified were referred to using a pseudonym.

Based on the results obtained from the questionnaire, 1 ELL Teacher and 1 SLP were identified to participate in the one-on-one interview. These participants were

contacted in order to arrange the interview on a day and at a location of their choosing. Prior to completing the follow-up interview, the participants were to sign an additional consent form for the interview. The interview took approximately 30 minutes. The interview questions and prompts are designed so the participants will be able to elaborate more on the personal perspective and practice aspect of the initial questionnaire in regards to their occupation as an ELL Teacher and SLP. The interview was digitally recorded on the researcher's personal computer for transcription and future analysis. The names and other identifying features of the interview participants were not used in the results. Interview participants were referred to using a pseudonym. At the culmination of this research, the recordings were deleted.

Pilot Study. A pilot study was conducted with an ELL teacher at the school site in this study. The purpose of this study was to review the questionnaire and discuss the interview questions in order to refine them and determine if they were relevant to ELL teachers since the adapted questionnaire geared towards the experiences of SLPs (Guiberson & Atkins, 2012). We clarified specific terms in the questionnaire and eliminated questions that were confusing to answer.

Ethics. Prior to conducting any research for this study, the data collection procedures and methods were discussed with the researcher's committee members and underwent the IRB Process at Hamline University. Afterwards, permission to conduct the study was obtained by the school administrator after the purpose of the study was explained. Participants were given a consent letter which informs them about the study being conducted. The letter informed the participants of the procedures of the research process along with their rights. They were informed that their identity would be

protected and their responses would remain anonymous. Participants who signed and returned the consent forms were used in this study. For the interview, the participants were able to choose a date and location where they would feel comfortable being interviewed. If at any time the participant felt uncomfortable partaking in the research study, they were allowed to leave without any penalty.

Data Analysis

Questionnaire. The data from the questionnaire was gathered through Google Forms and quantified on Google Sheets. Since the number of participants for this study was small, Descriptive Statistics was used to analyze the quantitative data. Descriptive statistics helped provide an overall summary and assisted in gaining a better understanding of the data gathered (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 250-251). Measures of central tendency commonly used are mean, median, and mode. (Mackey & Gass, 2005).

Interview. The recorded data obtained from the one-on-one interview was transcribed and stored on Google Drive. The transcripts were analyzed and coded according to themes that emerged in responses obtained. The codes were arranged according to theme. At the culmination of this research, all recordings and transcripts were destroyed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the rationale behind the selection of a mixed methods paradigm for this study was to gain an additional insight about the perspectives of SLPs and ELL teachers who work with CLD students. The methods used included a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview. The next chapter explores and analyzes the data collected in

order to learn more about what SLPs and ELL teachers focus on when working with CLD

students.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Introduction

The data collection process for my research took place in three phases in order to answer

my research questions. My research questions for this study are:

1. *What do ELL teachers focus on when working with culturally and linguistically*

   diverse students?

2. *What do SLPs focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse*

   students?

Each phase of this data collection process builds upon the next phase by providing

information to assist in a better understanding of the complementary results obtained. The

first phase consisted of artifact collection that was publicly-available information about

current graduate-level university program requirements to become a SLP and ELL

teacher in the state of Minnesota. The second phase was a voluntary web-based

questionnaire in order to gather information about the participant's background,

professional perspectives and experiences. This information was grouped and analyzed

according to the two groups of participants: ELL teachers and SLPs. The final phase was

a one-on-one follow-up interview with participants who were willing to take part in the

process. The purpose of this part of the research was to gather information about ELL

teachers' and SLPs' roles in schools and what they focus on when working with CLD

students in order to answer the research question.

Data Synthesis and Analysis

   The data collection process took place in three phases: artifact collection, questionnaire, and one-on-one interview. The data collected were grouped and analyzed according to the two groups of participants: ELL teachers and SLPs. Afterwards, this data was analyzed and coded according to the themes that arose to serve as answers to the research questions

   The respondents of this study reported that there are similarities and differences in what SLPs and ELL teachers focus on when working with CLD students. The data obtained from the artifact collection, the questionnaire, and interview were designed in order to learn more information about the interviewee's roles as language specialists in their schools and what they focus on when working with CLD students. In the rest of this chapter, the findings of this study that emerged from the analysis of the data collected in the three-phase data collection process will be presented. The following themes related to the similarities between what SLPs and ELL teachers focus on when working with CLD students are as follows: 1) SLPs and ELL teachers establish language goals for their students; 2) SLPs and ELL teachers provide scaffolds to help CLD students access and build their language skills within a specific content area; 3) SLPs and ELL teachers use formative and summative assessments to determine language growth. The themes related to differences in practice are as follows: 1) SLPs and ELL teachers focus on the language needs of CLD students using their area of expertise; 2) SLPs and ELL teachers focus on language goals by collaborating with other language professionals in the school.

Similarities in practices of SLPs and ELL teachers

        SLPs and ELL teachers establish language goals for their students. SLPs and ELL teachers stated that they both establish language goals for their students. During the interview, participants were prompted to describe what areas of language they focused on when working with CLD students. For example, in the domains of listening and speaking the SLP stated, "I would start focusing on the expressive language piece through picture symbols and building vocabulary; functional vocabulary" when working with her lower cognitive language students (personal communication, June 5, 2019). Meanwhile, the ELL teacher stated that the oral language goals were dependent on the student's prior exposure to English, especially if they are new to the country. However, he also mentioned that the students he works with:

> ...are not new to country students. They've all grown up here, they were born here. Most of them have older siblings so their exposure to social English is pretty frequent and their vocabulary isn't necessarily that of a native speaker, but it is more advanced than you would expect of a new to country student. (personal communication, June 6, 2019)

This revelation further emphasizes that CLD students have different life experiences that will determine their specific language needs and is reflective of the notion of breadth of diversity (Kohnert et al., 2003). In order to address the language needs of these types of students, the ELL teacher said he focused on more technical aspects of the English language such as "...subject-noun agreement or like plurality of words...then I'd say pronoun agreement, he-she instances" (personal communication, June 6, 2019). The findings from the artifact collection also support these technical language goals as ELL

teachers receive specific training around the linguistics topics of syntax and semantics in English (Appendix B).

Both participants stated that their goals were dependent on the current language skills of the student and their background knowledge of the student. The ELL teacher emphasized this point by saying, "There's not as many unknowns when it comes to someone when you know[the student], what they're capable of doing and how hard they're able to be pushed" (personal communication, June 6, 2019). Afterwards, they would take those goals and build upon them based on the student's current and future language goals.

The sources of information referenced to build language goals for each language professional varied according to their role. The SLP referenced the language goals of a student's IEP and the Language Benchmarks within the 2010 Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards in English Language Arts because she was able to compare where her students are now and where they need to be in the future. Additionally, the SLP elaborated on the process of examining the language goals of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) for her students:

> I mean obviously when you're working with kids you see other areas of need as you're working with them and I'll throw in other things as well that I know they need to work on outside of goals and objectives on their IEP. But when that IEP comes up, I just really try and step back and check out the data and see if they've met their objectives and if they don't, then try to continue to focus on the goals that they have and just kind of build on those each year. (personal communication, June 5, 2019)

It should also be noted that during the interview, the SLP mentioned that a student's IEP is reviewed annually and that students are evaluated every three years to see if they still need special education and speech-language services.

ELL teachers have a different source of information that helps establish their language goals. The ELL teacher mentioned in the interview that he uses the WIDA language rubrics to know "what they can do and what's the next step to build on that" (personal communication, June 6, 2019). The student's ACCESS scores are also referenced, although he emphasized the importance of using multiple measures in order to determine their language goals. He said, "So using their ACCESS scores, using what they know, what you know about them as a learner to kind of determine if their ACCESS scores are really applicable to what their abilities are or not" (personal communication, June 6, 2019). Additionally, he also used "a lot of both hard and soft data" to build a holistic approach to working with the student.

SLPs and ELL teachers provide scaffolds to help CLD students access and build their language skills within a specific content area. When determining their areas of focus within the language domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing, SLPs and ELL teachers scaffold the general education content in order to help their students' access and build their language skills within that specific content area. According to the questionnaire, both SLPs and ELL teachers indicated they were competent to provide language services to CLD students and this competency was supported by the anecdotal evidence shared from their interviews.

The scaffolds implemented by the SLP and ELL teacher were dependent on the skills of the student and the type of language needed to complete a specific task. In the

interview, the SLP said she establishes a focus question of the day that the students need to respond to in writing and "this kid might be able to write a sentence but then this kid to the right of me needs to work on tracing so they'll pull up the highlighter and they'll trace" which is reminiscent of the WIDA Can-Do descriptors that the ELL teacher used as their reference for writing goals. The WIDA Can-Do descriptors "represent what students can do with language across different content areas" and help provide "equitable access to developmentally appropriate content" by emphasizing differentiated instruction (WIDA, 2019). Even though the SLP did not have any previous experience working with this tool, she applied a similar philosophy of practice when working with her language students.

When helping CLD students scaffold their writing, the ELL teacher mentioned that it is important to have "a clear goal and expectation of what you want their writing to be" (personal communication, June 6, 2019). When working on writing a paragraph, he and the students would work on the introductory sentence together but afterwards the students would need to write the rest of the paragraph themselves. He further emphasized that modeling these processes is important because it helps them see a model of what they need to do. He said:

> Modeling for that is huge, showing students what you're expecting them to do and then not necessarily copy yours because they can't, but if you're writing about a similar topic using the content words that they know, to make it their own is helpful. (personal communication, June 6, 2019)

The ELL teacher also had clear and realistic expectations for the writing produced by his students when he said, "I don't expect their writing to sound like a native speaker [of

English] sometimes because they're not, but I do expect it to be something they are proud of and they can read and they can understand"(personal communication, June 6, 2019).

Both the SLP and ELL teacher also scaffold content lessons by explicitly teaching concept concepts and vocabulary. In the interview, the SLP shared that she pre-teaches vocabulary for students who need it in small groups before using those same vocabulary terms in her large group lessons. Additionally, the ELL teacher stated that there are often times in reading instruction where students are prompted to identify whether "a word looks or sounds right," but that it is not helpful to students who haven't been exposed to that word in English. He further emphasized this point when he said:

> A lot of it is just explicit instruction and instead of asking the student if they're
> having trouble with a sentence and they get stuck on a word, they're not using a
> picture clue to help them. It's not a lot of probing, it's a lot of understanding
> when you need to step in and just give them that information. (personal
> communication, June 6, 2019)

It seems that a lot of assumptions can be made about CLD students in regards to their understanding of the content or how to complete a procedure, especially if an educator assumes that the student is aware of how to complete a task. However, many CLD students need to have those processes modeled in order to build their independence. When discussing his role in scaffolding reading, the ELL teacher said his job is to "…give them information that they don't have to eventually acquire that skill on their own and be successful in reading" (personal communication, June 6, 2019). He also provides vocabulary words banks for students to reference.

SLPs and ELL teachers use formative and summative assessments to determine language growth. The findings of this study show that both SLPs and ELL teachers maintain records about their students' formative and summative progress in language instruction. The formative records ranged from maintaining notes about a student during the lesson itself to keeping samples of student work. The ELL teacher said he kept writing samples in order to compare them from the beginning to the end of the year and it helps him analyze whether they are taking ownership of their writing by using more sophisticated language or are they completing the task simply to have it done quickly. The SLP's response was more aligned to her job working with SPED students and referenced using the language goals on the IEP along with her personal observations and notes on a student to write a progress report that served as a summative assessment.

It was also interesting to learn that both participants indicated that they also consulted with the classroom teachers in order to see if the students were applying what they learned into the classroom setting. This process also served as an additional summative assessment, since the language skills being taught were for the purpose of using a specific language domain in a content-area. The SLP mentioned that she will ask the classroom teacher, "Okay do you see these things [language skills] in the classroom because I'm not there all the time" (personal communication, June 5, 2019). Similarly, the ELL teacher shared that he does not have his own summative assessment for the work they complete with him. During the interview, he expressed how the student performance in the classroom serves as a summative assessment:

My hope is that these students are transferring the knowledge of the language

skills that we're working on in my room to their classroom and putting that same

amount of detail and effort into their class work for their summative assessments

in their room. (personal communication, June 6, 2019)

Differences in practices between SLPs and ELL teachers

There were similarities in practices between SLPs and ELL teachers, namely in

the areas of establishing language goals, scaffolding the language in content, and using

formative and summative assessments to determine language growth. However, there

were also differences in the practices of SLPs and ELL teachers and they were

synthesized in the following themes: 1) SLPs and ELL teachers focus on the language

needs of CLD students using their area of expertise; 2) SLPs and ELL teachers focus on

language goals by collaborating with other language professionals in the school. In the

following sections, I will compare and contrast the practices of SLPs and ELL teachers in

these themes and how these practices correspond with their professional areas of

expertise and training.

**SLPs and ELL teachers focus on the language needs of CLD students using
their area of expertise.** Findings from the questionnaire revealed that SLPs and ELL

teachers feel confident in providing language services to CLD students. The artifacts

collected included course syllabi and narrative program descriptions. Those artifacts

indicated that there are specific topics that SLPs and ELL teachers focus on in their

graduate degree programs. This phase of the research process also sought to examine and

understand the specific course requirements that these language professionals must fulfill

in order to determine if there was any overlap in the content learned about working with

CLD students, more specifically in the areas of SLA, multilingualism, language learning,

and differentiating between language differences and language disorders. The findings

from this phase of the research showed that SLPs receive specialized training in treating language disorders, but some courses focus on working the CLD populations (see Appendix B). Conversely, the data from the artifact collection indicated that ELL teachers do not learn about language disorders but they do take courses about SLA and linguistics the topics of morphology, syntax, semantics, phonetics and phonology of language as well as language analysis.

As a result, the data collected from the interview supports this finding in how these language professionals discuss providing language services for CLD students as well as how they view themselves as language experts in their schools. The first question for the interview asked the participants to define the term language expert in an academic setting. Both participants indicated that it was an individual who has specific knowledge about language, but the responses were in alignment of their specific roles and experiences as a SLP and ELL teacher. The SLP responded that term made them think of "normal language development" and knowledge of "different types of language disorders…and how to treat them or how to find out how to treat them" (personal communication, June 5, 2019). When asked the same question, the ELL teacher stated, "I would define it as someone who has more than common knowledge about language acquisition. Also, differences between different languages in terms of like, grammar and syntax, how languages are organized" (personal communication, June 6, 2019). This participant also mentioned that a language expert in a school does not need to know this information about every language as it should be based on the group of students they are working with.

As for seeing themselves as language experts in schools, both participants modestly identified themselves as one of the language experts in their building within a limited scope of understanding. The ELL teacher said:

> I think I would consider myself one of the experts at the building but that wouldn't make me an expert compared to people that are linguists or those that spend their entire life studying language or learning other languages. But I do feel the knowledge I've gained of other language and language acquisition is more than what other members of our staff in our building would have. (personal communication, June 6, 2019)

Additional insights from the participants in the interview also revealed some insights into their personal understanding of social and academic language, or BICS and CALP in relation to their areas of expertise (Cummins, 1979). Typically, CLD students develop their BICS more quickly than their CALP which makes it seem as if they are proficient in English. (Cummins, 1979; Paradis et al., 2011). In the public-school setting, CALP is more often referred to as academic language. According to Genesee & Harper (2010) academic language is defined as:

> Language used in the learning of academic subject matter in a formal school context; aspects of language strongly associated with literacy and academic achievement, including specific academic terms or technical language, and speech registers related to each field of study. (p. 84)

Data from the artifact collection showed that ELL teachers received training in SLA as well as language analysis and research in SLA, so they are familiar with the concept of BICS and CALP. During the interview, the ELL teacher discussed this concept in

regards to students who seem to not be making enough progress in their acquisition of English, especially when they have had a lot of exposure to English through their native speaking peers and teachers. He wondered:

> ...Sometimes if because they're working so closely with other adults throughout their entire day that what they're outputting is sufficient for everybody because everyone knows them so well, so they know what they're trying to say. So, they're not getting that time to be challenged to give more or maybe use different words to describe something because their message is getting across fine. (personal communication, June 6, 2019)

This finding supports the research about factors that can impact L2 acquisition and these factors range from personality, motivation, as well as language development in the child's L1 (Kohnert et al., 2003; Paradis et al., 2011; WIDA, 2013).

In the case of the SLP, during the interview she admitted that one of her weaknesses in working with CLD students is that she knows that they might possibly speak and are fluent in another language at home, but when they are at school they speak English so well that she forgets about addressing additional language needs they might have, especially when they serve as the language models for her other students. Research has demonstrated that students' oral language skills can be deceiving, especially if the student can "speak the language so well" (Paradis et al., 2011).

However, the data from the artifact collection and questionnaire reveals that while SLPs feel comfortable working with CLD students, but they do not have any specific training about academic language. A majority of the training for SLPs is related to language disorders, so viewing a student with strong BICS as an exemplary language

model should not necessarily be misconstrued as a negative, but rather an opportunity for more professional development about understanding how to distinguish between BICS and CALP.

SLPs and ELL teachers focus on language goals by collaborating with other language professionals in the school. If a CLD student receives language services from a SLP and ELL teacher, it is essential for these language professionals to collaborate in order to avoid the specialization trap (Kangas, 2018). During the interview, the participants shared their experiences in working with CLD students who might work receive language services from both an ELL teacher and SLP and there were some minor differences in their experiences. The SLP had shared her comments about not seeing the other students as ELLs because their oral language skills were high, but said she was very open to learning more about how to see them through a different lens and to see if there is a better way of providing service for those students. However, she did not mention any past and present experiences collaborating with an ELL teacher. The SLP mentioned that she would collaborate with the classroom teacher in order to gain a better understanding of the content that was being covered in class.

The ELL teacher stated that he has worked with students who receive language services from a SLP and students with Emotional Behavior Disorders (EBD) in a center-based classroom. He also mentioned that he and other ELL teachers are wondering about the best way to serve dual-qualified students. However, in contrast to previous research that discusses how ELL and SPED teachers fall into the specialization trap, the ELL teacher said he collaborates closely with the SLP if they both share a student (Kangas, 2018). He stated:

I work more closely with our speech pathologist here than I have with the

center-based teachers. But she has a lot of great resources and things that she'll

notice with her language goals that she's working on with our shared students.

(personal communication, June 6, 2019)

 Additionally, he mentioned that he uses her as a reference about specific sounds students

are not making when they work with him in order to see if they are producing them when

they are working with her. He also mentioned that she has a resource that he would like

to have because it compares the phonologies of English to other languages, which is

helpful in determining "...if it's a home language speech issue or it's an English speech

issue" (personal communication, June 6, 2019).   Overall, he said the process of

communication is a key foundation of their collaborative relationship. Furthermore,

standard five of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)

International Association teacher standards (2018) states that ELL teachers must

collaborate with school staff in order to "improve the learning environment, provide

support, and advocate for ELLs and their families" (p.13).

According to Kangas (2018) this collaborative process is important because

"...having all parties perspectives...promotes a broader understanding of students as

individuals" (p.37). In the end, the results seem to show that collaboration is beneficial

and essential.

Additional findings in this research show that SLPs and ELL teachers strongly

agree with the statement "I believe special knowledge and skills are needed to work with

students from non-mainstream backgrounds." The special knowledge and skills of these

language professionals is clear and collaboration would be beneficial for both professionals and students.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to examine the results of my study in order to answer the following research questions:

1. *What do ELL teachers focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?*

2. *What do SLPs focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?*

The data collection process for my research took place in three phases: artifact collection, web-based questionnaire, and one-on-one follow up interviews with a SLP and ELL teacher. Each phase of the data collection process served to help with the analysis of the results for the complementary results obtained. It was discovered that there were many similarities and differences in what SLPs and ELL teachers focus on when working with CLD students. The themes related to the similarities between what SLPs and ELL teachers focus on when working with CLD students were as follows: 1) SLPs and ELL teachers establish language goals for their students; 2) SLPs and ELL teachers provide scaffolds to help CLD students access and build their language skills within a specific content area; 3) SLPs and ELL teachers use formative and summative assessments to determine language growth. The themes related to differences are as follows: 1) SLPs and ELL teachers focus on the language needs of CLD students using their area of expertise; 2) SLPs and ELL teachers focus on language goals by collaborating with other language professionals in the school. Overall, SLPs and ELL teachers share a similar

philosophy of understanding what their students are able to currently do with language and maintain a growth mindset as they provide them the necessary scaffolds to build their language proficiency to access content-based language. Chapter 5 will continue to analyze the results of this research within the context of the findings of this study and the literature review. In addition, it will also discuss the implications, limitations, and areas of future research for this study.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

Introduction

Currently, I have four years of experience working as an ELL teacher and each day I learn how to make improvements to myself and what I do. Every day, I learn more about how to be a better teacher to the students I serve, how to be a better advocate for myself as a woman of color and for the few students of color in my school, and how to better collaborate with my colleagues. Like myself, the field of education is a dynamic one due to the ever-changing demographics of the society it seeks to serve. The students in our schools are becoming more culturally and linguistically diverse and as a result, teachers must also change and adapt to serve this student population.

I can currently see struggles with these changes within my own school and school district. For example, I had to advocate for the needs of an ELL whose language difference was seen as a deficit. Through this experience, it became clear what I wanted to focus on for my area of research. I wanted to explore the preparation, practices, and perspectives of SLPs and ELL teachers who work with CLD students. I also wanted to learn more about what these language professionals do when they work with CLD students. In order to learn more about these areas, I sought to investigate the questions:

1. *What do ELL teachers focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?*

2. *What do SLP teachers focus on when working with culturally and linguistically diverse students?*

As I began my capstone, I had to set aside my biases based on my personal experiences as an ELL teacher while maintaining my strong belief in social justice and equity for CLD students. Through my research, I gained a better understanding of the roles of SLPs and ELL teacher, their personal experiences as language experts in schools, and the process for determining a language disorder in CLD students. I went into this research with the belief that SLPs did not understand how to work with or assess CLD students. However, the findings of my study contradicted my beliefs and with the knowledge I gained from my research, I know that I will be able to go forward as a better advocate for CLD students. In this chapter, I will revisit the literature review within the context of the results of my research. After that, I will discuss the implications, limitations, and areas of future research for this study.

Revisiting the Literature Review

The initial goal of my literature review was to identify a foundation of research that would assist in explaining the various factors that were related to answer my research questions. First, I needed to focus on research in relation to ELLs, the legal definition of ELLs in the state of Minnesota, the second language acquisition process, and the language proficiency screeners to determine whether a CLD student needs ELL services. After that, I focused on language disorders and language disorders in CLD students. This was followed by additional research about the roles and challenges ELL teachers and SLPs face as language professionals in schools. The final section of the literature review focused on researched-based practices for evaluating CLD students for language disorders. This section also included suggestions about building a collaborative relationship between ELL teachers and SLPs. When I reflect upon the results of my

research, I found that there were some commonalities and some differences in the results of my study in comparison to previous studies within my literature review.

SLPs and ELL teachers identify as language professionals in schools. It was clear from the data collected from all three sources that ELL teachers and SLPs see themselves as language experts in schools, although each of interviewees defined the term language expert within the context of their area of expertise. They also have specific areas of expertise developed through graduate-level university coursework that provides them with the necessary skills they need to work with students who are in need of their services. This coursework is also required by the state of Minnesota in order to become a licensed language professional (Minnesota Department of Health, 2019; TESL, 2017). Additionally, the results of the questionnaire showed that both ELL teachers and SLPs had received training to work with CLD students as a part of their graduate program or they received additional training through professional development.

The results of this study also provided some interesting insights into the mindsets of SLPs and their preparation for working with CLD populations. In reference to the level of comfort working with CLD students, a survey by Guiberson & Atkins (2013) found that only 67% of their participants had taken coursework that discussed the topics of SLA and differentiating between language differences and language disorders and although they had received this training, they still did not feel comfortable working with CLD students. However, based on the results of the questionnaire, all SLPs indicated that they did feel comfortable with CLD students and also had taken coursework that discussed the topics of SLA and differentiating between a language difference and language disorder.

Additionally, I learned how ELL teachers and SLPs are similar in how they approach language instruction and their beliefs in how to serve CLD students. These similarities included establishing language goals, scaffolding the language in content, and using formative and summative assessments to determine language growth. One of the differences found in practice was how the language professionals focused on language needs of CLD students within their area of expertise. My findings revealed that the SLP and ELL teacher used specific terminology when talking about language and language instruction that is regularly used within their professional cohorts and their understanding of language, especially how social and academic language differed. However, my research showed that SLPs and ELL teachers receive training and professional development that is specific to the populations they seek to serve in schools. An additional difference revealed that collaboration between teachers seems to be happening, but the frequency is relatively unknown.

SLPs and ELL teachers have a different understanding of social and academic language. The research in this area focused on educators often asks how long it will take a CLD student to acquire language and native-like proficiency (Paradis et al., 2011). It also discussed how teachers may remark about the oral language skills and assume that a student has a strong command of the English language when this may not be the case (Paradis et al., 2011). In the interview, the SLP mentioned that she struggled to see her CLD students as ELLs because their social English skills were high and they served as language models for other students in her language instruction groups.

However, the SLP also works with students with severe cognitive disabilities and many of these students are non-verbal, so it is understandable that she would see these

students as exemplary language models. This emphasizes the fact that other factors need to be taken into consideration when reviewing the language needs of CLD students because of the breadth of diversity that exists within this student population.

Collaborative relationships between language professionals are important. According to Cook & Friend (as cited in Dove and Honigsfeld, 2010) collaboration "is a style of interaction between at least two coequal parties voluntarily engaged in decision making as they work toward a common goal." If a CLD student is receiving language services from an ELL teacher and a SLP, then it is important that these language professionals collaborate in order to help develop the language skills of the students. Other research highlights the notion of the specialization trap that ELL teachers and SPED teachers often fall into in which they see themselves as solely responsible for the specific needs of a student based on their area of expertise (Kangas, 2018).

The interview with the ELL teacher indicated that he did not fall into the specialization trap and collaborated regularly with the SLP who worked at his school. He saw her as a valuable resource when he stated in the interview "she has a lot of great resources and things that she'll notice with her language goals that she's working on with our shared students." I was also surprised and interested in his comments about referring to the SLP when he has questions about the phonemic inventory of a CLD student they share, especially when compared to the difficult situation I was involved in with my school's SLP that served as the source of inspiration for my research. Additionally, in their interviews both the ELL teacher and SLP indicated that it was important for them to meet with and collaborate with the classroom teacher in order to see what the students

were doing in the classroom and how they were applying the language skills they were learning.

In my literature review, I had to identify a foundation of research that would help me better understanding the factors and themes in relation to my research questions. After reflecting upon the results of my research in conjunction with the literature review, I discovered that some of the results that supported the research and others presented different findings.

Implications

The findings of this research have implications for SLPs and ELL teachers who work with CLD students in schools. While the findings revealed that SLPs and ELL teachers share similarities in what they focus on when working with CLD students, there were also differences that were a result of the different areas of expertise. This section will discuss the importance of building a collaborative relationship between SLPs and ELL teachers in order to provide the appropriate language services for CLD students and avoid the "specialization trap."

SLPs and ELL teachers must collaborate when working with dual-qualified CLD students. An important finding in the interviews was that both of the language professionals found it beneficial to collaborate with other teachers in their buildings in order to better serve the needs of CLD students. The research demonstrates that unfortunately, there is a tendency for ELL teachers and SPED teachers to fall into the specialization trap which results in them isolating themselves from communicating or collaborating with other teachers who share the same students (Kangas, 2018). While the SLP interviewee indicated that she did not initially see the CLD students she worked with

as ELLs because of their strong BICS, she was open to learning about other ways to better serve those students. Moreover, the ELL teacher stated he found his collaboration with the SLP in his building beneficial because she was also a resource of knowledge and that communication was an important factor in their collaborative process.

In my own school, I can see examples of SPED teachers, general education teachers, and ELL teachers isolating themselves from each other despite the fact that they all work with the same students. This only leads to a negative work environment where each educational professional sees themselves as the expert in addressing the needs of a student, when it would be more beneficial to communicate and collaborate together in order to create a more holistic approach to educating the student. Furthermore, collaboration between all important educational stakeholders is essential because it validates the areas of expertise of each educational professional and also builds rapport between teachers. As was shown in the graduate-level coursework for ELL teachers and SLPs, there are specific topics that the other group has not studied, therefore they can help each other fill those gaps of knowledge when addressing the needs of a CLD student. Building a collaborative relationship between ELL teachers and SLPs only helps to "promotes a broader understanding of students as individuals" (Kangas, 2018, p.37). In the end, it is not for the sake of the educators, but for the students.

SLPs and ELL teachers must seek out opportunities to grow within their fields of expertise. The research shows that the field of education is dynamic and this change is apparent in our schools. Children in school are becoming more culturally and linguistically diverse "through the increasing numbers of students learning English as an additional language in schools" (Kangas, 2018; National Center for Education Statistics,

2018). Furthermore, Kohnert et al. (2003) highlighted the dramatic shift in the population of Minnesota due to immigration (p.260). With these rapid changes, it is up to schools and educators to rise to the occasion of meeting the complex academic and linguistic needs of these growing CLD populations. The results of my study showed that both SLPs and ELL teachers see themselves as one of the language experts in their school. However, in order to maintain that belief, it is necessary that these language professionals seek out additional professional development opportunities in order to continue to develop their skills within their areas of expertise. In their interviews, both the SLP and ELL teacher indicated that they still had more room for growth in their profession. Both language professionals stated they wanted to learn more about how to better serve CLD students who receive additional language services through Speech-Language or ELL instruction, especially when there are other exceptionalities to take into consideration.

As a Latinx ELL teacher who works in a school where a majority of the students and staff are white, I have personally experienced the struggle of trying to help my colleagues understand how to work with CLD students. The process has been difficult because the teachers have not had the experience of working with such a CLD population and, as a result, some of them believe that they can continue to teach using the same strategies for white, monolingual students with CLD students.   In fact, I was asked if there was a cheat sheet that could be provided that shared cultural and linguistic facts about our CLD population. The process for changing oneself and one's instruction is entirely self-motivated, but if the research shows that the demographics are changing, then as educators it is our responsibility to continue to seek out professional development

opportunities in order to be able to serve CLD students with the instruction they need and deserve.

The roles of SLPs and ELL teachers need to be clearly defined in public schools. The motivation for my research was based on the fact that I did not understand the role of the SLP in my school and what they focused on when working with CLD students. It was my naive misconceptions that led me to believe that SLPs mostly worked on stuttering, articulation, and severe speech impediments. Additionally, I felt that my role as an ELL teacher was diminished because I was not consulted regarding the language needs of a CLD student who was a part of my ELL caseload. Research by Harper & deJong (2009) revealed that other ELL teachers felt their role in schools was diminished because their skills and expertise were reduced down to simplistic approaches that were termed "best practices." In fact, this study found that many ELL teachers were told to focus on reading skills instead of integrated language skills within the content (Harper & deJong, 2009, p.143). In my professional experience, it is unfortunate that the SLPs, SPED teachers, and ELL teachers are all referred to as "interventionists." With the title comes the expectation that we will make ourselves available to serve the needs of all the students that are not a part of our caseload. The level of stress and anxiety is high because there is pressure to serve all students with specific interventions because we received training to implement these interventions, but the interventions are not necessarily appropriate for all students. Additionally, ELL service is not an intervention because "provides access to core instruction" (George and Kulinski, 2018). ELL service is a federally-mandated right (Castañeda v. Pickard, 1981; Civil Rights Act of 1964; Equal Education Opportunities Act of 1974; Lau vs. Nichols, 1974). If administrators,

teachers, and stakeholders had a better understanding of what SLPs and ELL teachers do and the importance of their roles in working the student population, then perhaps they would realize that it is not beneficial to label educational professionals with an inaccurate and misleading title.

Limitations

There were several limitations in this study that must be taken into consideration. These limitations include the time frame of the data collection process, number of survey participants, and the number and selection of interview participants. Ideally, the data collection process would have taken place during the beginning or middle of the school year in order to help me gather more data for the questionnaire and schedule more interviews. However, data collection took place close to the end of the school year so it was difficult to obtain responses from participants because of the end of the school year events and many teachers were leaving for summer vacation.

As for the questionnaire, there were a total of 6 participants at my school which included three ELL teachers and three SLPs which is a relatively small sample of the whole language professional population working in my district. As a result, the findings of this study are only representative of this small group of participants and cannot be generalized for the whole population of ELL teachers and SLPs. Averages for responses to the 5-point scale responses were determined, but it would be interesting to see if there would be a shift in the averages with a larger number of participants. There was an attempt to gain more participants from within my school district, but by the time they would have approved the questionnaire distribution it would have already been the last

day of school, which would have made it more difficult to gather data. However, I was fortunate to be able to get the same number of ELL teachers and SLPs to participate in the questionnaire for this study.

As a result of the small number of questionnaire participants, there was also a small number of respondents who were willing to participate in the follow-up interview. I was able to have one ELL teacher and one SLP participate in the interview, but the scope and depth of their responses may be different from their language professional peers.

Overall, there were several factors that limited the results of this study. As a result of this fact, I cannot make any generalizations about the entire ELL Teacher and SLP population. In spite of these limitations, this study was still able to provide some insightful information especially when taking into consideration that the number of CLD students within the school setting is small in comparison to other schools within the same district, which would provide fewer opportunities and experiences to work with that population. With these limitations in mind, I will now discuss recommendations for future research and actions to be taken based on the findings of this study.

Areas of Future Research

Based on the results of this study and their connection to the literature review, I find myself wanting to pursue this area of research even further to answer additional questions that arose during the research process. Many of the questions arose due to the limitations of this study or additional gaps discovered in the literature review that would serve as worthwhile areas of research. These areas of future research include the frequency of instances where CLD students were misidentified for SPED and speech-

language services, expanding the SLP and ELL teacher participant population for a comprehensive analysis, and the process of collaboration between SLPs and ELL teachers.

The need for a more careful process of determining if CLD students need SPED and speech language services. While completing this capstone, there arose another situation where two CLD students were misidentified for SPED and Speech services, when the students' needs were due to being ELLs. It was only through the advocacy of the parents and the classroom teachers that the students were removed from those services. Even if these instances are rare, the fact that they happen is a disservice to CLD students simply because their differences are seen as deficits in comparison to their white peers when they should have been examined further. It is necessary for educators understand that special considerations must be taken into account when working with CLD populations and it is especially important that ELL teachers take opportunities to advocate for these students.

Comparing the experiences of urban and rural language professionals. It would be interesting to contrast the experiences of language professionals who work with CLD based on specific regions within the state of Minnesota. For example, it would be interesting to compare an urban population in the metro area that serves a large CLD population vs. a rural population that serves a smaller, migrant CLD population while taking into consideration the availability of language professionals to provide language services.

Comparing the experiences of language professionals based on years of employment. Next, it would be useful to compare ELL teachers and SLPs based on the

number of years they have been working as a language professional. Instead of excluding language professionals who have taught fewer than 4 years, I would include their responses to compare them to their peers who have been working longer to see if there are any differences in their responses.

The process of collaboration between SLPs and ELL teachers. Another possible area of study I would investigate is the process of collaboration between ELL teachers and SLPs. The interview questions did not ask the participants specifically about collaboration, but they discussed collaboration without any prompting. However, the questions did not address how and when these language professionals collaborate with each other. Another question I might ask as a follow-up to the question: *"Have you ever had the opportunity to work with a culturally and linguistically diverse student who is also receiving additional language support?"* with the question *"Have you ever collaborated with the ELL Teacher/SLP who is providing language support for that student? Why or why not?"* It would be worthwhile to see if and how other language professionals in schools develop and take on the collaborative process with their peers in addition to learning about the barriers and enablers that are a part of this process.

Summary

At the beginning of this research, I wanted to explore the preparation, practices, and perspectives of SLPs and ELL teachers who work with CLD students. I wanted to explore these areas in order to better understand what these language professionals focus on when working with these students. This was inspired by my own experience of having to advocate for the language differences of a CLD who was also an ELL, but her difference was seen as a deficit. It was through my research that I gained a better

understanding of the role of SLPs and ELL teachers and their personal experiences as language experts in schools, and the process for determining a language disorder in CLD students.

I analyzed the results of the three-phase data collection process within the context of my literature review. In my findings, I learned that some results supported the research and other results presented different findings from the established research. The results of this study have implications for language professionals and educators alike, especially in regards to building collaborative relationships with one another in order to gain a deeper understanding of shared students and help address their specific needs. There were limitations within this study due to the time-frame of the data collection process and the overall number of participants for the initial questionnaire and follow-up interview. A future study must address these limitations in order to improve the results of the research so they could potentially be generalized for a larger population of ELL teachers and SLPs. Additional recommendations for a future study include analyzing different characteristics within the ELL teacher and SLP participants and further exploration of the collaborative process between these language professionals.

As I reflect upon the event that inspired the area of focus for my capstone and the hours dedicated to gaining a better understanding about the language professionals in schools and their work with CLD populations, I know that my work advocating for CLD students does not end at the culmination of this chapter. Change is difficult, especially when it involves a change in the status quo. It is a disservice to all CLD students when they are viewed through a deficit lens because the view is through the lens of whiteness and monolingualism. These inequalities must be faced and changed. James Baldwin

once said, "Not everything that is faced can be changed. But nothing can be changed until it is faced." It is my hope that as one of the few Latinx female educators in my district, I can help be an agent of change for the sake of my students.

References

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (n.d.). Spoken Language Disorders. Retrieved
from https://www.asha.org/PRPSpecificTopic.aspx?folderid=8589935327&
section=Overview

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (1993). Definitions of communication
disorders and variations. Retrieved from https://www.asha.org/policy/rp1993-00208/

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (2006). *IDEA Part B Issue Brief: Culturally
and Linguistically Diverse Students.*   Retrieved from
https://www.asha.org/Advocacy/federal/idea/IDEA-Part-B-Issue-Brief-Culturally-and-
Linguistically-Diverse-Students/

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2010). *Roles and Responsibilities of speech
language pathologists in schools.* [Professional issues statement]. Retrieved from
http://www.asha.org/policy/PI2010-00317.htm.

American Speech Language-Hearing Association (2016). *Scope of Practice in Speech Language
Pathology.* Retrieved from https://www.asha.org/uploadedFiles/SP2016-00343.pdf

American Speech Language-Hearing Association (2018a). Spoken Language Disorders:
Overview. Retrieved from https://www.asha.org/practice-portal/clinical-topics/spoken-
language-disorders/

American Speech Language-Hearing Association (2018b). *Spoken Language Disorders:
Assessment.* Retrieved from https://www.asha.org/PRPSpecificTopic.aspx?
folderid=8589935327&section=Assessment

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (2019a). Speech Sound Disorders-Articulation and Phonology Overview [webpage]. Retrieved June 29, 2019, from https://www.asha.org/PRPSpecificTopic.aspx?folderid=8589935321&section=Overview

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2019b). Speech Sound Disorders-Articulation and Phonology Assessment [webpage]. Retrieved June 29, 2019, from https://www.asha.org/PRPSpecificTopic.aspx?folderid=8589935321&section=Assessment

Artiles, A. J., Rueda, R., Salazar, J. J., & Higareda, I. (2005). Within-group diversity in minority disproportionate representation: English language learners in urban school districts. *Exceptional Children, 71* (3), 283.

Buffum, A., Mattos, M., Weber, C., & DuFour, R. (2008). *Pyramid response to intervention: RTI, professional learning communities, and how the respond when kids don't learn.* Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Cheng, L. L. (2007). Cultural intelligence (CQ): A quest for cultural competence. *Communication Disorders Quarterly, 29*(1), 36-42.

Civil Rights Act of 1964, § 6, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d *et seq* (1964).

Chu, S. & Flores, S. (2011). Assessment of English Language Learners with learning disabilities. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 84* (6) , 244-248.

Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism, 19*, 121-129.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dove, M., & Honigsfeld, A. (2010) ESL Coteaching and Collaboration: Opportunities to develop teacher leadership and enhance student learning. *TESOL Journal, 1,* 3-33.

English Learner Definitions, Minn. Stat. §124D.59 (2018).

Exec. Order No. 13166, 3 C.F.R. (2000)

Gillam, R., & Pearson, N. (2017). *Test of Narrative Language: Examiner's Manual.* (2nd ed.). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed Inc.

Genesee, F. & Harper, C. (2010). Standards for the recognition of initial TESOL programs in K-12 ESL teacher education. TESOL International Association. Retrieved from: https://www.tesol.org/advance-the-field/standards/tesol-caepstandards-for-p-12-teacher-education-programs

George, S., & Kulinski, W. (2018). *Title I and English Learners.* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/open?id=1lnd11iRuJQcfTsfeMnbSLYcRQzkWnPDB

Grech, H., & Dodd, B. (2007). Assessment of speech and language skills in bilingual children: A holistic approach. *Stem-, Spraak-En Taalpathologie, 15*(2), 84-92. Retrieved from https://sstp.nl/article/view/3347

Gress, K., & Hill, E. (2018). Language Difference or Disorder: How Do You Know? *MinneTESOL Journal, 34*(1). Retrieved from http://minnetesoljournal.org/journal-acrhive/mtj-2018-1/language-difference-disorder-know/

Guiberson, M., & Atkins, J. (2012). Speech-language pathologists' preparation, practices, and perspectives on serving culturally and linguistically diverse children. *Communication Disorders Quarterly, 33*(3), 169-180.

Harper, C.A., & deJong, E.J. (2009). English language teacher expertise: the elephant in the

    room. *Language and Education. 23*(2). 137-151.

Huang, J., Clarke, K., Milczarski, E., & Raby, C. (2011). The assessment of English language

    learners with learning disabilities: Issues, concerns, and implications. *Education, 131* (4),

    732.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2006, 20 U.S.C. § 1414

Johnson, L. V., Tuttle, M., Harrison, J., & Shell, E. M. (2018). Response to intervention for

    English learners: A framework for school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling,*

    16(17). Retrieved from http://www.jsc.montana.edu/articles/v16n17.pdf

Kangas, Sara. (2018). Why Working Apart Doesn't Work at All: Special Education and English

    Learner Teacher Collaborations. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 54*(1), 31-19.

Kohnert, K., Kennedy, M. R. T., Glaze, L., Kan, P. F., & Carney, E. (2003). Breadth and depth

    of diversity in Minnesota: Challenges to clinical competency. *American Journal of*

    Speech-Language Pathology, 12(3), 259. Retrieved

    from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=10521689&site=

    ehost-live

Kritikos, E. (2003). Speech-language pathologists' beliefs about language assessment of

    bilingual/bicultural individuals. *American Journal of Speech - Language*

    Pathology, 12(1), 73-91.

LEADERS Project. (2014). *Test Review: CELF-5.* Retrieved from

    https://www.leadersproject.org/2014/02/17/test-review-celf-5/

Levey, S., & Sola, J. (2013). Speech-language pathology students' awareness of language differences versus language disorders. *Contemporary Issues in Communication Science and Disorders, 40*(8).

Limited English Proficiency: A Federal Interagency Website. (n.d.) *What are the relevant laws concerning language access for LEP individuals?* Retrieved from https://www.lep.gov/faqs/faqs.html#OneQ2

Mackey, A., & Gass, S., M. (2005). Second language research: Methodology and design. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erbaum Associates, Inc.

Minnesota Department of Education. (2017). Minnesota Standardized English Learner Procedures Identification. Retrieved from https://education.mn.gov/mdeprod/groups/educ/documents/hiddencontent/bwrl/mdcy/~edisp/mde072228.pdf

Minnesota Department of Education (2018a). English Learner Education in Minnesota: Fall 2018 Report [PDF]. Retrieved from https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/el/

Minnesota Department of Education. (2018b). Minnesota Pre-Kindergarten and School Readiness Plus Program Implementation Manual 2017-2018 [PDF]. Retrieved from: https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/early/vpk/res/

Minnesota Department of Health (2019). Speech Language Pathologist and Audiologist Statutes [webpage]. Retrieved June 26, 2019, from: https://www.health.state.mn.us/facilities/providers/slpa/statutes.html

Minnesota Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board. (2018). 2017-18 Licensure Assignment Tables. Retrived from https://mn.gov/pelsb/assets/2017-2018%20Assignment%20Licensure%20Table%20post_tcm1113-321354.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). *English language learners in public schools.*

    Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp

National Education Association. (2007). Truth in labelling: Disproportionality in special

    Education. (1st Ed.), p. 5-10.

Paradis, J. (2005). Grammatical morphology in children learning English as a second language:

    Implications of Similarities with Specific Language Impairment. *Language, Speech, &*

    Hearing Services in Schools, 36, 172-187.

Paradis, J., Genesee, F., & Crago, M.B. (2011). *Dual Language Development & Disorders: A*

    Handbook on Bilingualism & Second Language Learning. Baltimore, MD: Paul H.

    Brookes.

Paradis, J., Schneider, P., & Sorenson, T. D. (2013). Discriminating children with language

    impairment among english-language learners from diverse first-language

    backgrounds. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 56*(3), 971-981.

Paslawski, T. (2005). The Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals, Fourth Edition

    (CELF-4): A Review. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 20*(1), 129-134.

Paul, R., Norbury, C., & Gosse, C., (2006). *Language Disorders from Infancy through*

    Adolescence: Assessment & Intervention. St. Louis, MO: Mosby Elsevier.

Pieretti, R., & Roseberry-McKibbin, C. (2016). Assessment and Intervention for English

    Language Learners with Primary Language Impairment: Research-Based Best Practices.

    Communication Disorders Quarterly, *37*(2), 117-128.

PreLas: The English Language Proficiency Assessment for Early Learners. (2019). Retrieved

    from https://laslinks.com/prelas/

Prezas, R. F., & Jo, A. A. (2017). Differentiating language difference and language disorder: Information for teachers working with english language learners in schools. *Journal of Human Services: Training, Research, and Practice, 2*(1) Retrieved from https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/jhstrp/vol2/iss1/2/

Powell, R.K. (2018). Unique Contributions to the Curriculum: From Research to Practice for Speech-Language Pathologists in Schools. *Speech, Language, and Hearing Services in Schools, 49,*140-147.

Roseberry-McKibbin, C., Brice, A., & O'Hanlon, L. (2005). Serving English language learners in public school settings: A national survey. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 36*(1), 48-61.

Roseberry-McKibbin, C., & O'Hanlon, L. (2005). Nonbiased assessment of English language learners: A tutorial. *Communication Disorders Quarterly, 26*(3), 178-185.

WIDA Consortium. (2013). RTI[2]: developing a culturally and linguistically responsive approach to response to instruction & intervention (RTI2) for English language learners. Retrieved from http://www.uab.edu/education/esl/images/WIDA_RtI2_forELLs.pdf

Tashakkori, A., & Creswell, J.W. (2007). Editorial: The New Era of Mixed Methods. *Journal of Mixed Method Research, 1*(1), 3-7.

TESOL International Association (2018). *Common Acronyms in the TESOL Profession.* Retrived from http://www.tesol.org/enhance-your-career/career-development/beginning-your-career/a-guide-to-common-acronyms-in-the-tesol-profession

Teachers of English as a Second Language. Minnesota Rules, part 8710.4400, subpart 3, item H; MINN. R. 8710.4400 (2017)

University of Minnesota: Speech-Language Hearing Sciences (2019a). Courses [webpage].

Retrieved June 26, 2019, from https://cla.umn.edu/slhs/graduate/courses

University of Minnesota: Speech-Language Hearing Sciences (2019b). MA in Speech Language

Pathology [webpage]. Retrieved June 26, 2019, from https://cla.umn.edu/slhs/ma-speech-

language-pathology

WIDA. (2016). *Can Do Descriptors Name Chart-Kindergarten.* Retrieved from

https://wida.wisc.edu/teach/can-do/descriptors

WIDA. (2017). *WIDA Early Years Guiding Principles of Language Development*. Madison, WI,

Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System.

WIDA Consortium (2018a). *Memberships and Programs.* Retrieved from

https://wida.wisc.edu/memberships/consortium

WIDA Consortium (2018b). *WIDA MODEL for Kindergarten.* Retrieved from

https://wida.wisc.edu/assess/model/kindergarten

WIDA Consortium (2018c). *WIDA Screener.* Retrieved from

https://wida.wisc.edu/assess/screener

WIDA. (2019). *Can Do Descriptors.* Retrieved from

https://wida.wisc.edu/teach/can-do/descriptors

Zacarian, D. (2011). *IDEA and English Language Learners.* Retrieved from

http://www.colorincolorado.org/article/what-individuals-disabilities-education-act

APPENDICES

Appendix A: CELF-5 Subtests

Test	Age Range	Purpose	Format
Observation Rating Scale	5-21	Systematic observation of a student's listening, speaking, reading and writing skills in the classroom and at home. Identifies situations where reduced language performance occurs.	Multiple raters (e.g. teachers, parents/ caregivers etc.) complete a form rating student's classroom and home interaction and communication skills according to how frequently the behavior occurs. Examiner summarizes the raters' responses.
Sentence Comprehension	5-8	Measures comprehension of grammatical rules at the sentence level.	Following an orally presented stimulus, the student points to the corresponding stimulus image
Linguistic Concepts	5-8	Measures understanding of linguistic concepts, including comprehension of logical operations or connectives.	Following oral directions that contain embedded concepts, the student points to
Word Structure	5-8	Measures the acquisition of English morphological rules.	The student completes an orally presented sentence in reference to visual stimuli
Word Classes	5-21	Measures the ability to understand relationships between associated words	Given 3-4 orally presented words or visually presented pictures, student selects the two words that are most related
Following Directions	5-21	Measures the ability to interpret, recall and execute oral directions of increasing length and complexity, remember the names, characteristics and order of objects.	Following oral directions, the student points to correct shapes in order in the stimulus book
Formulated Sentences	5-21	Measures the ability to formulate semantically and grammatically correct sentences of increasing length and complexity.	Student formulates a sentence about a picture using 1-2 target words presented orally by the examiner.
Recalling Sentences	5-21	Measures the ability to recall and reproduce sentences.	Student imitates orally presented sentences of increasing length and complexity.
Understanding Spoken Paragraphs	5-21	Measures the ability to interpret factual and inferential information.	Following oral presentation of a paragraph, student answers questions targeting

			the paragraph's main idea, details, sequencing and inferential information
Word Definitions	9-21	Measures the ability to define word meanings by describing features of the words.	Following oral presentation of a sentence, student defines the target word used in the sentence
Sentence Assembly	9-21	Measures the ability to assemble words and word combinations into grammatically correct sentences.	Following presentation of visual or oral word combinations, the student produces syntactically and semantically correct sentences
Semantic Relationships	9-21	Measures the ability to interpret sentences that include semantic relationships.	Following presentation of an oral stimulus, the student selects 2 correct choices from 4 visually presented options that answer a target question.
Pragmatics Profile	5-21	Provides information regarding development of verbal and non-verbal social communication.	A 4-point Likert scale questionnaire, completed by examiner or parent/caregiver
Reading Comprehension	8-21	Measures the ability to interpret information presented in written paragraphs.	The student reads a written paragraph and then answers questions presented orally targeting the paragraph's main idea, details, sequencing and inferential information.
Structured Writing	8-21	Measures the ability to interpret written sentences to complete a story.	Student writes a short story by completing a sentence and writing one or more additional sentence(s).
Pragmatics Activity Checklist	5-21	Provides information related to student's verbal and non-verbal social interactions	The examiner completes a checklist about their interaction with the student as observed during formal testing and selected activities.

Appendix B: Minnesota Language Professional Requirements

University of Minnesota SLP Course Requirements

M.A. IN SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY

Students completing the M.A. must complete the following departmental requirements.

A. Required Coursework

Core Coursework

SLHS 5401	Counseling & Professional Issues	3 credits
	Grad status, or instructor consent	

Speech Disorders

SLHS 5602	Speech Sound Disorders: Assessment and Treatment Across Languages	3 credits
	Grad status, or instructor consent	
SLHS 5502	Voice & Cleft Palate	3 credits
	Prerequisite 3305, 4301, grad status, or instructor consent	
SLHS 5503	Fluency and Motor Speech Disorders	3 credits
	Prerequisite 3305, 4301, grad status, or instructor consent	

Language Disorders

SLHS 5603	Assessment and Intervention of Language Disorders in Children	3 credits
	Prerequisite 3303, grad status, or instructor consent	
SLHS 5605	Language & Cognitive Disorders in Adults	3 credits
	Prerequisite 3302, 4301, grad status, or instructor consent	
SLHS 5606	Introduction to Augmentative & Alternative Communication	3 credits
	Grad status, or instructor consent	
SLHS 5609	Child Language Disorders in Diverse Populations	3 credits
	Grad status, or instructor consent	

Related Disorders

SLHS 5504	Evaluation and Management of Dysphagia	2 credits

PREREQUISITE FOR GRAD PROGRAM
Foundations of Practice & Introductory Discipline Courses
- SLHS 3302: Anatomy & Physiology of the Speech & Hearing Mechanisms
- SLHS 3303: Language Acquisition & Science
- SLHS 3304: Phonetics
- SLHS 3305W: Speech Science
- SLHS 4301: Introduction to the Neuroscience of Human Communication*
- SLHS 4402: Assessment and Treatment in Speech-Language Pathology*
- SLHS 4801: Hearing Measurement and Disorders*
- SLHS 4802: Rehabilitative Audiology*

Hamline University K-12 ESL Licensure Courses

MAT-Initial K-12 ESL Licensure

Education Courses

NOTE: Undergraduate students register for EDU classes until admitted to the Teacher Education Program.
GED 7801 Intro to Advanced Teacher Thinking, 0cr
EDU 1150/GED 7815 Schools & Society, 4cr
EDU 1250/GED 7825 Educational Psychology, 4cr
EDU 3500/GED 7862 Education and Cultural Diversity, 4cr
EDU 3260/GED 7867 Theory to Practice, 4cr
GED 7862 Education and Cultural Diversity, 4cr
GED 7872 Exceptionality, 2cr
GED 7878 Teaching ESL and World Languages K-12 Part I, 4cr
GED 7896 K-12 Student Teaching, 8cr
GED 7050 Student Teaching Seminar, 2 cr

English as a Second Language Courses

ESL 8100 Linguistics for Language Teachers, 4cr
ESL 8110 Language and Society, 4 cr
ESL 8120 Pedagogical Grammar and Discourse, 4cr
ESL 8130 Exploring Learner Language and SLA, 4cr
ESL 7755 Development of Literacy Skills, 4 cr (prerequisite for ESL 7776)
ESL 7753 Testing and Evaluation of English Language Learners, 2cr
ESL 7776 ESL Methods, 4 cr (take semester prior to student teaching)

Appendix C: Language Professionals Questionnaire

Background Information

My occupation is:
___ELL Teacher   ___ Speech Language Pathologist

I have been employed as an SLP/ELL Teacher for

__ 1-3 years   __ 4-6 years   __ 7-10 years

__ 11-15 years   __ >15 years

Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students Training
I have had specialized training in providing language services to individuals from diverse cultural or linguistic backgrounds.

____Yes   ____No

If yes, the specialized training was provided by (Check all that apply):

__Graduate program   __Mentorship from a colleague   __Professional workshop

__Employer (e.g., school district)   __Other

Have you had any coursework that addressed the following issues?
(Check all that apply):

__Second language acquisition

__Communication patterns in a culture where a language other than English is spoken

__Considerations for differential assessment of monolingual versus multilingual children

__Assessment tools for multilingual individuals

__Differentiating language disorder from language difference

Have you attended any in-service or professional development that addressed the following issues?
(Check all that apply):

__Second language acquisition

__Communication patterns in culture where a language other than English is spoken

__Considerations for differential assessment of monolingual versus multilingual children

__Assessment tools for multilingual individuals

__Differentiating language disorder from language difference

PROFESSIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Please use the scale below to react to the statements below:

1= strongly disagree   2= disagree   3= no opinion   4=agree   5=strongly agree

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
I am competent providing language services to culturally and linguistically diverse students	1	2	3	4	5
I am comfortable assessing and serving an individual from a cultural or racial background other than my own.	1	2	3	4	5
Communication skills may vary across cultures	1	2	3	4	5
Special knowledge and skills are needed to work with students from non-mainstream backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5

If you provide language services to culturally and linguistically diverse students, please indicate the frequency with which you encounter the challenges indicated:

1= rarely   2= sometimes   3= often   4=usually   5=almost always

	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Usually	Almost Always
Lack of knowledge of individual's cultural characteristics	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of knowledge of the nature of second language acquisition in children	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of professionals who are knowledgeable in working with individuals from culturally diverse backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of developmental norms on the child's first-language.	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of knowledge regarding appropriate procedures of assessing individuals from non-mainstream cultural groups.	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of knowledge regarding low family/student literacy (in any language)	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix D: Language Professionals Interview Questions

- What does the term "language expert" mean to you in an academic setting?
  - How do you see yourself as a language expert in your current school setting?
- When you work with culturally and linguistically diverse students, what do you focus on?
  - How do you develop their oral language skills in the domains of Listening and Speaking?
  - How do you develop their literacy skills in the domains of Reading and Writing?

- What information do you reference in order to establish that focus or build those language goals?

- How do you collect formative data on a student's language development?
- How to you collect summative data on a student's language development?

- Have you ever had the opportunity to work with a culturally and linguistically diverse student who is also receiving additional language support? (ELL or SLP)

- Have you ever collaborated with a _____ in order to provide language services?
  - If yes, what were some benefits of building that collaborative relationship?
  - If no, what prevented you from building that collaborative relationship?