Spring 1-1-2018

Response to Intervention in a Dual Language School: a Case Study

Vanessa Santiago Schwarz
University of Colorado at Boulder, Vanessa.Schwarz@Colorado.EDU

RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION IN A DUAL LANGUAGE SCHOOL:

A CASE STUDY

by

VANESSA SANTIAGO SCHWARZ

B.A., Barnard College of Columbia University, 2005

M.S. Bank Street College of Education, 2008

A dissertation submitted to the

Faculty of the Graduate School of the

University of Colorado in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

School of Education

2018

This dissertation entitled:
Response to Intervention in a Dual Language School: A Case Study
written by Vanessa Santiago Schwarz
has been approved for the School of Education

_____

Kathy Escamilla, Ph.D.

_____

Alison Gould Boardman, Ph.D.

_____

Lucinda Soltero-Gonzalez, Ph.D

_____

Jamy Stillman, Ph.D

_____

Pui Fong Kan, Ph.D

Date _____

This final copy of this dissertation has been examined by the signatories, and we
find that both the content and the form meet acceptable presentation standards
of scholarly work in the above-mentioned discipline.

IRB Protocol # 6-0645

Abstract

Schwarz, Vanessa Santiago (Ph.D., Educational Equity and Cultural Diversity)

Response to Intervention in a Dual Language school: A Case Study

Thesis directed by Professor Kathy Escamilla

The issue of identifying, placing and educating struggling students who are developing two languages has been a topic of conversation among educators and researchers for decades. However, there are continue to be inconsistencies about how Emergent Bilingual (EB) students who struggle academically are instructed and assessed for special education needs. In this qualitative case study, I combined Critical Race Theory, a Holistic Bilingual Perspective and Disabilities Studies in Education in order to investigate the special education process at one Dual Language (Spanish/ English) school. I focused on a 5th Grade Literacy instruction and documented how the teachers implemented Response to Intervention (RTI), a three-tiered approach for providing different levels of instruction and monitoring student progress. I provide detailed examples of the strong instruction teachers provided in the first tier, which was the general education classroom, and the second tier, an interventionist setting. Results indicate that strong consistent instruction in these settings, Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching, and collaboration amongst practitioners benefited EB students who struggled academically, and prevented what might have been inappropriate referrals to special education.

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to the three people who make up my precious family. To my daughters: Both of you were born at different stages of this dissertation process, and you each played a critical role. Isabella, you were with me early in the process, as I prepared for and completed my comprehensive exams. The thought of meeting you and giving you my undivided attention helped me stay focused. Then, on your 6-month birthday, you came to campus to participate in my prospectus defense and lit up the room with your cheerful energy. Lucia, you joined for the later stages. I carried you during my data collection, and you timed your arrival perfectly for when I was ready to write. I was nervous about balancing my writing with caring for you as a newborn, but you have made it so easy. You even snuggled up with me for many writing and editing sessions. You two inspire me daily and I hope my pursuit of this degree can in turn inspire you to achieve your goals.

And to my life partner and husband, Gabriel. People often use the phrase, "I couldn't have done this without you," when expressing gratitude. In this case, it couldn't be more accurate. For the last 5 years, you have supported me in every way possible. You did your best to understand each phase of this journey, listened to me ramble through various ideas, and took care of so much at home when I needed to be in front of my computer. Thank you for being by my side through this entire process and celebrating each milestone with me. I can't imagine having done it any other way.

Acknowledgements

Several important people played a role in the completion of this dissertation. I would first like to thank the insight, wisdom and support of my dissertation committee. Dr. Escamilla, you stepped in and took me on as your advisee when I needed you most. Even though we came together under hard circumstances, I am honored to have had the privilege to learn from you. Your work and dedication inspire me, and I am forever grateful for your extensive feedback and continuous encouragement throughout this process.

I also wish to thank my first doctoral advisor, Dr. Janette Klingner, who is sadly no longer with us. Your research and writing on bilingual and special education influenced the decisions I made as a young teacher in New York, and it seemed impossibly lucky that you were to become my advisor when I began this journey. Four years later, your passing still feels unbelievably tragic and I continue to long for what I know would have been your incredible guidance. The work you left behind continues to inspire and guide me. Thank you for devoting so much of your career and life to this field. I promise to continue what you started.

To Dr. Alison Boardman, you have gone above and beyond to offer me your guidance and wisdom during my doctoral studies: from inviting me to participate on papers, to holding my baby so I could present at a conference. I always worry that my expression of gratitude fails to accurately capture just how fortunate I feel to have had your mentorship. Thank you, a million times over, for everything.

An enormous debt of gratitude goes to the community of teachers, students and families at Córdoba. Thank you especially to "Ms. Callahan" and "Ms. Kern," for being the devoted and passionate educators you are and for inviting me into your classrooms. It was an honor to learn from you two. Your students and colleagues are lucky to have you. Thank you for all that you do to support our students. I am extremely grateful to the students in this

study who welcomed me into their lives and trusted me with their stories. I hope that this dissertation can work towards improving schools for you and your community members.

Thank you to the members of my cohort, who have become some of my closest friends. We have held each other up over the past five years, and I am grateful to know each of you. Paty. Moni, Ofe, Ellie, Ashley and Becca, I feel so lucky to have gone through this with you and I know that our schools will benefit immensely with you all in the field.

I am extremely grateful to Dr. Bill Barclay and Connie Hoon and the Miramontes scholarship that facilitated my ability to conduct such an in-depth study. The work of Dr. Ofelia Miramontes continues to inspire me, and I feel so honored to have been the recipient of this generous funding.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents and in-laws. Thank you to my mother and father who always made me believe that I could do *anything*. You placed a high value on our education, and for that, I am forever grateful. You both continue to inspire me with the passion you show for your careers and your commitments to making the world a better place. And to my in-laws, thank you for all your support these last 5 years. You have been both my cheerleaders and our family's caregivers, and I am so thankful to be part of your family.

CONTENTS

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction and Theoretical Framework

Research Problem

The issue of identifying, placing and educating struggling students who are developing two languages has been a topic of conversation among educators and researchers for decades (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002; Benavides, 1988; Ortiz, & Yates, 1983). Students who speak a first language other than English and who struggle academically present a unique demographic with a variety of individual experiences and needs. In the U.S. school system, there continue to be inequitable educational opportunities for students from certain culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) backgrounds, and this holds especially true for those with disability classifications (Obiakor & Green 2014). Although scholars in the field of special education for students developing two languages have agreed that use of both languages in assessment and education is best practice (August & Siegel, 2006; Maldonado 1994; Ortiz & Yates, 2001; Slavin & Cheung, 2005), inappropriate tools continue to be used in order to assess and educate these students (Burr, Haas & Ferriere, 2015; Abedi, 2014; Macswan & Rolstad, 2006).

In the 2014 – 15 academic year, the overall percentage of Emergent Bilingual (EB)[1] students in public schools was an estimated 4.6 million students, and the majority of these students (77%) were identified as Spanish-speakers (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). Of these EB students, 665,000 (13.8%) were also identified as students with disabilities (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). Given the large proportion of EBs in our public schools, it is imperative to investigate the complex processes involved in learning in two languages in order to better meet the needs of our students, avoid unnecessary referrals to special education, and

---

[1] See section on Background and Definition of Terms for an explanation on the choice to use the phrase Emergent Bilingual instead of English Language Learner.

provide appropriate supports for those who are struggling academically. Examining how issues of special education are addressed with EB students involves an exploration of the identification and placement processes, as well as teaching practices and opportunities to learn. Since the overwhelming majority of EB students in public schools are Spanish-speakers, this study specifically focused on a bilingual setting in which the two languages were English and Spanish. Specifically, this study examined one Dual Language (DL) setting, which refers to "any program that provides literacy and content instruction to all students through two languages and that promotes bilingualism and biliteracy, grade-level academic achievement, and multicultural competence for all students" (Howard et al., 2007, p. 1).

Emergent Bilingual Students in Special Education

Much of the recent and historical research on the education of EBs in special education has focused on the challenges involved in distinguishing between disabilities and language acquisition, as well as the disproportionation representation (DR) of EBs with disability labels (e.g., Artiles, Rueda, Salazar, & Higareda, 2005; Figueroa, 2005; Sullivan, 2011). There is, however, surprisingly limited empirical evidence for effective interventions in the instruction of EBs who struggle academically and those with disabilities (Klingner, Artiles & Barletta, 2006). As Garcia and Tyler (2010) discussed in their article on instructional characteristics of EBs with Learning Disabilities (LD), there is a complex interface between LD, second language learning, and culture. These authors acknowledged that though many EB students have been misidentified with a disability, there *are* those who do "struggle academically for reasons beyond second language status, sociocultural backgrounds, and educational history, even when compared to their [EB] peer" (p 115). A portion of my literature review provides an overview of research based strategies to assist EBs who require additional academic support in general and special

2

education settings due to special learning needs beyond those associated with second language acquisition. However, there are few studies with this focus and thus, this particular study documents effective strategies that are much needed by teachers to support EBs who struggle academically. Through an in-depth case study, I was able to work closely with educators and monitor student progress over a full semester. This study addressed the following research problems:

- The lack of consistency regarding appropriate assessment, evaluation and placement practices of EBs in Special Education.
- The over- and underrepresentation of EBs with Disabilities.
- The need for effective instructional approaches for supporting EBs who struggle academically.

Below, I provide additional information on the background of special education and bilingual education terms and history. Then, I explain how my research questions address the research problems described above.

Background and Definition of Terms

On Nov. 29, 1975, President Ford signed into law the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. The Act required free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) for all students with special needs. This Act was later revised and renamed The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Prior to the act, about 1 million students who were identified with special needs were excluded from schools (Connor & Ferri, 2007). Under the mandate of IDEA's principle of LRE, students with special needs must be educated in general education settings to the maximum extent possible, and states are required to monitor the placements (Turnball et al, 2013).

Response to Intervention. On December 3, 2004, President Bush signed the revised version of IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA, 2004). A

major change in the law included a movement for educators to implement "Response to Intervention," or RTI (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006), a multi-tiered approach aimed at supporting students at the earliest signs of academic struggle. RTI involves providing various tiers of high-quality instruction and interventions that match students' needs, and includes close and frequent student progress monitoring and using data to make decisions regarding special education referrals (Averill & Rinaldi, 2013).

In the first tier, all students receive a high quality and appropriate instruction through evidence-based curricula in the general education classroom with consistent progress monitoring. For EBs, in order for instruction to be aligned with students' needs, it must be "both *linguistically* and *culturally* congruent" (Brown & Doolittle 2008, p. 67). This includes an understanding of students' proficiencies in both languages, and including instruction and materials that are representative of diverse cultural perspectives.

Students who do not make sufficient progress with tier 1 instruction receive tier 2 interventions, which entail additional and targeted support, generally in small groups, either from their classroom teacher or another school practitioner (e.g., interventionist, speech therapist, ESL teacher, school psychologist, etc.). These interventions should be administered in addition to the high-quality instruction students receive in tier 1, and should also be culturally and linguistically appropriate for EBs. As with tier 1, student progress should be systematically and consistently monitored.

For students who need additional support, tier 3 interventions are available. This tier involves individual or small group intervention support, and sometimes leads to a special education evaluation, or special education services. Students in tier 3 might receive a different

curriculum from tiers 1 and 2. For EBs, instruction and assessment in this tier should also align to students' level of language proficiency and individual needs (Brown & Doolittle, 2008).

If a student is assessed as needing tier 3 supports and is evaluated for a disability, he/she may be identified with one of the current 13 classifications under IDEIA, including Emotional Disturbance (ED), Intellectual Disability (ID),[2] Speech and Language Impairment (SLI) and Specific Learning Disability (LD) (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). Once identified with a disability, an individual education plan (IEP) is created for a student and must be agreed to by the student's parents. The IEP document includes the classification of the specific disability, student learning goals, accommodations and placement requirements. Among the setting options, students may be placed in a less restrictive environment, such as an inclusive general education classroom with related services, or a more restrictive environment, such as a self-contained class that is separate from the general education population. Since IDEA's passage, there continue to be inconsistencies in the nature and level of inclusion of special education students with general education students and curricula (Sullivan, Abplanalp & Jorgensen 2013).

Disproportionate Representation. In 1968, Dunn published a paper that discussed high placement of Black students in Educable Mental Retardation (EMR), classes in California. Dunn argued that students of color were inappropriately labeled because of their socioeconomic status and therefore should receive special education services within a general education classroom. In 1982, Finn reported similar findings from data in the Office for Civil Rights' *Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Compliance Repor*t (OCR; U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights, 1994). This database was established in 1968 as a method of monitoring the

---

[2] In 2010, President Obama signed Rosa's Law, which mandated the change of the stigmatized classification label "Educable Mental Retardation" to "Intellectually Disabled." Since then, many in the field of education have shifted in this terminology, but the original name is still widely used.

demographic patterns in school districts with previously held civil rights violations. The OCR *Compliance Report* has since been used to continue the examination of disproportionate representation (Hosp & Reschly, 2003) as has another large national database maintained by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for the 1998-1999 academic year (U.S. Department of Education, 2000). Data from both of these sources show that for decades, Black students have been continuously classified at higher rates for certain disability labels such as ID and ED that often justify separated self-contained settings.

This issue of the overrepresentation of ethnically and culturally diverse students in special education programs, also known as Disproportionate Representation (DR) (Harry, 1994), refers to situations in which the percentage of students from culturally and linguistically diverse groups in special and/or gifted education is larger or smaller than the percentage of that group within the educational system as a whole. While data has continuously shown Black students to be *over*represented within certain disability categories, such as EB and ID, the issue of DR is more complicated for Hispanic or Latino/as, which are both terms used to describe individuals from Mexican, Central / South American, and Caribbean Islands (Puerto Rico, Cuba and The Dominican Republic) in which Spanish is the primary language (Dray & Vigil, 2014). Both terms reflect an assumption that members of this group share a universal characteristic, presumably language, which unifies a certain population in the United States. However, there are several other characteristics that shape the experiences of these individuals, including immigration status and country of origin (Dray & Vigil, 2014). Defining a broad category of people as Hispanic or Latino/a often fails to recognize the diversity within this group. The preference is to name the demographic by specific country of origin.

The variety of linguistic, cultural, immigration, and sociopolitical experiences may explain why DR is a more complicated issue for Latino/a students than students from other racial and ethnic groups (Ford, 2012). While national data indicate that Latino/a students are not overrepresented in special education (Hosp & Reschly, 2003; U.S. Department of Education, 2012), individual studies on specific Latino/a groups and specific disability categories often show contradictory findings (Baca & Cervantes, 2004; Figueroa, 2005; Ford, 2012). Furthermore, the issue of non-English students not receiving adequate educational opportunities is not a new one. In 1970, the class action suit, *Diana v. State Board of Education in California,* was filed on behalf of nine Latino/a students who had been required to take IQ tests in English, and consequently were classified with the EMR label. When then were retested by a Spanish-speaking evaluator, only one of the nine students was labeled with the same disability (Ferri & Connor, 2005). In 1974, the *Lau v. Nicholas* U.S. Supreme Court ruled that students whose first language was not English were receiving an education that was subpar to their native English-speaking peers. While the court did not mandate a specific program to serve EB students, they suggested Bilingual/bicultural programs, Multilingual/ multicultural programs, and Transitional Bilingual Education as appropriate for meeting the needs of EB students. Policy decisions were left up to states, which may also explain inconsistencies regarding DR of Latino/as within different areas of the U.S.

From English Language Learner to Emergent Bilingual. Garcia, Kleifgen & Falchi (2008) address the inequities embedded within the commonly used terms "Limited English Proficient" and "English Language Learner" to describe students whose first language is not English. I use their suggested term *Emergent Bilingual* (EB), which focuses on students' potential to speak *two* languages, and helps emphasize a second language as an added attribute,

instead of a problem to be remedied. This perspective is especially important in a DL setting that fosters the development of two languages. Furthermore, researchers and educators who work with EB students should consider the position of many students as "simultaneous bilinguals," or those who are not monolingual in either Spanish or English upon entering school, but instead begin speaking both languages from a young age (Escamilla & Hopewell, 2010). Despite the prevalence of these students, DL programs still generally rely on a native speaker distinction by identifying students' perceived dominant languages. This binary can be problematic because it can confirm deficit theories about students' linguistic abilities. For example, Macswan and Rolstad (2006) conducted a study with 6-8-year-old EBs, many of whom had been labeled as "non-nons," or students who had low linguistic skills in both Spanish (their home language) and English based solely on standardized tests. The authors implemented assessments through "natural language samples," which included analyzing open-ended verbal and written responses from these students. The results of these assessments were compared to the standardized assessments that had labeled most of the students as lacking proficiency in Spanish. With the natural language samples, the authors found that only 2/145 actually lacked proficiency in Spanish. Macswan and Rolstad (2006) explained:

> Because teachers might reasonably refer students identified as having low ability in both languages for special education testing, where some test or another is likely to qualify a referred student, we can expect Spanish-background ELL students to be overrepresented in special education categories. Because the Spanish-language test results are dramatically inaccurate, misidentifying a majority of ELLs as limited in their L1, these children are very likely to be inappropriately placed in special education programs in large numbers. (p. 2323)

Thus, misunderstanding the abilities of simultaneous bilinguals can impact deficit theories regarding students' language abilities and special education decisions.

It is also important to keep in mind that not all Latino/a students are EBs, and not all EBs are Latino/a, and the terms should therefore not be used interchangeably. There are many Latino/a students who are only negotiating one language. However, when examining DR and the processes of special education referrals and placements among Latino/a students, it is crucial to consider the potential intersecting factors of race, ethnicity and language. For example, Hosp and Reschly (2003) found that although Hispanic students were not overrepresented in special education nationally, many were *referred* for an evaluation and ultimately received services through other means such as Bilingual education settings. DL settings include instruction in two languages are often designed to meet the linguistic and academic needs of EB students. Therefore, these settings can offer more appropriate instruction for students who are struggling academically because of the language acquisition process. However, for some students, special education needs may be overlooked because of language development. In this case, EB students may have an undiagnosed disability and deprived of appropriate services. In the Hosp and Reschly study, certain students who were referred for special education services did not appear in special education classification data, but may have had a disability. This finding emphasizes the need to take a closer look at the systems in place for addressing special education needs of EB students.

DR of EB students continues to be an issue, although specific patterns have changed. The use of large-scale databases such as the OCR to investigate DR may not reflect troubling patterns within specific communities. General educators are often unable to distinguish students whose academic problems are an artifact of limited English proficiency from those whose difficulties

are associated with disabilities (Baca & Cervantes, 2004; Ortiz, et al., 2011). Consequently, EB students have historically been inappropriately referred and identified with disabilities, especially in the SLI and LD categories (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002; Dray & Vigil, 2014). In other cases, school programs allow more time for EBs to transition to English before evaluating students for special education. This has often resulted in the underrepresentation of EB in special education (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002).

Artiles, Rueda, Salazar, and Higareda (2002, 2005) conducted studies in California, where the implementation of proposition 227 mandated English-only instruction. The authors reported several disturbing findings for Latino/a EB students. These students received limited language supports and tended to be over-represented in the ID and SLI categories. The 2002 study revealed an overrepresentation of EBs in special education settings in higher graders, starting at Grade 5 and continuing through the end of high school. EB students were 27% more likely than English-proficient students to be placed in special education in elementary grades and almost twice as likely in middle school and high school. Furthermore, the study suggested that EBs in special education settings were more likely to be placed in more restrictive settings that were segregated from the general education population. The 2005 study found that as language supports were reduced, EB students were more likely to be placed in special education settings. This finding points to the importance of supporting the linguistic needs of EBs in order to avoid inappropriate special education placements.

Research Questions

This study primarily aims to explore the strategies used in one DL settings to support EB Spanish speaking students who struggle academically. First, in order to provide a context for the study, I ask an exploratory question about how issues of special education are addressed in this

DL setting, including the referral, evaluation and placement process. This question guides an overarching emphasis on the various elements involved in Special Education for EB students. Then, I more closely address the research problem of a lack of empirically tested strategies for students who are navigating two languages and have been identified as struggling academically. I ask about the supports used at this school to support these students through an implementation of Response to Intervention (RTI). Therefore, the research questions for this study are:

1. How are issues of special education addressed in one Dual Language setting including issues of referral, evaluation and placement?

2. What strategies are used through Response to Intervention for supporting EB students who struggle academically?

   a. What does Tier 1 instruction look like one Dual Language school that implements Response to Intervention?

   b. What does Tier 2 instruction look like in a Dual Language school that implements Response to Intervention?

Research Purpose

The purpose of this research project is to contribute to the field's understanding of the complexities involved in identifying and educating EB Spanish speaking students who struggle academically. Much of the recent research on the education of EBs with special education needs has focused on the challenges involved in distinguishing between disabilities and language acquisition, as well as the disproportionation representation (DR) of EBs with disability labels (e.g., Artiles, Rueda, Salazar, & Higareda, 2005; Figueroa, 2005; Sullivan, 2011). As described above, both the over and underrepresentation of EBs in special education are ongoing issues. Continuing research of the special education referral process with EBs can add to a deeper

understanding of how misclassification can be avoided and DR can be mitigated. Therefore, one of the goals of this research study is to contribute to appropriate practices for the special education referral, evaluation and placement practices for EBs.

Furthermore, as I explain in my literature review, there is limited research that provides implications for effective interventions in the instruction of EBs with disabilities (Klingner, Artiles & Barletta, 2006). Thus, an essential goal of this study it to examine effective strategies that focus on the population of EBs who require additional academic support in general education settings due to special learning needs beyond those associated with second language acquisition. Because issues of language acquisition and special education are most prominent in literacy (Klingner, Artiles & Barletta, 2006), I focused my observations on instruction in the literacy class. Investigating how EB students were supported in literacy in a DL school that is committed to developing biliteracy skills can deeper the field's understanding about successful instructional supports.

Theoretical Framework

Elements of Disabilities Studies in Education (DSE), Critical Race Theory (CRT), and a Holistic Bilingual Perspective provide the conceptual frameworks for exploring how the academic and linguistic needs of EB Latino/a students are addressed through DL and Special Education systems. These frameworks encourage an examination of the current distribution of power that often contributes to the marginalization of students of color in special education. For Latino/a EB students with disabilities, the oppressive systems of racism, ablesim as well as the hegemony of English can, and often do contribute to inequitable learning opportunities (Dray & Vigil, 2014). Within DSE, *ableism* is the term used to refer to the marginalization caused by dominant notions of ability (Ferri & Connor, 2005). Similar to other forms of oppression, this

term attempts to highlight the power imbalances that result from everyday interactions and institutional norms, including those experienced in schools. The hegemony of English (Shannon, 1995) is a term used to recognize the high status that English maintains globally and nationally. Researchers in the field of bilingual education have recognized how the imbalance between the status of English and Spanish influences instruction in DL programs and often prioritizes English (e.g., Escamilla, 2000; Scanlan & Palmer, 2009; Shannon, 1995). Given that the focal students in my study have multiple identity factors that cannot be separated from one another, I use elements of CRT as the basis for my theoretical framework, and weave in theories from DSE and a Holistic Bilingual Perspective.

Harry and Klingner (2014) explored the cultural contexts of schools, interpersonal communications, and referral practices that surround the special education classification and placement processes. They described "cultural hegemony" (p. 50) as the concept that society's mainstream cultural beliefs and practices are embedded in the expectations and values of institutions and privileged above others. Our societal institutions, including schools, favor the dominant culture, which in the U.S. is that of White, middle-class, able-bodied native English-speakers. The authors found that although their study focused on urban schools with mostly Latino/a and Black student populations, middle-class White culture was the "normal currency" (p. 51) of the classrooms. The current evaluation system for special education referrals and placements often relies upon the subjectivity of school practitioners. Therefore, if a student's language or behavior does not meet the cultural expectations of a pre-established norm, he/she may be referred to and placed in special education settings (Harry & Klingner, 2014). In the DL setting in which I conducted this study, most of the teachers were White and most students who

were referred for special education were Latino/a. Thus, in this investigation, it was helpful to use CRT in order to consider the influence of race and ethnicity on educational decisions.

History of Critical Race Theory. CRT gained momentum in the 1970's from a collection of lawyers, activists, and scholars. This included the prominent figures Derik Bell, Alan Freeman, and Richard Delgado, who were "interested in studying and transforming the relationship among race, racism, and power" (Delgado & Stefanic 2001, p.2). Tate (1997) described CRT "as a movement and as an intellectual agenda [connected] to the development of the new approach to examining race, racism, and law in the post-civil rights period" (p. 206). One of the essential goals of this movement is to eliminate racial oppression and end all forms of oppression (Matsuda, 1991). Scholars in the field of education (e.g., Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Delgado Bernal 2002; Yosso, 2005) have identified tenets of CRT that are helpful for informing educational research. Yosso (2005) defined CRT in education as a "theoretical and analytical framework that challenges the ways race and racism impact educational structures, practices, and discourses" (p. 74). Below, I explain which elements of CRT are related to this study addressing special education needs among Latino/a EB students in a DL setting and weave in elements of DSE and a Holistic Bilingual Perspective as necessary.

Centrality of race and racism. Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) argued for a CRT perspective in education similar to what had been used legal scholarship. Among the propositions in their argument, the authors maintained that using CRT in education recognizes that racism is embedded in the culture of our country. Within U.S. society, racism is "enmeshed in the fabric of our social order" and thus using CRT allows researchers to "unmask" and "expose" how racism appears normal within our everyday lives (Ladson-Billings 1998, p. 21). This acknowledgement allows a deeper examination of the role race plays in any educational

inequities observed between the Latino/a and White students. Most Latino/as in the U.S. experience discrimination within schools and are identified as "racial others" (Bonilla-Silva 2014, p. 237). Thus, the position of Latino/as in schools as non-Whites warrants recognition that race is central to investigation how special education is addressed among these students. Furthermore, this study took place during the 2016 presidential election, and many Latino/a student participants perceived the president's motives as discriminatory. Conversations about race and immigration took place in the classroom following the election results and inauguration of Donald Trump. Using CRT as a framework helped me analyze these conversations and the teacher actions.

Interest convergence. Another relevant tenet of CRT is the notion that Whites have been the "primary beneficiaries of civil rights legislation" (Ladson-Billings 1998, p. 22). Thus, even when progress has been made in the interest of people of color, there remains an underlying benefit for dominant portions of society. Derek Bell (e.g., 1980) referred to this principle as "interest convergence" (p. 94), and illustrated various examples, including the pivotal U.S. court case of *Brown v. the Board of Education*. Bell (1987) illustrated how this decision to end school segregation was greatly influenced by the need to gain more support in the U.S. in the face of competition with Communist countries.

Similarly, Palmer (2010) used interest convergence to illustrate how the support for a DL program, in which students received instruction in both English and Spanish, was greatly influenced by large numbers of White families who wanted their children to learn Spanish. The author demonstrated how White parents used their agency within the school to guarantee that their children would become bilingual through sharing a classroom with Latino/a Spanish speaking children. The setting in which I conducted my study was experiencing gentrification

during the time of the study. For the five years leading up to the study, the number of Latino/a students at the school had decreased and the number of White students had increased, and it is important to consider this shift when analyzing the instruction of Spanish-speaking EB students. Escamilla (2000) argued that in the U.S., the lower status of Spanish and the hegemony of English have contributed to a situation "where most schools and teachers model Spanish literacy instruction and assessment on English instruction and assessment" (p. 102). The author argued that effective literacy programs for Spanish-speakers will not be effective unless educators consider how Spanish literacy develops differently from English literacy.

A Holistic View of Bilingualism emphasizes that bilingual students are unique learners, and not merely "the sum of two complete or incomplete monolinguals" (Grosjean 1989, p. 3). Through this perspective, EB students are not assessed for what they are able to do in one language without considering the other. The focus is on the process of how students use two languages, either together or separately. A Holistic perspective recognizes the variety of individual differences and social contexts that must be considered when understanding the development of bilingualism in our individual students. This framework points to the problematic consequences of comparing EB and bilingual students to monolinguals. Thus, using CRT's concept of interest convergence, along with a Holistic view of bilingualism that emphasizes the unique position of EB learners, allowed me to critically analyze the instructional decisions that were made regarding Spanish-speaking Latino/a EB students in the DL setting.

Privileging experiential knowledge. CRT recognizes that individuals of color hold valuable knowledge based on experiences, which is critical to understanding and transforming racism (Delgado Bernal, 2002; Yosso, 2005). CRT favors the voices of individuals who have experienced oppression (Ladson-Billings, 1998). The experiences of People of Color are

privileged and recognized in various methods such as storytelling and family histories (Yosso, 2005). This stance is evident in the findings of this study, which exemplify the teachers' use of a culturally and linguistically relevant pedagogy.

Similarly, one of the goals for developing an understanding of disability issues is "to reverse the hegemony of the normal and to institute alternative ways of thinking about the abnormal" (Davis, 2010, p. 17). DSE can be considered a "counter-narrative" to the dominant discourses that define normalcy and disability within education (Connor, Gabel, & Gallagher, 2011, p. 455). This approach stems from Disabilities Studies (DS), which considers disability to be a social construct. Within this social model, disability is viewed as a "relationship between people with impairment and a disabling society" (Shakespeare, 2010, p. 268). Like other marginalized groups, individuals with disabilities are acknowledged as a population who experience discrimination within our society. As Gabel (2005) has argued, deficit views, which attribute student failures in school to inherent deficits or deficiencies, are imposed on individuals with perceived disabilities. These negative perceptions about students' abilities result in significant consequences and often justify some practitioners' decisions to separate the disabled from those who are not classified as disabled (Gabel, 2005). Disabled students have historically received separate and often unequal education in segregated settings because of the argument that their "deficiencies" prevent them from learning in a general education setting (Erevelles, 2000). DSE is committed to social justice and inclusive models (Connor, Gabel, Gallagher & Morton, 2008). This study illustrates how teachers at one DL school were able to keep struggling EB students in the general education classroom, by providing appropriate academic supports in strategic tier 1 and 2 settings through a successful implementation of RTI. Thus, rather than

separate students who needed support in special education settings, struggling students were supported in their classroom alongside their peers as well as in intervention settings.

Similar to the approach that DSE takes to reject deficit views of disabilities, educational scholars have used CRT to challenge the widely-held beliefs that students of color enter schools with cultural and/or language deficiencies (Yosso, 2005). The current evaluation system for special education referrals and placements often relies upon the subjectivity of school practitioners. When student behaviors do not meet the cultural expectations of a pre-established norm, students may be referred to and placed in special education settings. This norm is often based on a privileged dominant culture, and therefore students who come from non-dominant cultures are labeled with deficiencies (Harry & Klingner, 2014). Thus, using elements of CRT with DSE was helpful when considering if and how Latino/a EB students are marginalized by an education system that favors one dominant culture.

From a Holistic Bilingual Perspective, one can recognize the benefits and potential of a DL setting that may center on and value non-dominant languages, such as Spanish, which is often deemed inferior to English. The DL setting in which this study took place can be seen as a form of multicultural education that "centers the voices and experiences of marginalized students" (Baca & Cervantes, 2004, p. 23). Students were empowered to embrace their first language and become bilingual and biliterate. From this perspective, deficit theories of language acquisition are discarded and bilingualism is valued.

Issues of race, ability and language all interact and influence the referral, evaluation and placement processes of this unique and heterogeneous group of students. While EB Latino/a students often enter school speaking a language that has been historically and systematically marginalized, Palmer (2009) argues that DL can raise the status of Spanish as a language of

importance, which consequently can increase Spanish-speaking students' self-esteem and academic success. Nonetheless, in their extensive literature review of studies that examined the effectiveness of DL, Howard and colleagues (2003) found consistent issues of equity as well as gaps between the ideals and realities of DL programs. Therefore, even in a DL setting that aims for placing equal value on and instructional time in two languages, norms often reflect dominant power structures and the decisions about the program often come from "middle- class, English-dominant parents and educators" (Dorner, 2011, p. 580). Ideologies of normalcy, which are informed by a dominant culture, influence teachers' perceptions of their students' abilities and needs and have the potential to impact educational outcomes for students. Furthermore, cultural perceptions of special education labels vary between communities. Therefore, no one factor can fully explain the unique learning context of an individual EB Latino/a student. Using a combination of the frameworks above facilitated an exploration how factors of race, ethnicity language and ability interacted and influenced the learning contexts and application of RTI for these students.

Significance

Special education services are meant to create equitable learning environments through IDEA's principles of FAPE and LRE. However, the overrepresentation of EBs in special education contradicts these intentions and is problematic because of the negative stigmatization associated with disability labels, as well as instructional practices mismatched to student needs (Burr, Haas & Ferriere, 2015). Investigating the implementation of an RTI model and how EB students are assessed for disabilities can assist in the reduction of inappropriate referrals and classifications, and increase knowledge about effective teaching practices.

Figueroa (2005) noted two major factors associated with Latino students' educational success: culture and bilingualism. While many Latino EB students are misdiagnosed with disability classifications because of linguistic and cultural differences (Figueroa 2005; Harry, 1994), there are many EB students who authentically experience special education and under IDEA, and are entitled to a FAPE, as are all students in the U.S. Baca and Cervantes (2004) described bilingual special education as "the use of the home language and the home culture along with English in an individually designed program of special instruction for the student in an inclusive environment" (p. 18). The authors emphasized the importance of considering students' language and culture as foundations for building an appropriate education. The Bilingual Act of 1968 and subsequent court cases and laws have led to federal funding for programs that meet the needs of EB students (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002). However, even with the advent of new ways of addressing the needs of both students with special needs and EB learners, there remains a gap in recent research that focuses on addressing the needs of these students.

As our field shifts toward Common Core standards, it is ever more critical that schools ensure that EBs have access to increasingly rigorous standards and high quality instruction. Distinguishing special education needs from language acquisition requires an extensive knowledge of the unique strengths and needs of EBs. This study examines how special education issues were addressed in one DL elementary school, and reports on effective practices for EB students who struggle academically through implementation of RTI.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

In this literature review, I examined significant seminal work, as well as recent empirical studies that explore the special education referral, evaluation, and placement process of EBs, as well as instructional practices for EBs who struggle academically. The main intention was to identify the issues that the research literature has addressed regarding my central research questions concerning the education of EBs who require additional support in school. Moreover, this literature review identifies the areas in which this study may contribute empirically to the body of research.

Selection of studies

I selected the studies for this paper based on a process described by Klingner, Artiles and Bartletta (2006) in their literature review examining EBs "who struggle to learn to read and who may or may not have LD" (p. 109). I followed a similar process that included:

1. a search for articles that related to EBs with special needs, and

2. a determination of which articles to include based on specific criteria.

Following a similar model as the authors, I searched for existing research on the special education referral, evaluation and placement process for EBs, as well as interventions for EB students with special needs by (a) online journal searches (b) citation searches and (c) consultation with researchers in the field.

Step 1: initial selection

Online journal search. I conducted computer searches using both Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and Google Scholar with descriptors for EBs *and* those who have special learning needs. I used various terms that have been used to describe these students. My search included "English Language Learners AND special education," as well as

combinations with other descriptors for EBs such as "Limited English Proficiency," "Bilingual" and "English Language Learner," as well as those in special education such as "Disabilities," and "Struggling students / readers." Furthermore, in order to best address my first research questions, I included the terms "Referral Process," "Evaluation Process," "Placement Decisions," and "Instructional Practices" in searches.

Citation Search. I examined lists of citations from existing books and articles related to EBs with special needs, including the seminal works, *English language learners with special education needs: Identification, assessment and instruction* (Artiles & Ortiz, eds. 2002) as well as *The Bilingual Special Education Interface* (Baca & Cervantes, 2004). The second edition of *Special Education Considerations for English Language Learners* (Hamayan, Marler, Sánchez-López & Damico, 2013) was also helpful given the more recent publication date, the large number of resources, and the range of topics covered.

Consultation. I located additional studies by contacting scholars in the field who were familiar with research on EBs with special needs, and asked for publications that included suggestions for interventions to use with this population of learners.

Step 2: criteria-based selection

To determine which studies to include in this review, I established several criteria, which I describe below. Issues of special education in Culturally and Linguistically diverse (CLD) settings have been researched for decades. Latino/a students have been found to be overrepresented in the Intellectual Disability (ID) category as early as the 1920's (Figueroa, 2005). Therefore, in order to investigate how issues of special education are addressed in DL school settings, it was important to understand the history and existing findings from previous research in the field. Studies on the topic have investigated three specific strands: the referral

process, evaluation systems, and the placement patterns including common teaching practices of students from different racial and linguistic groups. I included the earliest reports of DR from 1968, as well as a review of landmark court courses from the 1970's in order to examine the history of special education rights and explain the existing law. For literature on instructional practices, I only included sources that:

1. explicitly provided strategies that could be applied in K-12 settings
2. targeted EB students who had a Learning Disability (LD) or those who struggled academically; and
3. were published in or after 2002.

The searches described above resulted in several studies on trends in the misdiagnoses of EBs with disabilities, the overrepresentation of EB students in special education, and strategies for distinguishing between disabilities and English acquisition. These topics are critical to understanding the complex interactions of culture, language and disability labels and must be considered in order to avoid inappropriate referrals and placements of EBs to special education. However, in addition to reviewing the history and literature on these topics, this review aims to also review the tangible strategies that have been proposed for teachers to use with EBs who struggle academically for reasons beyond learning English as an additional language. This issue seems particularly to be a gap in the literature. I had originally planned to only include publications in which the authors had conducted their own research, but because of the limited sources, I also included articles that synthesized several research studies and those that provided suggestions for teachers working with this population of students.

LD is the most common label for students identified with disabilities under IDEA, and students with this classification are more likely to be educated in general education or inclusive settings (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). I selected studies that focused on EB students with LD and those described as "struggling" in school because students with LD make up the

largest portion of those served under IDEA, and students identified as struggling may present

similar needs (National Center for Learning Disabilities, 2016). Furthermore, given recent

movements towards inclusive models, most teachers are likely to have students who display

learning characteristics associated with the LD label and/or described as struggling (Rivera

Moughamian, Lesaux, & Francis, 2009).

In order to provide strategies that are most applicable to the current context of education

within the U.S., I reviewed literature only from 2002 to the present in regards to recommended

instructional practices. Recently, the U.S. has attempted to use standards-based reforms to raise

student achievement by "specifying exactly what all students should know, then teaching to

those specifications" (Sleeter, 2005, p. 16). On January 8, 2002, President George W. Bush

signed the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, which rests on the premise that students must be

held accountable for learning common standards in order to compete in a global economy.

Students' Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) based on standardized testing now measures school

success and failure (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

Although the education of EBs with special needs has been researched for decades, both

the populations of students and school settings within the U.S. have changed drastically (Obiakor

& Rotatori, 2014). In our current standards-driven context, teachers face different realities than

those in past decades. For example, the NCLB legislation has placed greater focus on *all* teachers

to address the needs of *all* students within their classrooms (Rivera, Moughamian, Lesaux, &

Francis, 2009). This includes struggling students who speak a language other than English. Thus,

I decided to focus on literature that was published recently when reviewing recommendations for

instructional practices for struggling EB students.

After I assembled a list of studies that met my criteria, I read each one and identified the purpose, research questions, and key findings regarding referrals, evaluations, placements and optimal instruction for EBs with special needs.

The first portion of literature is divided into three sections that address my first research questions and address the special education referrals, evaluations and placements among EB students. Then, to address my second research question about strategies used for supporting EB students who struggle academically I summarize the literature I found by categorizing the approaches into four broad themes. The final categories were (a) Response to Intervention (RTI), (b) Collaboration among practitioners (c) Access to language supports and (d) Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching (CLRT).

The referral process

In the last decade, several educational researchers have investigated the process of teacher referrals for special education in order to investigate possible factors that contribute to DR. In the second edition of their book, Harry & Klingner (2014) reported on their findings from a 4-year ethnographic study completed ten years ago. The researchers explored the cultural contexts of schools, interpersonal communications, and referral practices that surround the special education classification and placement processes in a study of 12 schools. Harry and Klinger argued that the process of determining a student's special education classification was flawed because of an arbitrary referral and evaluation process. There was a clear presence of racial bias in teachers' tones and manners towards children. The authors found that the lack of preparation that teachers had before working with CLD students was a strong contributing factor to DR.

Public contexts, including schools, favor the dominant culture, which in the United States is that of White, middle-class Americans. Teachers often referred students to special education because of behaviors that did not meet the culturally dominant standards of the school. In addition to factors related to cultural hegemony that influenced issues of DR, the authors also observed several instances of concern in their investigation of bilingual issues and the special education referral process. Although the school practitioners in the study were well prepared, students' language needs were not as central to the referral process as they should have been. Language needs and the influence of acquisition on learning and behavior were not discussed during the referral, evaluation or placement processes. Instead, teachers tended to use deficit language and described students as having inherent inabilities to progress academically, linguistically and socially. The scope of the study did not lead to any findings regarding the DR of EB students, but their data did suggest that the referral process for these students was "variable and confused" (p. 131). The authors noted that the teachers' referral, which is followed by the evaluation process, is one of the most influential factors that ultimately determine a student's disability classification and placement. Therefore, accurate assessments that accurately capture students' needs are crucial. In addition to Harry & Klingner, other researchers have found that evaluation processes also often contribute to the misidentification of CLD students with disabilities and DR (e.g., Figueroa, 2005; Macswan & Rolstad, 2006; Sullivan, 2011).

The nature of my study was unique given the DL setting, because teachers in this context were aware of how culture and language impacted learning, and were committed to providing authentic and meaningful experiences for students of color. This knowledge and preparation of teachers, I argue, is critical as in my study, very few students were referred to special education. Further, my study examined the ways that teacher actions can contribute to the field's

understanding of how referrals, evaluations and placements can differ when EBs have opportunities to learn in dual language settings or Tier 1 as identified by RTI.

Around the same time as Harry and Klingner conducted their influential study, Hosp & Reschly (2003) investigated the issue of DR by synthesizing the literature on the rates of referrals for intervention or assessment of students from three racial and ethnic groups: Caucasian, African American, and Hispanics. With this existing data, they provided a new quantitative analysis of the variables that influence the patterns of overrepresentation in schools. The authors began their paper with a review of research on DR in special education within the United States. Hosp & Reschly built on the work of Finn (1982), who reported findings from data in the Office for Civil Rights' Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Compliance Report (OCR; U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights, 1994). This database was established in 1968 as a method of monitoring the demographic patterns in school districts with previously held civil rights violations. Hosp & Reschly noted that the use of the OCR Compliance Report has since been used to continue the examination of disproportionate representation, as has another large national database maintained by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for the 1998-1999 academic year (U.S. Department of Education, 2000). Data from both of these sources show that African Americans are classified at higher rates for certain disability labels such as EMR and Emotional Disturbance (ED) than Caucasian students and Hispanics are identified with disabilities a lower rate than Caucasians, but they do not provide a breakdown for EB students. In addition to existing data on the proportions of students found eligible for special education services, the authors stated the need to conduct new research that focused on the process of referring students to special education.

Compared to the national rates for eligibility, Hosp and Reschly (2003) found that referral rates were higher for both African American and Hispanic students than Caucasian students. However, even though African American students and Hispanic students were referred for special education at similar higher rates when compared to Caucasian students, fewer Hispanic students than Caucasian students were found to be *eligible* for special education. The authors explained that because the operational definition of referral for the analysis included referrals for assessment *or* intervention, students who ultimately were provided with services through means other than special education (e.g., Title I, Bilingual or English Language Learner [ELL] services) appeared in the referral data but not in the special education classification data. Thus, this is another way in which investigating the special education referral process in a DL setting in which *all* students receive a bilingual education has the potential to contribute to the field's understanding of referral patterns among Latino/a EBs. In the DL setting in which I conducted my study, students who were referred to special education did not receive ELL services as an alternative. It is also important to note that although some students in Hosp and Reschly's study who were referred to special education received Bilingual services as an alternative intervention, this is not considered a Tier 2 intervention in RTI. Instead, instruction that meets the linguistic needs of EB students is considered to be part of strong Tier 1 instruction (Brown & Dolittle, 2008) . My study thus provides unique data and insight into the special education referral process for Latino/a EBs because of the DL context in which effective language and literacy teaching in two languages form the core of the Tier 1 instruction.

Ortiz et al. (2011) used three studies of elementary school aged EBs who were labeled with reading-related LDs as a backdrop for a discussion on how bilingual educators can help prevent inappropriate referrals to special education through RTI. The three studies were part of a

longitudinal investigation of the characteristics of EBs who had been identified by a large, urban

school district in Central Texas as having LD and who received reading instruction in a special

education program. Out of the 77,000 students enrolled in the school district, 34,000 (49%) were

Latino/a and 13,000 students were identified as ELLs. In order to meet eligibility for the study,

students must have been identified as ELL by the district, enrolled in a transitional bilingual

program, classified with LD, and receiving instruction in a bilingual special education setting.

The studies included were:

- Wilkinson et al., 2006 (n = 21)
- Liu et al., 2008 (n = 9)
- McGhee, 2011 (n=14)

The study conducted by Wilkinson and colleagues (2006) included 21 students who were

classified as having reading-related LD, with no additional impairments, upon their initial entry

into special education. In the Liu and others (2008) study, only nine of the 19 participants were

diagnosed with reading-related LD. These students were placed in special education services

between ages 3 and 5 and initially served in early childhood special education programs. Later,

they received reading instruction in a bilingual special education classroom. Five of the

remaining students were classified as SLI five were classified with LD in areas other than

reading. Participants in the McGhee (2011) sample included 14 students who were classified as

students with SLI. This classification occurred either before being identified as LD, at the same

time as, or after an LD classification.

Ortiz et al. analyzed the data from these studies as they related to student referral,

assessment, and intervention eligibility determinations to describe the special education process

as implemented by the participating district. The second phase of the study included an analysis

of the district data by a clinical judgment panel. In each study, three bilingual special education

professors, whose research and teaching focus on Spanish-speaking EBs with LD, reviewed all available data, and each made an independent special education eligibility recommendation for each participant. The panel's final recommendations were then compared with the district's intervention eligibility determinations. The results across the three studies were similar and showed "serious shortcomings in the district's implementation of special education referral, assessment, eligibility determinations, and placement procedures for ELLs" (p. 322). For example, referral documents did not document specific teacher concerns or student challenges, and the most common reasons for referral were general academic problems and/or language and literacy difficulties. Additionally, although all student participants received instruction in both Spanish and English, only two out of 44 students were assessed in both languages. Furthermore, although 42 of the students were identified as Spanish monolinguals or Spanish dominant based on standardized language assessments, the IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test or Language Assessments Scales, the interventions that general education teachers reported using did not target English development for these students. On students' referral forms, there was also little documentation of teachers implementing differentiated interventions before referring students to special education. When the clinical judgment panel analyzed the 44 cases, they agreed that only 10 of the 44 students actually appeared to qualify as LD. The implications from this report included the need for states and local school districts to develop intervention policies and procedures specific to EBs with a focus on prevention of academic problems and early intervention for struggling learners. Moreover, Ortiz and colleagues discussed in their report about how bilingual education teachers can play a critical role in preventing student failure and in supporting struggling learners with strong Tier 1 and 2 instruction. In contrast to the extant research, in my study, the classroom teachers were bilingual educators and were committed to

avoiding inappropriate special education referrals for Latino/a EBs by examining and addressing students' academic and linguistic needs.

The Ortiz et al. (2011) study concluded with the implications that teachers of EB students should use the following strategies to avoid inappropriate referrals to special education:

- Screening, Assessment, and Progress Monitoring: Teachers must collect baseline data that describe students' language and literacy skills and track changes in performance, in each language, over time. This monitoring should go beyond one school year.
- Language Assessment: Teachers should add periodic language-proficiency assessments to monitor native- and second-language development, as well as progress on interventions targeting language growth. These may include informal measures such as conversation samples. This can help teachers interpret other assessments and provide a more complete picture of students' strengths, needs, and better inform future instruction.
- Literacy Assessments: Teachers should support students in developing strong native-language literacy skills to facilitate the transfer of these skills to English. There should be systematic screening and assessment of students' reading skills, typically at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. These assessments should help bilingual education teachers track skill in both Spanish and in English: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, as well as study strategies. Results can help teachers manage and plan literacy instruction across languages.
- Bilingual Language and Literacy Profiles: Teachers should use assessments that use valid instruments and procedures that are equivalent across languages provide a description of what students know in each language and what they know across both. These comparisons can help determine if language proficiency is contributing to challenges in school.

In my study, I compare these suggestions with the actions the teachers took when making referral decisions for EBs. As a case study, my investigation was able to go more in depth into a DL environment in order to explore how bilingual teachers could support EBs who struggled in literacy through RTI.

The Evaluation Process

Dunn (1968) first addressed the problem of disproportionate placement in a paper that discussed high placement of black students in EMR classes in California. He argued that students

of color were inappropriately labeled because of their economic disadvantages and should remain unlabeled and receive special education services within a general education classroom. Dunn stated that 60% to 80% of students in isolated special education classes for IDs were from "low-status backgrounds" including nonstandard-English–speaking students. His work is often considered groundbreaking in the realm of DR, and was seen as the catalyst for future court cases and further research. Research and court cases addressing the DR continued into the 1970's with the landmark cases *Diana v. State Board of Education* (1970) and *Larry P. v. Riles* (1971) that challenged the inherent biases of the standardized testing procedures that are used to identify special education needs (Ferri and Connor 2005). *Diana* was filed on behalf of nine Spanish-speaking children who were forced to take an IQ test in English, and were classified with IDs. When tested again in Spanish, only one child received the same label. In *Larry P.,* the ruling showed that the disproportionate number of students of color in self-contained ID classes was a result of biased educational practices.

Furthermore, in 1973, Jane Mercer used data from the 1960's and reported on the DR of certain racial and ethnic groups of students in special education classes in California. She found that the percentage of Mexican American students placed in ID classes was four times their percentage in the population. These cases and reports addressed the role of teachers, school psychologists, and testing practices that contribute to the inappropriate special education labeling of linguistically and culturally diverse students.

Decades later, Ochoa, Rivera & Ford (1998) found similar results when they surveyed 1,507 school psychologists from eight different states in order to investigate their training as it related to bilingual psycho-educational assessment of Spanish-speaking Latino students. The researchers found that the school psychologists who conducted bilingual psycho-educational

assessment did not believe that they had received sufficient training. About 80% of the participants stated their level of training was less than adequate on the following three areas: (a) knowledge of second language acquisition factors and their relationship to assessment; (b) knowledge of methods to conduct bilingual psycho-educational assessment; and (c) ability to interpret the results of bilingual psycho-educational assessments. The findings from the study implied that school psychologists who do conduct bilingual psycho-educational assessment are providing services without having received adequate preparation. Consequently, many EB students are inappropriately labeled with disabilities.

Issues of appropriate evaluations for EB students are still a topic of debate and research in the 21st century. In his book on the Bilingual Special Education Interface, Baca (2004) referred to three additional U.S. court cases as the most significant in the development of bilingual special education services for EB students: *Jose P. v. Ambach* (1983), *United Cerebral Palsy (UCP) of New York v. Board of Education of the City of New York (1979)*, an*d Dyrcia S. et al. v. Board of Education of the City of New York (1979)*. These cases require that school systems do the following to meet the needs of EB students who may need special education services:

- Use bilingual resources to identify English language learners that need special education services
- Provide evaluations that are in two languages and are nondiscriminatory based on culture or language
- Provide bilingual options at each stage of the special education placement process
- Protect the rights of parents and students
- Develop a home language version of the parents' rights booklet
- Hire school practitioners who can include parents in the IEP process

Despite the safeguards in place, data continue to reveal concerning placement patterns and educational researchers continue to address the special education evaluation process of CLD groups in an effort to avoid misclassification that often leads to low quality special education

settings. Figueroa (2005) suggested that within the field of special education, students are labeled with LD with minimal consideration of Latino/a students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds. He proposed that the future of LD might resemble the patterns of DR in ID categories if educators do not address the social constructions involved in diagnosis and harmful pedagogical consequences for Latino/a students. Intelligence Tests that continue to be widely used in schools provide a discrepancy between nonverbal IQ and academic achievement. Consequently, bilingual students are more likely to be diagnosed with an LD because of their language acquisition process and not an inherent intellectual ability. Again, the unique context of my study in a DL school was able to add to existing research in the field because of the teachers' awareness of and commitment to addressing students' linguistic needs.

Placement Settings

In order to propose effective teaching practices for EB students who require additional support in school, researchers have also sought to explain the decision process involved in placing students who have been identified with disabilities. Given the growing population of EB students receiving special education services, there has been an increase in attention to placement settings and instructional practices within the last decade.

Zehler et al. (2003) reported the findings from a nationally representative study of EB students (referred to as limited English proficient (LEP) students) and included a focus on EB students who receive special education services. The authors explained that this population of students is an increasing concern among educators because of a rapid growth in the proportion of students with disabilities who do not use primarily English at home. Between 1992 and 2002, the EB student population in grades K-12 increased 72 percent to 3,977,819 LEP students. With the continuing increase in the EB student population, the authors explained that the population of EB

students with special needs could be expected to continue to increase as well. At the time of the report, 56% of ELLs in special education were served under a LD classification. Among the key findings, the authors presented information regarding the amount of time EB students with disabilities receive special education services outside of the general education classroom. By comparing the most recent percentages reported for special education students in general and for the EB students with disabilities, the authors found that EB students with disability labels are more likely than special education students in general to receive services outside the general classroom. The authors suggested that this might be partially explained by the use of separate settings in EB students' native language. Zehler et al. stated the need for additional research on the nature of the educational settings in which EB students are provided special education services.

Artiles et al. (2005) examined the placement patterns of EBs in California urban districts and investigated the various factors that contribute to the diversity of this subpopulation, such as language proficiency, social class or program type. The goal of their study was to assess the magnitude of DR for EBs within several California urban districts. This state has one of the largest concentrations of EBs in the nation, and since most are Latino/a the authors focus on this group of students. The researchers addressed the concerns within the context of the initial implementation of Proposition 227, which was passed in 1998 and mandated English-only instruction in California. Concerns related to the segregation and tracking of EB students. The researchers stated a need for future studies to focus on how trends such as this interact with other policy reforms and the impact of special education placement patterns for EBs.

A key message in the study's findings was that when examining placement patterns, it was important to consider the indicators used and the level at which the data was examined. The

authors found that data from population subgroups could provide more insights than data at a larger state and national levels. Relying solely on state or national level data may not reveal important local patterns of under - or overrepresentation of EBs in special education. For example, the researchers found that in some cases, EBs were more likely to be placed in special education in grades 6-12 and the percentage of EBs increased as they progressed through high school. Furthermore, as language supports were reduced or eliminated, the authors found that EBs had a greater chance of being placed in special education. The authors' findings highlight the importance of examining the various contextual factors that may contribute the inappropriate placement of EB students in special education and reinforce the need for research that examines the best practices for EB students, which my study does.

Teaching Strategies for EBs with Special Needs

  Response to intervention. In this section, I explain the potential benefits of Response To Intervention (RTI) for EBs who struggle academically. Multi-Tier Systems of Supports (MTSS) is a larger support system that incorporates both RTI as well as Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) in order to provide system-wide structures and practices through multiple levels of support. Like RTI, PBIS is a multi-tiered, data driven approach, but its focus is on addressing student behaviors. Both RTI and PBIS aim at targeting individual student needs and applying research-based interventions (Averill & Rinaldi, 2011). For this study, and the literature review, I focused on the implementation of RTI within the larger MTSS framework in order to address my research questions.

  RTI is a multi-tiered approach aimed to provide support for students at the earliest signs of academic struggle, though the approaches vary depending on the context (Ortiz et al., 2011). In the first tier, classroom teachers provide evidence-based *quality* instruction to all students.

Students who do not respond to this instruction receive tier 2 interventions, which entail additional and targeted support, generally in small groups, either from their classroom teacher or another school practitioner (e.g., speech therapist, ESL teacher, school psychologist, etc.). In tier 3, those who still do not respond to instruction qualify for further individual intervention support, and sometimes lead to a special education evaluation, or special education services (Orosco & Klingner, 2010). As described earlier, Ortiz and colleagues (2011) revealed how through the use of this multi-tiered instructional approach, bilingual educators are in a position to prevent inappropriate referrals of EBs to special education. Bilingual teachers should use instruction and assessment practices that have been validated with similar populations and develop an understanding of students' abilities across languages. These strategies can contribute to strong tier 1 instruction and prevent inappropriate referrals of EBs to special education.

Furthermore, Brown and Doolittle (2008) emphasized that in order for RTI to be successful, especially for EBs, practitioners must have a deep knowledge of individual learner's life experiences and how these experiences influence learning. The authors highlighted the potential benefits for EB students because of RTI's allowance for a comparison of students to other similar classmates rather than national standards, the collaborative nature that brings teachers and related service providers together for intervention, and the opportunities for early intervention for students who need additional support. If administered with adequate consideration for individual student learning and linguistic needs, educators can collaborate with various school professionals to provide optimal support for students through various tiers of intervention. In addition to reducing the number of inappropriate referrals to special education, educators can better address the needs of struggling students who do not have disability labels and thus do not receive mandated special education services.

IDEA requires a free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) for all students with special needs. By structuring a multi-tiered approach that aims to meet student needs within the general education classroom, EB students are more likely to receive an education appropriate to their needs in the LRE and are less likely to be placed in separated self-contained education settings when it is unnecessary.

As Hamayan and colleagues (2013) explain in their extensive book on Special Education for EBs, implementing RTI with EB struggling students provides a shift towards assessment that is more closely aligned with instruction, which "provides diagnostic information and also functions to guide instruction" (p. 60). Furthermore, this approach encourages instructional adjustments prior to making decisions about tiered placement of students who are struggling. Orosco and Klingner (2010) conducted a qualitative study of one urban elementary school with a high percentage of EB students and examined how practitioners implemented RTI. Their study showed how an over-reliance on standardized measures contributed to deficit beliefs and misunderstandings about the abilities, needs, and progress of EB students with special needs. The authors also found that a negative school culture and inadequate teacher preparation, which they described as "lack[ing] the understanding of the second-language acquisition process and how to distinguish between language acquisition and LD" (p. 270) resulted in a failing RTI model that did not meet the needs of the students. Furthermore, the researchers explained that assessment and instructional practices were inappropriate for meeting the needs of EBs because teachers lacked knowledge of the of the language acquisition process. The findings from this study emphasized a need for schools to investigate both the effectiveness of instructional approaches as well as descriptive information about the context in which the practices are likely to be successful.

For RTI to be successful with EB students, research indicates that teachers should use instruction and assessment practices that have been validated with similar populations and, if possible, develop an understanding of students' abilities across languages (Ortiz et al, 2011). Thus, while there are potential benefits for using RTI with struggling Ebs, the advantages are contingent upon high quality, culturally and linguistically appropriate instruction, authentic assessment, and meaningful collaboration with school practitioners. My study is able to add to the existing research by exploring the implementation of RTI in a bilingual setting.

Collaboration among school practitioners. As described above, the collaboration among school personnel is critical for the success of RTI. This notion of school wide approach to meeting the needs of EBs with special needs was another theme that emerged from my search for literature. In their chapter on meeting the needs of Latino EBs with disabilities, Dray & Vigil (2014) presented a collection of suggestions for educating Latino/a EB students who struggle academically. The authors made recommendations based on research (Oller & Eilers, 2002; Ramirez, Yuen, Ramey, & Pasta, 1991; Thomas & Collier, 2002) that suggests that optimal instruction for EB Latino/a students with minimal English proficiency should be in the students' native language with high quality English as a Second Language supports. Dray and Vigil stressed the importance of a "school wide problem-solving process" (p. 61), including participation in professional development workshops on relevant topics such as first and second language acquisition. Teachers of EB students with special needs are often unprepared to meet the various needs in their classroom. Consulting colleagues who hold different fields of expertise within a school building (e.g., ESL strategies, students' language proficiency, special education practices) is a practical way to develop new insight into ideal instructional practices.

Paneque and Barbetta (2006) presented the benefits of collaboration for teachers who do not speak the same first language as their EB struggling students. The researchers used a survey approach to examine special education teachers' perceptions of efficacy in the education of EB students with disabilities. The results indicated a statistically significant positive correlation between teacher proficiency in EBs home language and teacher efficacy. The findings from this study suggested that teachers of these students "should have skills in the languages of their students or support from others who are language proficient" (p. 102). Teachers who speak the same language as their EB students can develop a more complete understanding of students' academic and linguistic needs and provide appropriate instruction accordingly. Thus, for special or general education teachers who do *not* speak the language of their EB struggling students, collaboration with colleagues who *are* proficient is beneficial because it can help promote student learning. Findings from this study suggest the need for more research in the area of collaboration between bilingual and non-bilingual staff, which I address in my research.

Nguyen (2011) investigated the population of EBs, EBs with LD, the teachers of these students, and the types of professional development all teachers need to work with all students. Similar to the authors above, Nguyen suggested collaboration between general and special education teachers, and other specialists (e.g., ESL/ELD, speech, reading), in order to design appropriate learning experiences for EBs with LD. The author argued that in order to fully include EBs with LD in the LRE, *all* teachers must use research specific approaches to ensure quality instruction for these students. She emphasized that this can be done through partnerships with school practitioners who share different forms of knowledge, as well with parents who "play a pivotal role in their child's life, success, and future of our nation" (p. 149).

When given appropriate support from school administration such as time to plan with colleagues and schedules that allow service providers to work within classrooms, collaboration among school practitioners can benefit EBs with special needs. Collaboration among school practitioners can contribute to successful implementation of RTI and allow for bilingual and special education teachers to share their knowledge and expertise with colleagues in order to benefit EBs. My study contributes to a better understanding of the specific ways that non-bilingual and bilingual teachers can collaborate to support EB students.

Language supports. Research has shown that for EB students, practices such as instruction in the native language and English as a Second Language (ESL) supports are optimal for academic and linguistic growth. In 2004, researchers Thomas and Collier published their findings from their extensive longitudinal studies of DL education. The researchers grouped DL programs into two categories: one-way and two-way. One-way DL programs describe education settings in which students are separated by language group and taught through two languages. Two-way DL programs educate English learners and English speakers in both languages. Thomas and Collier (2004) had been analyzing long-term databases since 1985 and had collected the largest set of quantitative databases gathered for research in the field of bilingual/ESL education. This included analysis of over 2 million student records. The quantitative data they collected included testing databases as well as data from other specialized offices that work with linguistically and culturally diverse students. They also collected qualitative data, including source documents across many years, interviews with central office administrators, school board members, principals, and community member, as well as school visits and classroom observations. The goal of their research was to analyze various types of education services provided for culturally and linguistically diverse students within U.S. public schools, as well as

achievements as measured by districtwide assessments in English and in students' home language, when available. The article focused on instructional and assessment patterns they found from several one-way and two-way dual language programs.

The authors explained in their findings that "both one-way and two-way bilingual programs lead to grade-level and above-grade-level achievement in second language" (Thomas & Collier 2004, p. 11). They continuously found that DL programs were more successful in developing EB students' academic and linguistic skills when compared to other bilingual/ESL programs developed for English learners. The authors state an important next step in the field of bilingual education research is to examine more closely the particular forms of DL programs that are most effective for EB students. This is an essential goal of my study in which I use the lenses of CRT and holistic bilingualism to investigate the implementation of RTI in a DL setting in order to more closely examine how factors of race and language influenced instruction.

The findings from Thomas and Collier's work are supported by other experts in the field who explain that when EBs have the opportunity to receive literacy instruction in their home language, they are more likely to succeed academically and linguistically (August & Shanahan, 2008; Krashen, 2003). Instruction in students' home language also provides the opportunity to build upon EBs' strengths, activate prior knowledge, and assist with the transfer of knowledge to the second language (Baca & Cervantes, 2004; Hamayan, et al., 2013). When instruction in a student's home language is not feasible, teachers can implement other ESL strategies in order to support students' academic and linguistic growth and provide comprehensible input.

This same logic holds true for those EBs who need additional academic support. Linan-Thompson, Vaughn, Hickman- Davis, & Kouzekanani (2003) researched the effectiveness of an intervention for EBs who were struggling to read that included both ESL strategies and reading

practices that had shown to be effective based on research with monolingual English speakers. The study included 26 second-grade students who were identified as EBs at risk for reading difficulties. The students were provided an intensive reading intervention in English that included 13 weeks of supplemental reading instruction daily for 30 minutes individually or in small groups of 2 or 3. The results of the study showed that the participating students benefited from supplemental reading instruction that included an intensive, explicit approach. Most of the second grade EBs in the study made gains on outcome measures from pretest to post-test with significant gains for passage comprehension and fluency. The teachers in the study reported that after only 2 weeks of the intervention, most of the students moved through the lessons quickly. Furthermore, the students mastered phonemic awareness, word analysis, vocabulary and comprehension skills rapidly, and they were able to generalize their use after minimal practice. The authors concluded that targeted instruction in English sounds, word patterns, and spelling rules, as well as studying the relations between and among words, "likely provided a foundation for literacy development" (p. 234). Furthermore, the poor performance that these students had shown on earlier reading assessments seemed to have been a result of a lack of early instruction in English reading, rather than a reading disability. This study points to the importance of targeted ESL support to assist EBs with reading difficulties.

Vaughn, Mathes, Linan-Thompson, & Francis, (2005) reported on the effectiveness over time of an intensive intervention for second-grade EBs who were classified with reading problems and received intervention in either English or Spanish. The purpose of their study was to describe features of interventions that were empirically validated for use with struggling EBs at risk for reading disabilities, whose home language was Spanish. In their intervention, they used supported vocabulary and concept development in each language through a daily read aloud

routine that included scaffolded story retelling. Across the Spanish outcome measures in the study, which included assessments for letter naming fluency and phonological awareness, there were consistently significant findings in favor of the intervention group. The authors used several features associated with best practices of ESL instruction, such as repetitive language and routines, explicit modeling, and opportunities for students to engage in dialogue. Their study showed how targeted language and support activities assisted these students in acquiring new vocabulary and concepts.

The two studies above (Linan-Thompson et al., 2003; Vaughn et al., 2005) illustrate how principles of optimal instruction for EBs can also apply to those who have LD and/or are struggling academically, with increased levels of intensity. Klingner, Boelé, Linan-Thompson and Rodriguez (2014) presented a concise synthesis of the essential components of special education for EBs with LD and highlighted the importance of using research-based interventions that are designed specifically for the needs of these students. Teachers who work with EBs who struggle in school must remember that cognition and language are intricately linked (Vigil & Dray, 2014) and therefore implement strategies that focus on language development in addition to other special education services.

Maldonado (1994) contributed to the field's understanding of how instruction in students' home language can support students with an LD classification. The researcher examined the benefits of instruction that involved some use of Spanish instruction compared with English-only instruction. In this study, 20 second and third grade Spanish speakers with LD randomly assigned to 1 of 2 groups:

- A Bilingual group that was taught mainly in Spanish for a year with 45-minute ESL period sessions, and a control group that got traditional special education in English;

- In year 2, students in the bilingual program received half of their instruction in English and half in Spanish;
- In year 3, students received instruction primarily in English.

Both groups of students had similar demographics in terms of age, educational experience, incidents of LD, language proficiency and socioeconomic background. The 2nd and 3rd grade Spanish speakers with LD who were taught initially in Spanish and transitioned into English (through integrated bilingual special education program) outperformed the control group who received special education only in English. The native language instruction and cultural development increased self-esteem levels, learning abilities, and expectations of EB students with LD. Furthermore, the students in the treatment group were able to reach chronological grade level where they are expected to be. A follow up study was conducted during the 1990- 91 school year: results indicated that the ten students who received integrated bilingual special education were successfully mainstreamed during this year into general education classrooms. Students achieved at their respective grade level and competed with their regular peers receiving only LD teacher consultant support. This study, while older than the others included in this review, is important to highlight because it demonstrated the benefits of bilingual instruction for students with LD. My study provides similar, but new information that is more relevant to our current standards-driven context of our education system.

Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching (CLRT). A fourth theme that emerged throughout the field of EBs in special education was the need for Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching (CLRT). As Ortiz, et al. (2011) explained, the multi-tiered approach to intervention has the potential to be effective for identifying and meeting the needs of EBs with LD *if implementation is linguistically and culturally responsive.* CLRT ensures that students have access to meaningful instruction with which they can relate. An approach that is

culturally responsive uses cultural references to empower students intellectually (Ladson-Billings, 1992) and centers instruction on the strengths that CLD students with special needs bring to the classroom (Obiakor & Green, 2014).

Classrooms with CLD students should reflect their cultural and linguistic background to create meaningful connections and instruction (Gay, 2000; Klingner et al., 2014). A culturally responsive approach includes instruction that uses students' "cultural orientations, background experiences, and ethnic identities as conduits to facilitate their teaching and learning" (Gay 2000, p. 614). This concept can be expanded to include instruction that is both culturally *and* linguistically responsive. For example, Dray & Vigil (2014) explained that the learning environment should build on the experiences of students and position cultural *and* linguistic differences as assets. They stated that when working with EBs with special needs, it is more important for educators to "develop authentic relationships with students in a manner that not only validates and respects their students' hybrid identities but also embeds such information or experiences during instructional activities" (p. 58). Honoring the backgrounds and experiences of students is critical to ensure quality instruction for EBs with special needs.

Garcia and Tyler (2010) offered a framework for instructional planning and collaboration between content area, ESL, and special education teachers in order to ensure the success of EBs with LD in general education settings. They explored the common barriers that prevent meaningful instruction for these students in English instruction content-area classes. The authors recognized the sociocultural factors involved in the education of certain groups of EBs and the worldviews that may vary considerably from those valued at school. They maintained that in order for teachers to implement "meaningful and comprehensible instruction" for EBs with LD, instruction "must be culturally and linguistically relevant, and also responsive to their disability"

(p. 114). The linguistically responsive portion to this approach includes "language objectives and language supports and develops linguistic competence through purposeful classroom dialogue and frequent opportunities to learn and use academic language" (Klinger et al., 2014, p. 93). Thus, teachers include strategies that target both the culture and language of their students.

Klingner, Soltero-Gonzalez & Lesaux (2010) described how while RTI holds promise for EBs, certain factors must be taken in consideration, including the need for a "positive, responsive learning environment that views students' cultural and linguistic diversity as assets" (p. 136). Additionally, the authors highlighted the importance of teacher knowledge around research-based instructional approaches and assessments that have been designed for EBs. And finally, they emphasized that students benefit from their teachers' understanding of the language acquisition process and how learning to read in English is similar to and different from learning to read in other languages. In their chapter on RTI for EB students, they explained how the foundation of RTI for EBs should be high-quality culturally and linguistically responsive assessment and instruction and that the idea of being culturally and linguistically responsive is an essential one. They defined "responsive" teachers as those who "are in tune with their students and understand their strengths as well as their needs" and "know how to match their ways of teaching with students' cultural ways of learning" (p. 137). My study offers empirical examples of how these theories hold the potential to meet the strengths and needs of EB in a DL setting that is committed to CLRT practices with its design.

Recently, the US Department of Education Office for Special Education Programs (OSEP) (2015) has commissioned a series of briefs of MTSS with specific focus on meeting the needs of English Learners in primary grades. Upon completion of my study, researchers Hoover and Soltero-Gónzalez (2018) published an article with a summary of one aspect of the OSEP-

funded model demonstration project (MDP), which was designed to develop, examine, and sustain MTSS in schools serving large numbers of EBs in order to improve literacy instruction and the referral process for special education. The project took place in a rural mountain school district which educated approximately 6,500 students and had experienced more than a 40% increase of EBs over recent years, and had an overrepresentation of EBs in special education (37% ELs in district with 49% of special education students being ELs). Three pilot schools participated in the project, which included one DL school and two schools implementing an ESL model. The MDP focused on developing MTSS for EBs in Grades K-3 with an emphasis on literacy instruction and reducing disproportionality. Their findings revealed how Professional Development was associated with an overall improvement of school-wide delivery of MTSS and increased improvements in reading instruction for EBs. Furthermore, participants adopted a new tool for referring students to special education that was aimed to be culturally and linguistically responsive. My study addresses similar problems as Hoover and Soltero-González's, but takes a closer look at an upper level class in the form of an ethnographic case study. Thus, I am able to explore similar themes and focus on tier 1 and tier 2 instruction for EBs in a DL setting.

As several authors highlighted, CLRT for EBs with special needs includes not only addressing, but also honoring the diverse cultural, linguistic *and* learning experiences of learners. Through these teaching methods, teachers can empower students to grow academically and linguistically. From this review of literature in the field of bilingual special education, it is clear that CLRT is essential for effectively instructing EB students in all tiers of an RTI model. However, much of the existing research has been more conceptual than empirical. Thus, my study adds to the field by providing empirical evidence from a DL setting that implemented RTI.

Conclusion

For decades, research has shown that educators have difficulty determining whether an EB student who is struggling is doing so because of the language acquisition process or an LD. This is especially troublesome because teachers' referrals are very influential in the ultimately decisions regarding students' disability classifications and a lack of understanding regarding the academic and linguistic needs of EBs could result in inappropriate special education referrals and thus classifications. The context of my study offers new and unique information into addressing the academic and linguistic needs of struggling EBs given that the focal educators had training and experience working in DL education and the program structure was one that provided an optimum Tier 1 environment for EBs that included culturally relevant pedagogy as well as a sound linguistic framework.

Researchers have found that evaluation processes also often contribute to the misidentification of EBs with disabilities. Several U.S. court cases have resulted in regulations that schools must follow in order to meet the needs of EBs, including the use of bilingual resources to evaluate students and involve parents in the process. Nonetheless, there continue to be inappropriate tools used to assess whether EBs have disabilities and linguistic and cultural backgrounds are often ignored when determining students' eligibility for special education. Again, my study provides unique insight into this stage of the special education process given the school's commitment to DL education and thus available resources in two languages.

When examining placement patterns for EB students with special needs, researchers have found that while DR for EB students does not tend to be an issue nationally, data from population subgroups can reveal more insight regarding problematic trends of both over and underrepresentation. Furthermore, regarding optimal instructional for EBs who struggle

academically, research shows that there is overlap among successful implementation of RTI, school wide collaboration, access to language supports and CLRT. For example, implementing RTI successfully with EB students includes using tools that target language needs and are culturally and linguistically responsive, as well as thoughtful planning among various school practitioners. Furthermore, providing adequate language supports often involves consulting colleagues with different areas of linguistic expertise. Through a combination of these strategies, the findings from my study show how educators can provide meaningful and effective instruction for the unique and diverse group of students who navigate two languages and are struggling academically.

My study adds to the field by taking a deeper look on how special education issues are addressed through RTI among EB students in one urban school, where children's language and cultures are valued and teachers are committed to DL education. I examine the RTI process through the lenses of Holistic Bilingualism, CRT and DSE in order to gain deeper insight into how students who are vulnerable to various forms of oppression can best have their needs met in Tier 1 and 2 settings. Strong Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction can offer struggling EB students a high quality and appropriate education in the LRE, which reflects an essential goal of DSE to include students with special needs in general education settings. A DL environment should support a Holistic view of Bilingualism, because it places value on Spanish-speaking Latino/a students' home language and culture. Furthermore, DL models promote "multicultural competence" (Howard et al., 2007, p. 1) for all students, which aligns with CRT's recognition that individuals of color hold valuable knowledge based on experiences (Delgado Bernal, 2002; Yosso, 2005). In this model, teachers and administrators place value on languages other than English and

bilingualism. Thus, my study offers unique insight into instruction for struggling EBs by examining both RTI and DL models, which coexist in one particular school.

Chapter 3: Methodology

I conducted a qualitative case study at a local public elementary school, which I selected because of its commitment to bilingualism as well as the staff members' eagerness to participate in a research study with the potential to contribute to a deeper understanding of special education for EB students. The participants of this study included two 5th grade classroom teachers, special education teachers, interventionists, and 5th grade students at a DL public school called Córdoba Elementary. My overarching goal was to examine how issues of special education were addressed among EB students in one DL school through a qualitative case study (Stake, 1995) using critical ethnographic methods (Carspecken, 1996). This approach, as I explain more in detail below, is a useful research design for acquiring a depth of knowledge about a particular community (Stake, 1995), in this case, one 5th grade group of students, their teachers and the RTI process for this particular school.

Participants and Setting

Escuela Córdoba[3] is an urban public school[4] in the Rocky Mountain region of the United States serving 369 students in Early Childhood (age 3 and 4) through 5th grade with a schoolwide Spanish-English DL program. As described on the school's website, the goal of the school's DL model is for "*all* students to acquire oral and text-based language skills so as to become bilingual and bi-literate in ***both*** English and Spanish." (Emphasis included on the website). The school aims for a balance of 50% native Spanish speakers and 50% native English speakers. However, according to the district's website at the time of the study, the school had experienced a change in population over the past five years. Enrollment of White students had

---

[3] Names of Institutions and Participants have all been changed to protect privacy
[4] Information describing the school was taken from the school's website

increased by 20% and Latino/a enrollment had decreased by almost 10%. Furthermore, the

population of students receiving free or reduced lunch had fallen by 16%. Table 1 displays the

demographic information of the school during the year of the study.

Table 1: Demographic information of Escuela Córdoba, 2016-2017 Academic Year

Demographic	Number of Students	Percentage
Students Receiving Free and Reduced Lunch	195	51%
Racial / Ethnic Categories		
Latino/a	241	63%
White	126	33%
African American	3	1%
Asian / Pacific Islander	1	<1%
American Indian	0	0%
Multiple Races	9	2%
Students receiving Special Education Services	43	11%
Students identified as English Language Learners	130	34%
Total Number of Students Enrolled		380

Córdoba served students in Early Childhood Education (ages 3 and 4) through 5th grade.

From kindergarten through second grade, students spent about 60% of each day in what was

considered their native language environment, and about 40% of each day in their second

language environment. Not all students presented a clear dominant language. However, because

this linguistic model depends on a dominant language, case-by-case decisions were made for

these students in order to determine which language balance would best meet their individual

needs. The decisions were made collaboratively by teachers, instructional coaches and parents. By third grade, all students received 50% of their instruction in each language. Teachers adjusted this language allocation schedule on a case-by-case basis in order to meet individual student's academic and linguistic needs. This overview of language allocation was obtained from the school's websites and informal interviews with the study's focal teacher, Ms. Callahan, who taught 5th grade literacy at the school. In my findings section, I include "thick descriptions" (Stake, 1995) that provide more in depth details about the school's language policies.

Additionally, the 5th graders were divided into two groups based on teachers' assessment of their language strengths, as assessed by their teachers and scores from the standardized assessments, ACCESS. Thus, Ms. Callahan also taught an English Language Development (ELD) block for 45 minutes a day to 5th graders who were considered to be Spanish-dominant. Her partner teacher, Ms. White, taught math, social studies and science to the same two groups of students, and an additional Spanish Language Development (SLD) block.

The determination of students' language strengths was described by Ms. Callahan as "imperfect." The study took place in a state that was part of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) consortium, a cooperative of states that aims to implement and promote equitable educational opportunities for EB students. At the time of the study, 39 states were part of WIDA. Schools within these states implemented the large-scale English language proficiency tests in all grades (K-12) called ACCESS, which stands for: Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State. It was administered annually and assessed four language domains: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Students received a level from 1 (entering) to 6 (reaching). The teachers at Córdoba used this information, as well as information from previous teachers, family members, and informal observations to determine students'

language strengths and needs. When I asked her about this during an interview, Ms. Callahan explained:

> Certain kids are clear, in terms of which language they learned first, or speak at home. For others if it's not as clear, so we think about what they need to work on to be successful. So, for Arturo and Raúl, someone in the family speaks Spanish, but there's also a lot of English. They have been stronger in English orally, but need help accessing the information so we are focusing on English literacy. They are in English L2 so that we can work on English academic language. (Personal communication, February 23, 2017)

I analyze and discuss more about Córdoba's language policies and assessment in my findings, as well as discussion and implications. While the separation of students based on these linguistic profiles seemed questionable, observing Ms. Callahan's ELD block provided more insight into how she was able to support students labeled as EBs,

For my research interest, it was helpful to collect data from students at a higher grade in the elementary school. Artiles et al. (2005) found that EB students were more likely to be placed in special education in higher grades. One factor contributing to this phenomenon may be that school programs often allow more time for EBs to transition to English before evaluating for special education (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002). Thus, participants at Córdoba included the two 5th grade classroom teachers, special education teachers, interventionists, and 5th grade students.

Teachers. I worked most closely with one literacy teacher, Ms. Callahan, who was one of the school's two 5th grade teachers. Ms. Callahan taught the literacy portion of the grade, including reading, writing in both English and Spanish, as well as an English Language Development block for 45 minutes a day. Her partner teacher, Ms. White, taught math, social studies and science to the same two groups of students. Ms. Callahan and Ms. White each spent half days with the two 5th grade classes. Both teachers aimed for an even split between English and Spanish instruction, and alternated who would teach in each language. After explaining my

background interests and research ideas to the school's principal, she suggested I work with Ms. Callahan because of my previous experience as an upper elementary DL teacher, as well as Ms. Callahan's expressed desire to learn more about meeting the needs of her diverse learners.

Before my research began, I spent time with Ms. Callahan at the school as a volunteer. During this time, I became familiar with several practitioners at the school. I ultimately worked most closely with Ms. Callahan as well as Ms. Kern, whose role was split between working as an interventionist and special education teacher. Below, Table 2 displays the teacher participants and data sources for each. Then, I describe each teacher's role at the school and my participation with her.

Table 2: Teacher Participants

Name	Role	Years Teach-ing	Bilingual English/ Spanish? (Yes or No)	Language of Instruction	Data Sources
Ms. Callahan	5th Grade Literacy Teacher	6	Yes	English and Spanish	Observation Field Notes, Interview, Artifacts
Ms. Kern	Halftime Interventionist / Halftime Special Educator; worked with 5th graders in pull-out	10	No	English	Observation Field Notes, Interview, Artifacts

	intervention and special education services				
Ms. Sky	Halftime Interventionist / Halftime Literacy Coach; worked with 5th graders in pull-out intervention settings	12	Yes	English and Spanish	Observation Field Notes, Interview, Artifacts
Ms. White	5th Grade Math and Science Teacher	5	Yes	English and Spanish	Observation Field Notes, Interview, Artifacts
Ms. Ramond	Special Education teacher for lower grades	7	Yes	English and Spanish	Interview

Ms. Callahan. During the year of this study, Ms. Callahan taught the literacy portion of the grade. This meant that she had two main groups of fifth grade students. She taught literacy to one in the morning, and then taught the same lessons again to the second group in the afternoon. Her literacy instruction included reading and writing, and incorporated social studies. She spent

three weeks teaching in each language. Ms. White would teach in the other language during this time, so that students could get half days in each language.

Ms. Callahan held a Masters of Arts in elementary education, and the year of this study was her 6th year teaching. She had previously taught on a Native American reservation and a charter school, and this was her 3rd year at Córdoba. She had studied Spanish in high school and college, including a year spent in Chile. Her training in bilingual teaching methods came mostly from professional developments at Córdoba, and she had received an English Language Acquisition – Spanish (ELA-S) certification through her school's district. This involved completing requirements for the English Language Acquisition -Transitional (ELA-T) certification and passing a Spanish Language Proficiency Exam. At the time of the study, Córdoba's district required all teachers to complete the ELA-T courses by May of the first-year teaching. This was 39.5 hours total of coursework and included training on academic language in the content areas and English Language Development or sheltered instruction.

Though she often expressed feeling challenged to provide instruction at an adequate level of Spanish, she spoke, read and wrote fluently. She worked hard to plan lessons in both English and Spanish and adhered to the allocated language of instruction. Ms. Callahan was very interested in learning more about DL and special education, and had enthusiastically offered her classroom as a space for me to volunteer, observe, participate as well as collect data.

In my findings section, I describe the approaches Ms. Callahan took to create a safe, culturally and linguistically responsive classroom with appropriate tiers of support for her various learners.

Ms. Kern. Ms. Kern worked as a half-time intervention, halftime special education teacher. This was her 11th year working with students, all at Córdoba. Her first position was as a

paraprofessional in a self-contained classroom, which the school no longer had at the time of the study. After a year in this position, she enrolled in a special education teaching program with a local state university. During her last two years as a teacher in the self-contained setting, she also earned a Masters in reading intervention. Eventually, the self-contained program was cut because of funding and Ms. Kern moved into the position she had during the year of this study, where she has been for 3 years. Ms. Kern worked with two distinct groups of students: students with existing IEPs and students who did not have IEPs but had been identified as needing intervention services. I explain more about this process in my findings section. Ms. Kern only spoke and taught in English, however she did implement linguistically responsive teaching techniques, as I describe in my findings and discussion. She taught both literacy and math to students in small groups in a separate classroom dedicated to intervention and special education. She saw 11 groups of students a day, and a total of 17 students.

Of these students, 10 had IEPs and 7 were on her intervention caseload. Some groups were formed based on student needs. For example, one of her 5th grade groups consisted of Daniela, a student who did not have an IEP and J who did, but were paired together because they had similar reading needs. She worked with six 5th grade students, and I conducted the majority of my observations with her when she was providing literacy intervention to Arturo, Raul and Karen. These students were selected because they had all been identified as EB students and received intervention services. Thus, I was able to observe and analyze how issues of special education were addressed among EB 5th graders at Córdoba. There were 4 other 5th grade students who met the same criteria. However, their parents did not give consent for them to participate in this study and therefore I do not present any data on these students.

Ms. Sky. At the time of the study, Ms. Sky identified her role as half interventionist and explained that although the other half of her title was officially "senior team leader," it involved coaching and evaluating teachers. Her roles were specifically designated to grades 3-5. Ms. Sky met with Ms. Callahan regularly to discuss lesson plans and the progress of students who were flagged as struggling. Part of her role involved helping teachers decide which students should be referred to intervention services. She also worked with students in small group intervention settings four days a week.

Ms. Sky was trained as an interventionist through *Descrubiendo La Lectura*, which she explained was the Spanish version of Reading Recovery and a 9-credit literacy endorsement. She was previously trained as a literacy coach, and had recently also taken a course through the district on an intervention called "Guided Reading Plus." This program was a small group intervention for students who were reading below grade level, and included a writing and word study component. Ms. Sky used this framework with most of her small groups. She held a Masters in Literacy Instruction, and had previously worked as a Bilingual teacher in another district.

Ms. Sky was bilingual, though based on her description and my observations, she was much stronger in her English-speaking skills. She worked with students who teachers felt could use more support in Spanish and switched between languages when working with students. She would attempt to adhere to the language of their current literacy unit, but explained that as they got closer to transitioning to middle school, which would be all in English, she worked more in English with the students. I explain more about her role and language policies in my findings.

Ms. White. Ms. White was the other 5th grade teacher at Córdoba for the year of my study. She worked with the same group of students as Ms. Callahan, but taught math and science.

For the beginning of the year, she worked with my focal group in the afternoons. Since my focus was on literacy practices, I did not spend too much time in her classroom. However, after several months of data collection, it became clear that I would also gain important insight from observing my students in this setting, especially given that literacy activities were naturally incorporated into her lessons. For example, students used a variety of sources to conduct research for their science projects and presented information in written form.

Ms. White was bilingual in English and Spanish. She learned Spanish in school and from living abroad in Honduras. Though she considered herself to be bilingual, she expressed some hesitation when teaching in Spanish.

Ms. Ramond. Ms. Ramond was an additional special education teacher at Córdoba during the time of my study. She explained that her primary role was to instruct and support students' in their abilities to access classroom instruction. While Ms. Kern's role included supporting students through intervention and special education services, Ms. Ramond *only* worked with students with existing IEPs, in math and literacy. She was bilingual, had completed a TESOL certification program, was about to complete a Masters in Bilingual Education, and had been in her role for 7 years at the time of the study. I did not spend time observing Ms. Ramond, because she only worked with one 5th grader who did not have consent to participate in the study. Nonetheless, she provided valuable insight into the school's MTSS process. I used information obtained from an interview with her to triangulate and support claims I make in my findings regarding the school's ability to collaborate and avoid unnecessary referrals to special education.

Students. The participants in this study included two groups of fifth grade students who received literacy instruction from Ms. Callahan in both English and Spanish. There were 40

students with a mix of racial and ethnic backgrounds, linguistic backgrounds and intervention services (See Table 3 below.)

Table 3: Overview of 5th Graders at Córdoba

Demographic	Number of Students
Racial / Ethnic Categories	
Latino/a	29
White	11
Students receiving Intervention services	10
Students receiving Intervention services in literacy	8
Students with IEPs	2
Students identified as English Language Learners	20
Total Number of Students Enrolled	40

While I spent time working with and observing most of the 5th graders, my field notes focused specifically on those who had been identified as Latino/a, had Spanish spoken at home and were identified as struggling academically. Table 4 displays an overview of the focal students for this study.

Table 4: Focal students and services received

Name	Language strength (as identified by teachers)	Identified as ELL / EB (Yes or No)	Intervention services received	Years at Córdoba	Years in Intervention at Córdoba
Jennifer	Spanish	Yes	Math with Ms. Kern Literacy	6	4

			with Ms. Sky		
Andrea	Spanish	Yes	Math with Ms. Kern Literacy with Ms. Sky	6	4
Daniela	Spanish	Yes	Math with Ms. Kern Literacy with Ms. Kern	1	1
Raúl	English	Yes	Literacy with Ms. Kern	3	3
Arturo	English	Yes	Literacy with Ms. Kern	6	3
Karen	Spanish	Yes	Literacy with Ms. Sky (until February) Literacy with Ms. Kern (from February to June)	5	4

Although some of the students were described by their teachers as being "English-dominant," they were all considered English Language Learners (or EBs) according to their ACCESS scores. All of these students came from households with Spanish-speaking family members. Raul and Arturo had bilingual households, while mostly Spanish was spoken at Jennifer, Andrea, Daniela and Karen's households. Based on formal and informal assessments, all of the above students were flagged as "struggling," and referred to intervention services.

Identifying students as struggling was a collaborative process in the 5th Grade and was done through the school's MTSS process. The teachers spent the first month of school observing and evaluating their students using a combination of information from previous teachers, and informal and formal assessments. For literacy, Ms. Callahan relied on reading assessments in both English and Spanish that were administered within the first month of school. She used the Developmental Reading Assessment, Second Edition, PLUS (DRA2+), a formative reading assessment in English in which teachers observe, record, and evaluate changes in student reading performance. A student's DRA2 level reflects the student's oral reading fluency with 95% accuracy, and comprehension with 90% at independent performance levels. A score of 40 is considered grade level for the beginning of 5th grade. All of the students identified as struggling received scores of 38 or lower. The students were also assessed in Spanish literacy, using the Spanish equivalent of DRA2, the second edition of the Evaluación del desarrollo de la lectura (EDL2+). 5th graders at Córdoba who scored below grade level on the DRA2 in English were automatically considered for Tier 2 literacy interventions with Ms. Kern or Ms. Sky. The ultimate decision about student grouping was made at a meeting among 5th grade teachers and interventionists in a scheduled MTSS meeting.

 In addition to the reading scores, teachers took into consideration any notes from the students' previous teachers and observations of students' reading habits within the first month of 5th grade. Furthermore, students' language proficiency, learning styles and behavior needs when making grouping decisions. By 5th grade, all of focal students, with the exception of Daniela who was new to Córdoba, had been in intervention services the previous year with Ms. Kern or Ms. Sky. Thus, these two practitioners were able to provide insight during the first MTSS meeting of

the school year about what Tier 2 services might meet their needs. In the findings and discussion chapters, I spend time analyzing this implementation of the RTI model.

It is also interesting to note that students who only scored below grade level on the ELD2+ were not identified as needing interventions in Spanish from one of the school's specialist. Instead, these students were placed in the Spanish Language Development (SLD) block with Ms. White for the 45-minute daily L2 block. Or, the information was used to make referral decisions about students. For example, if after intervention services, a student were not to show progress in both languages, he/she might be considered for special education.

The overall information gathered from the first month of observing and assessing students' literacy levels and needs was used to determine Ms. Callahan's guided reading groups, which I also discuss in the findings when I give examples of Tier 1 instruction. In February, students were re-tested and teachers reconvened to discuss their progress. Decisions about students in Tier 2 intervention were re-examined, and some students were moved to different intervention groups based on their progress. Ultimately, the decision to have students work with Ms. Kern and/or Ms. Sky in Tier 2 intervention settings was based on a combination of standardized assessments and teacher observation. Below, I include more in-depth profiles about each student.

Jennifer. Jennifer was an eleven-year-old student at the time of the study. She had been at Córdoba since pre-K, and had two older siblings who also attended the school. She was a cheerful and talkative student, who was eager to participate in most of her classes. Jennifer was bilingual, and spoke mostly in Spanish with her family members and friends. She would often offer ideas and responses in Spanish during instruction, even when conversations and lessons were in English. She loved reading, dancing, and spending time with her family and friends. She

received intervention services in literacy at the time of the study, and special education services in Math. She received both of these services in bilingual settings and within small groups alongside other 5th grade students with similar academic needs. Jennifer was friendly and talkative, and very social with her peers. She struggled to complete many assignments independently, and worked very well when supported by teachers, interventionists, and myself.

Andrea. Andrea was a ten-year-old girl who lived in the school's neighborhood had been a student at Córdoba since she was in pre-K, and had received intervention services in both math and literacy for 4 years. She was bilingual, and spent most of her time outside of school speaking with friends and family in Spanish. She showed a preference for speaking in Spanish. When given a choice, she asked for materials in Spanish. Andrea and Jennifer were good friends. Teachers often felt challenged to have them be productive when they were working in the same small group, because they would want to speak to one another. Andrea did not often volunteer to participate during whole class and small group lessons. She often resisted my assistance, and said that she would prefer to work alone. She struggled to complete independent reading and writing tasks in the classroom, but very much enjoyed her intervention services and participated more in this small group setting outside of the classroom. For her literacy intervention services, she worked with Ms. Sky, and usually chose to speak with her in Spanish.

Daniela. Daniela was new to Córdoba and eleven-years-old at the time of the study. Her case was an interesting one, because she had previously attended a local charter school that seemingly followed a different special education process than the district's public schools. As I discuss more in my findings section when I explore the implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) at Córdoba, a team of school practitioners met regularly to discuss and monitor Daniela's progress and interventions. At the beginning of the school year, the following

was written about her under the caption "relevant information": "New to Córdoba this year (16-17). Was formally on a IEP for speech from last school with a math and literacy goal but when reevaluated this year, did not qualify." I found her case confusing, because of the disconnect and misunderstandings between the Charter school which she had previously attended and Córdoba. Nonetheless, through the duration of the study, Daniela received intervention services in both literacy and math. Both these services were with Ms. Kern, and thus only in English. At the end of the school year, she had not been referred to special education services and graduated from Córdoba with her 5th grade peers.

Daniela was able to decode and comprehend second grade level text in both English and Spanish. She made several grammatical errors in her writing in both languages, and it was often hard to follow or comprehend her thoughts as a reader. Daniela was very kind to her classmates and teachers, and participated in class activities willingly, though she often had trouble following along. She needed additional time when responding to questions. During whole class instruction, it was helpful for me to sit by her side and repeat questions the teacher asked. She would often discuss an idea with me quietly first before feeling confident to share with the whole class. From the beginning of the school year, Daniela welcomed my assistance and often expressed gratitude when I helped her.

Raúl. Raúl was a ten-year old fun-loving enthusiastic 5th grader at Córdoba at the time of the study. I include several anecdotes and examples of his participation and our interactions in my findings and discussion. Raúl was a simultaneous bilingual learner, and felt more confident speaking, reading and writing in English. He had two older siblings, and he spoke mostly in English with them and his mother, but exclusively in Spanish with his father. At the beginning of 5th grade, Raúl scored at a 4th grade level on the DRA2 and a 2nd grade level on the ELD2+. His

teachers had made the decision to focus on English texts and writing with Raúl this school year, because he was identified as struggling and his teachers thought it would be best to put more effort into one language. I analyze this decision in my findings and discussion, as it does not seem to be supported by literature in the field of bilingual education.

Raúl was an avid baseball player, and he cared deeply for his family. He lived about 40 minutes away, and commuted to attend Córdoba. He was very eager to share personal stories, including successes and challenges going on his life. I worked with him often during the year of the study. I supported him in small groups and individual reading and writing activities. He worked with Ms. Kern in a small intervention group daily, and I observed this weekly.

Arturo. Arturo was a sensitive, bright, ten-year-old boy at the time of the study. He had been at Córdoba since pre-K, and his older sister had also attended the school and was now in high school. Arturo lived in the neighborhood, and walked to and from school on his own as a 5th grader. He was very responsible, and took his schooling seriously. Arturo participated often in both small group and whole class activities. He was a simultaneous bilingual, but spent most of his out of school time with friends and family members who spoke English, and he showed a strong preference for reading and writing in English. Like Raúl, his teachers had made the decision to provide him with mostly English texts and assignments, and he showed resistance when I tried to work with him in Spanish. He qualified for Tier 2 interventions because of his low reading scores. Like the other focal students, he had previously received Tier 2 support, and his teachers believed that he would benefit from this again as a 5th grader. He worked with Ms. Kern in intervention services, and while he and Raúl would sometimes get distracted and talk to each other, he would typically remain focused and engaged in class activities. He struggled to

work independently on classroom tasks, but accepted my assistance graciously and worked very well with teacher and small group supports.

Karen. Karen was a soft-spoken ten-year-old girl at the time of this study who took her studies seriously. She had attended Córdoba since first grade. Karen commuted to attend Córdoba, but her grandmother lived in the neighborhood and provided a lot of care for her and her younger sister before and after school. Karen was bilingual, and when she was not in school, she spoke mostly in Spanish with her grandmother and sister. She often responded in Spanish when given the option, but was also able to code-switch easily. Karen loved to read and write, and did so about 2 grades below level in both English and Spanish. She was very focused during lessons and volunteered to participate often. She often needed extra time to process her reading and formulate her verbal and written thoughts, though she rarely showed frustration or discouragement. Despite her quiet demeanor, Karen loved to sing and performed a solo in the school's talent show. She was very loving to her friends and teachers, including me, and eager to improve her reading and writing skills. Karen received intervention services in literacy. She began the year working with Ms, Sky so that she could have bilingual support. In February, her teachers decided that she would benefit from more instruction in English, and was then switched to an intervention group with Ms. Kern. Ms. Kern met with her, Arturo, and Raúl daily for the remainder of the year.

Research Design: Case Study

For this analysis, I used an exploratory case study approach, with the 5th grade Tier 1 instruction, and Tier 2 interventions as the unit of analysis. One upper grade classroom provided my main sources of data, though I developed relationships with many faculty members throughout the course of the year. Creswell (2014) described Case Studies as a method "in which

the researcher develops an in-depth analysis of a case." (p. 20). The length of my study allowed for a full ethnographic investigation of a specific classroom, as well as the school's MTSS process.

Data Collection. In order to address my research questions and examine how issues of special education were addressed in a DL setting with specific focus on RTI implementation, I conducted a 6-month case study at Escuela Córdoba. This prolonged period of time in the field allowed me to "develop an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon under study and can convey detail about the site and the people that lends credibility to the narrative account" (Creswell 2014, p. 202). I spent the majority of first semester of the school year as a volunteer, developing a relationship with Ms. Callahan, Ms. Kern, as well as other school practitioners, students and parents.

In the upper grades at Córdoba, classrooms were separated by literacy and math with content areas. Each teacher worked with two classes of students, as students spent half of their day with the literacy teacher, and the other half of the day in the math and content classroom. Within each classroom, the literacy teachers spent half of their total time instructing in English and the other half in Spanish. The specific allocation between days and weeks varied based on each grade level and the decisions made by teachers. However, each teacher aimed for an overall 50/50 instructional balance between the two languages.

During the year of this study, the two 5th grade teachers had chosen to instruct students in each language for three weeks at a time. Table 5 below shows the language allocation for 5th grade.

Table 5: Language Allocation

Weeks 1-3 of School	
Mornings	**Afternoons**

Class A (20 students)	Literacy with Ms. Callahan (3 weeks in English)	Math and Science with Ms. White. (3 weeks in Spanish)
Class B (20 students)	Math and Science with Ms. White. (3 weeks in Spanish)	Literacy with Ms. Callahan (3 weeks in English)

Weeks 3-6 of School

	Mornings	**Afternoons**
Class A (20 students)	Literacy with Ms. Callahan (3 weeks in Spanish)	Math and Science with Ms. White (3 weeks in English)
Class B (20 students)	Math and Science with Ms. White (3 weeks in English)	Literacy with Ms. Callahan (3 weeks in Spanish)

In February, the teachers decided to switch which group they saw in the mornings and afternoons. Thus, for the second half of the day, students in Class A were with Ms. Callahan in the afternoons for literacy. It was important for me to collect data from lessons in both English and Spanish so that I could adequately observe and analyze if and how teachers used linguistic tools that a DL setting can provide to support struggling students.

Because issues of language acquisition and special education are most prominent in literacy (Klingner, Artiles & Barletta, 2006), I focused my observations on instruction in the literacy class. I also felt that it was important to observe a higher grade at the elementary level because of previous research showing that EB students are more likely to be placed in special education in higher grades (Artiles et al., 2005). This pattern may be attributed teachers allowing more time for EBs to transition to English before evaluating for special education (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002). Furthermore, there is little existing research on RTI for EB students in the higher grades. The selection of this focal classroom was also partially out of convenience. I sought input from the principal and other staff members about which teachers would be willing to participate

in the study. I began this process in the Fall of 2014 and was placed with Ms. Callahan, who was both interested in learning more about the bilingual / special education interface, and was eager to receive my input and assistance in her classroom.

Participant Observations. I spent the first few months of school, from late August until Thanksgiving Break, in this classroom as a volunteer, working mostly with the 5th grade literacy teacher Ms. Callahan and Ms. Kern during her intervention sessions. Then, beginning the first week of December, my role shifted to researcher and I conducted participant observations. I visited the school between 1 and 3 times every week for the entire academic year. Lessons and observations ranged from 30-60 minutes, for a total of 38 volunteer hours and 75 hours of data collection as a participant observer. Table 6 displays an overview of my participation. Spending the majority of my time with Ms. Callahan and Ms. Kern provided the necessary data I needed to examine tiers 1 and 2 of the school's RTI model.

Table 6: Researcher Participation

Activity	Teacher	Language	Participation as Volunteer	Participant Observations
Morning Meeting	Ms. Callahan	English and Spanish	14 (7 Spanish; 7 English)	**14** (7 English, 7 Spanish)
Reading	Ms. Callahan	English and Spanish	14 (7 Spanish; 7 English)	**16** (7 Spanish; 9 English)
Writing	Ms. Callahan	English and Spanish	14 (7 Spanish; 7 English)	**14** (7 Spanish; 7 English)
ELD	Ms. Callahan	English	14	**12**
SLD	Ms. White	Spanish	0	**2**

Literacy Intervention	Ms. Kern	English	8	**16**
Literacy Intervention	Ms. Sky	English and Spanish	0	**7** (3 Spanish; 4 English)
Morning Meeting	Ms. White	English and Spanish	0	**4** (2 Spanish, 2 English)
Math	Ms. White	English and Spanish	0	**4** (2 English; 2 Spanish)
Science	Ms. White	English and Spanish	0	**4** (1 Spanish; 3 English)
Special Events (e.g., talent show)	Various	English and Spanish	0	**6**
Total Observations			50	**99**

I took on the role of the participant observer, which Spradley (1980) explained as having the dual purpose of "engaging in activities appropriate to situation" and observing the "activities, people and physical aspects of the situation" (p. 54). This approach required an explicit awareness of occurrences that are usually blocked out through casual observation or participation. For example, teachers often switched between languages during a single interaction with a student. These occurrences might have gone unnoticed or unanalyzed had I not been looking for specific examples of teachers' use of Spanish and English throughout their lessons. I documented observations like these, which I later analyzed and discuss in my findings chapters.

I simultaneously took on the role of an insider and outsider, using myself as a research instrument by reflecting upon my observations and bringing awareness to how my own biases may have informed my interpretation. I spent my visits alongside the students and teachers. Sometimes, the teacher I was observing would ask for input during a lesson. For example, during Ms. Kern's lessons, students would often point out cognates between words in English and Spanish. Since Ms. Kern did not speak Spanish, she would ask me if there was a need for clarification, though she primarily relied upon the knowledge of her students. When working with Ms. Callahan, I assisted her as needed. During whole group activities, I circulated and assisted students individually with any given task. Ms. Callahan also implemented guided reading daily, and at certain points throughout the year, I was tasked with working with a specific group of students. Often times during writing lessons, Ms. Callahan would ask that I work with specific students who needed more individualized support. Furthermore, I accompanied Ms. White on a walking field trip when she needed an extra set of hands.

I attended special school wide events, such as the school talent show and graduation. This was done in part to gain deeper insight into community, but also to support the students and teachers. For example, shortly after President Trump's inauguration, the school held an event one evening to answer questions families might have about immigration. An immigration lawyer attended and the event was held all in Spanish. For after school events such as these, I would bring my 1 year old daughter to the childcare provided, and many of the 5th grade students took a special interest in playing with her.

After each visit, I documented the activities I observed and those in which I participated with focus on how they related to addressing EBs who were identified by their teachers as struggling academically. I began my observations with an inductive approach, first documenting

all the activities. Then, in an effort to contribute to the field's knowledge of successful implementation of RTI for EBs, I focused my observations more closely on approaches that seemed to benefit these students. I brought my computer with me daily and recorded observations. I did not spend too much time on my computer during observations, because I wanted to be more present in the activities. After each visit, I spent 2-4 hours elaborating on my field notes, transcribing interviews, and writing analytic memos. Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2014) described an analytic memo as "a brief or extended narrative that documents the researcher's reflections and thinking processes about the data" (p. 95). These reports allowed me to capture thoughts and themes that emerge throughout data collection. Furthermore, the process of writing memos enabled me to make changes to the data collection process based on my analytic needs. For example, the special education / intervention teacher, Ms. Kern, was not someone I had planned to observe as much as I did. However, she explained that her lessons with her 5th graders would often span two days. Therefore, I ended up shifting my schedule to allow for consecutive days of observing her work with some focal students. This gave me the opportunity to gain deeper insight into the connections she was making between reading and writing for her students. I discuss this example more in my findings section.

Interviews. I also conducted semistructured interviews with the focal teachers in order to gain insight into the special education process at the school. Interviews were conducted at Córdoba, in the interviewee's classroom at agreed upon times. I used Spradley's (1979) suggestions on ethnographic interviews, including the tip that, "a few minutes of easygoing talk interspersed here and there throughout the interview will pay enormous dividends in rapport" (p. 59). This dynamic was somewhat inevitable, given that I had formed friendly relationships with the practitioners over my time at the school. However, I followed my interview protocol to

ensure that the purpose of my interviews remained central. A list of sample questions can be found in the appendices. I included questions about each teacher's education and teaching background in bilingual and/or special education in order to get a sense of the expertise of the school's staff members. I also asked specific questions that pertained to observations I had made up until that point. Furthermore, I asked each interviewee about the MTSS process at the school. This provided me with various perspectives on the school's approach to addressing issues of special education. I used the information in these interviews to support claims that I made mostly through my participant observations.

      Researcher Role. Before beginning a doctorate program in Educational Equity and Cultural Diversity, I spent several years as special education teacher in DL elementary schools, where I worked with educators who believed in the value of bilingual education. My colleagues and I constantly re-evaluated our policies regarding language allocation, sought out rich literature in Spanish, and emphasized a pride in bilingualism and biliteracy. The school communities addressed issues of access and educational equity as it related to students of color and EBs. Despite our shared dedication to change deficit perspectives of our students' language acquisition process, we still noted disturbing patterns of marginalization and disagreements about how to address issues of special education. There were much higher numbers of Latino/a native Spanish speaking students with stigmatizing special education labels when compared to White native English speakers. My experiences in the classroom contributed to my pursuit of a PhD in Educational Equity and Cultural Diversity, as well as my interest in researching the topic of this study. Furthermore, because of my background as an elementary school teacher, I was perceived as such by the participants in the study. Teachers asked for my input after I observed lessons, and students asked for help with instructional tasks and confided in me about personal issues. While

all the teachers at the school were called by their last names, I went by Ms. Vanessa. This was a small attempt on my part to shift my role from one non-authoritative. Nonetheless, it was clear that the students still saw me as a teacher.

Spending time at Córdoba before data collection facilitated a stronger relationship with teachers and other staff members. More importantly, one of my main goals was to ensure that the participants would "receive the benefits" of my research (Creswell 2014, p. 98). Ms. Callahan and I met periodically throughout the year in order to brainstorm and discuss possible teaching practices that would benefit her students. I shared articles and other resources with her based on our conversations and her requests, and assisted in the classroom as needed. I hope that my presence there was able to relieve some of the stress that comes when instructing 20 students.

Most importantly, I kept Paris's (2011) description of "humanizing research" in mind as I conducted my participant observations. He stated that one of the key elements of this approach is "building reciprocal relationships of dignity and care" and encouraged researchers "to share of ourselves as we ask people to share of themselves" (p. 140). Building on these recommendations, I connected with students and shared information about myself and my family. At the time of the study, I lived, and still live in the community and continue to run into students when I am out walking with my two small children. When this happens, they are always extremely friendly encounters, and the students tell me about school, their families and their extracurricular activities. I discuss more on my role as a researcher, and my ability to share in the lives of my students in my findings section.

Data Analysis. After each visit, I documented the activities I observed and those in which I participated with focus on how they related to addressing the needs of EBs who were struggling academically. I spent time after each visit elaborating upon my field notes, transcribing

interviews, and writing analytic memos. Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2014) describe an analytic memo as "a brief or extended narrative that documents the researcher's reflections and thinking processes about the data" (p. 95). These reports allowed me to capture thoughts and themes that emerged throughout data collection. Furthermore, the process of writing memos enabled me to make changes to the data collection process based on my analytic needs. For example, writing a memo about Ms. Kern helped me realize the importance of her role and make the decision to spend more time in her intervention setting. Another primary aspect of these memos was the creation of "pattern codes," initial hypotheses or assertions that were then "tested" against additional data sources (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2014). Pattern codes link descriptive and interpretive codes, and therefore tend to be causal and explanatory in nature. Thus, I used these analytic memos to begin the coding process, elaborate on emerging themes and draw conclusions about my findings.

Coding. I began by taking an inductive approach to coding through an examination of the data and memos to see what patterns emerged from teachers' interviews and observations. I specifically looked for approaches the school practitioners took to address issues of special education. I coded field notes, interview transcripts, portions of observations were transcribed, and my analytic memos. Following the recommendations of Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2014), I first created a list of master codes based on the major patterns I observed for example, "use of multicultural materials," and, "example of translanguaging" in both tier 1 and tier 2 settings. Then, I grouped the codes into four master appropriate master categories: *Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching, Response to Intervention, Collaboration,* and *Explicit Language Instruction.* These major categories informed my decision about how to organize the findings section. I also created additional sub-categories as necessary to give more specific

deductive codes. During this coding process, I specifically looked for positive examples of instruction that supported EBs who had been identified as struggling.

Validity. This was an exploratory study and therefore relied upon researcher interpretation in order to create findings. Nonetheless, the nature of a case study offered the unique opportunity for extended and intense contact with the participants, which Carspecken (1996) identified as one strategy qualitative researchers can use to support validity claims.

Furthermore, as Creswell recommended, I used multiple approaches to enhance the accuracy of my findings. I triangulated different data sources of information by including evidence from a variety of sources in order to strengthen my claims. For example, I incorporated information gathered during interviews from both special educators as well as data from observations to interpret the school's Response to Intervention model. Using various data sources helped justify the claims I make in my findings. Furthermore, I use "rich, thick descriptions" (Crewsell 2014, p. 202) to convey my findings and paint a descriptive picture of what I observed. As explained in my role as a researcher, I recognized the assumptions I brought to the study, and therefore continuously reflected upon how this bias may have influenced my interpretation of data. Furthermore, I spent several hours a week in the setting over the prolonged period of time of a full academic year to develop an in-depth understanding of the focal issues. Upon completion of the study, I continued to remain in contact with Ms. Callahan and other community members, and I asked Ms. Callahan follow-up questions when I felt the need to add to descriptions or evidence in my finds. Finally, I relied upon support of my peers who continuously offered debriefing sessions and provided valuable feedback on interpretations, thus adding to the validity of findings.

Technology and Software

The documents that were coded and analyzed were low-inference field notes, activity logs, transcripts, lesson plans and student work. Field notes were taken using Microsoft Word and transcriptions were done using the software Transana. Analytic memos were typed in Word. All documents used pseudonyms and were saved on an external hard drive to protect the identities of the participants.

Field notes, memos and transcripts were all uploaded into Dedoose, a cross-platform application for analyzing qualitative and mixed methods research data. Typing in Word allowed for faster note taking than writing notes by hand, and Dedoose facilitated the process of coding and organizing themes.

Chapter 4: Addressing Special Education through RTI at Córdoba

The students walk into class, sweaty and tired from Physical Education. Some take sips of water as they glance towards the Promethean Board. Others come straight to the rug, sit down and look at the message their teacher had previously typed up. There is some chatter as a few students are having side conversations about different topics. Ms. Callahan offers a gentle reminder, "Ghost Peppers, it's fine to get a quick drink of water, but please find your rug spot and read the morning message." Within a few minutes, all of the students are seated. Most of them are on the rug, and two are at their desks. Most students look up at the Promethean Board and read the message:

Dear Ghost Peppers,

Happy Picture Day! We will take our class picture at 11:25 before lunch. This morning, we will also talk about what curiosity looks like throughout the day.
This evening, there is an important event at Córdoba from 5:30-7:30 about immigration laws to help families know their rights. Please remind your families to come if it would be useful for them!

Sincerely,
Ms. Callahan

Ms. Callahan asks for the students to look at her after they are done reading, so that she knows when to move on. After a few minutes, she addresses the class: "This morning, we are going to do 'air high fives.' Please give the person on either side of you an air high five, so, without touching. The students take turns greeting each other in this manner. The two students, who are at their desks, come to the rug for this activity. It happens quickly and fairly quietly. Once they have finished, Ms. Callahan continues to address the class. "Some of you have requested to do 'secret' valentines with your classmates this year. Ms. White and I have talked about it, and we've decided that it's not a good idea. We don't want anyone to be forgotten or feel left out. If you want to bring in valentines, please do so for the whole class." Some students whine, and protest. Ms. Callahan calmly and quietly says that they've made the decision, repeating that they don't want anyone's feelings to be hurt, and that she is going to move on. This is not mentioned again.

The teacher continues addressing the class, repeating what's written in the morning message about Picture Day and the event regarding immigration laws. At this point, she switches to Spanish, essentially translating what is written on the board, and then adding, still in Spanish, that she will be there. She then asks if students feel comfortable, to give a thumbs if their family members plan to be there. 3 students give a thumbs up. Ms. Callahan explains that the meeting will be all in Spanish, and then she switches to English and repeats this, adding that she will be there to help translate if anyone needs. She asks if there are any questions, and one student asks about dinner. Ms. Callahan explains that there will be pizza served, and childcare provided. She mentions that I will be there with my 1 year old, and that I can help translate as well. Some students express excitement over the pizza and the fact that they will get to see my daughter, but there are no more questions and the timer goes off indicating that the morning meeting is over, and students transition to L2 instruction.

The above vignette is an example of a typical morning during my year of observation in Ms. Callahan's classroom. Students knew the structure and routines, and what to expect daily. There were clear expectations and norms. While most students were asked to sit on the rug, a few students were allowed to sit at their desks in order to meet their individual needs. The message was written in English, which was the language of instruction for that day. However, when Ms. Callahan felt it was necessary, she translated the important information to Spanish and added more pertinent details, thus allowing for flexibility in the language allocation. Finally, the content of the message was important, connecting to many students' lives given the recent political events.

In the next two chapters, I analyze this example and include others to address my research questions:

1. How are issues of special education addressed in one Dual Language setting including issues of referral, evaluation and placement?

2. What strategies are used through Response to Intervention for supporting EB students who struggle academically?

   a. What does Tier 1 instruction look like one Dual Language school that implements Response to Intervention?

   b. What does Tier 2 instruction look like in a Dual Language school that implements Response to Intervention?

The manner in which Ms. Callahan led the morning meeting highlights the well-established routine and is an example of strong tier 1 instruction. Allowing certain students to sit at their desks is one of Ms. Callahan's many differentiation techniques. Furthermore, the content of the morning message and the manner in which Ms. Callahan led the meeting is an example of her implementation of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching (CLRT), which I address in the next chapter. In this chapter, I explain how issues of special education were addressed at Córdoba through RTI and provide details of tier 1 and 2 instruction.

Multi-Tier Systems of Supports (MTSS) and Response to Intervention (RTI)

Córdoba implemented a larger support system referred to as Multi-Tier Systems of Supports (MTSS), which incorporates both Response to Intervention (RTI) as well as Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS). RTI refers to the practice of providing multi-tiered and high-quality instruction to match students' needs (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). This intervention involves monitoring student progress frequently and making data-driven decisions about the need for intervention and/or special education services. Like RTI, PBIS is a multi-tiered, data driven approach, but its focus is on addressing student behaviors. Both RTI and PBIS aim at

targeting individual student needs and applying research-based interventions (Averill & Rinaldi, 2011). MTSS incorporates both RTI and PBIS in order to provide system-wide structures and practices through multiple levels of support. For this study, I focused on the implementation of RTI within the larger MTSS framework in order to focus on academic supports in literacy. Below, I elaborate on the RTI model used at Córdoba.

Ortiz et al. (2011) revealed how through the use of this multi-tiered instructional approach, bilingual educators are in a position to prevent inappropriate special education referrals of EBs, because of the potential expertise they hold regarding language acquisition and learning. At Escuela Córdoba, only 2 of the 40 fifth graders were identified with a disability and received special education services during the year of this study. Table 7 below again provides an overview of the 5th graders at Córdoba, highlighting the number of students who were identified as ELLs, received intervention services and had IEPs.

Table 7: 5th Graders at Córdoba

Demographic	Number of Students
Racial / Ethnic Categories	
Latino/a	29
White	11
Students receiving Intervention services	10
Students receiving Intervention services in literacy	8
Students with IEPs	2
Students identified as English Language Learners	20
Total Number of Students Enrolled	40

At first, I was skeptical about the low number of students who received special education services, fearing that certain students might not be receiving the support they needed. However, 10 of the 40 5th grade students *did* in fact receive additional support from interventionists, which qualified as tier 2 supports. In the discussion, I address the fact that while teachers tried to avoid unnecessary referrals to special education for Latino/a students, *all* of the 5th graders who received intervention services and who had IEPs were Latino/a.

I attended whole class and small group lessons and focused my attention on 6 students who had been identified as EB students and received intervention services. Thus, I was able to observe and analyze how issues of special education were addressed among EB 5th graders at Córdoba. There were 4 other 5th grade students who met the same criteria, but their parents did not give consent for them to participate in this study and therefore I do not present any data on these students.

The teachers at this school used instructional and assessment practices that had been validated with similar populations (e.g., EB students), and they worked hard to develop an understanding of students' abilities across languages. This contributed to strong tier 1 and 2 instruction and prevented unnecessary special education referrals while supporting EB students who struggled academically. Below, I elaborate on some examples of what this looked like and how students responded.

Tier 1 instruction: point of view example. The first tier of instruction for 5th graders at Córdoba occurred in Ms. Callahan and Ms. Winter's general education classrooms. As I described in the Methods chapter, these two teachers would coordinate their language allocation and they divided their instructional time equally between Spanish and English. For example, Ms. Callahan would provide literacy instruction for 3 weeks in English while Ms. White conducted

her math and science activities in Spanish. After they completed a 3-week period, which usually involved a single unit of study, the teachers would switch their language of instruction. For the first half of the school year, Ms. Callahan met with the same group of 20 students each morning. These students would then see Ms. White in the afternoons. In February, this was switched and my focal group had literacy instruction with Ms. Callahan in the afternoons.

Most of my observations took place in Ms. Callahan's classroom, and there were several examples of strong tier 1 instruction that was aimed to meet the needs of a variety of learners. During typical literacy lessons, Ms. Callahan would model a task with the whole class sitting on the rug for about 15 or 20 minutes. She explained to me early in the school year that her goal was to not have them sit for too long, understanding that they were likely to disengage with the academic content after about 15 minutes. Reading and writing tasks were often connected by having students write about texts they were reading as a class or in small group. For example, in February, Ms. Callahan led the students through a unit in English on Point of View. (See Appendix A for the full unit plan). The main learning target for this unit was written as: *How a narrator's or speaker's POV influences how events are described.* The assessment was listed as: Essay analyzing the impact of the narrator's point of view on the way events are told in novel read for group. This 5th grade unit met the following Common Core Standards:

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.5.1
Quote accurately from a text when explaining what the text says explicitly and when drawing inferences from the text.
CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.5.2
Determine a theme of a story, drama, or poem from details in the text, including how characters in a story or drama respond to challenges or how the speaker in a poem reflects upon a topic; summarize the text.
CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.5.5
Explain how a series of chapters, scenes, or stanzas fits together to provide the overall structure of a particular story, drama, or poem.
CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.5.6
Describe how a narrator's or speaker's point of view influences how events are described.

The following example is taken from the second week of the unit, when students read the story *Two Bad Ants* by Chris Van Allsburg, and then worked as a class to analyze the illustrations and text, and compared and contrasted points of view. Afterwards, the students applied their knowledge of point of view by completing similar tasks with their own texts. I chose to describe this particular lesson in detail because it is a strong example of typical instruction in Ms. Callahan's literacy class, and illustrates several strong tier 1 teaching strategies, including a Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and differentiation.

Two Bad Ants. In the picture book, *Two Bad Ants* by Chris Van Allsburg, an ant scout returns home with a "mysterious crystal," which is fact a sugar crystal, and the queen ant declares that it is the most delicious food she has ever tasted. That evening the other ants set off on a journey to fetch home as many of these crystals as they can carry. The narrator portrays this journey to a person's kitchen from the perspective of the ants, and describes how they travel up the "mountain," which is in fact a wall, and their encounter with a "large scoop," a spoon, and "hot brown liquid," or coffee. The human kitchen is described as foreign and dangerous place from the ants' point of view. They manage one narrow escape after another until finally they decide to choose one last crystal each and leave the strange and frightening scene.

Ms. Callahan read the book as a read aloud to the class. She started by first building on students' background knowledge and making a connection to another book, *Encounter* that had been a read aloud text. She presented the slide from the previous day on the Promethean Board, reminding students what they had worked on as a class:

> *"How does the point of view impact the way events are described in Encounter?"*
> *Answer in a paragraph or more.*
> *Ideas:*
> - *Includes how people lived before Europeans arrived*
> - *Includes the dream*

- *Talks about his experience and what he things about what's going on*
- *Since he's a boy from the tribe, he was taken away, but also not listened to*
- *He had never seen a sword -described as a "pointed stick," and others: bells, mirrors, guns, necklaces, ships, hats*
- *Makes you think but shows what he's talking about*

Ms. Callahan continued to address the class and explained that they were going to continue to explore the same concept, but with a new text. She presented a new slide with the question: How does the *point of view* impact the way events are described in *Two Bad Ants?* She explained how she was going to read the book out loud to the class, and ask for ideas to share ideas. She read the first page and then paused and the following interaction took place as a whole class:

> Ms. Callahan: What is the point of view?
> Daniela: The narrator
> Ms. Callahan: Yes, the narrator is telling the story. Who is the narrator talking about?
> Daniela: The ants?
> Ms. Callahan: The ants. So the point of view is from the ants. Let's see how this impacts the way the events are described.

Ms. Callahan read a few more pages, pausing to ask clarifying questions. For example, she asked students to explain what the author meant when he described the ants as climbing a giant mountain (the wall of a building) or being thrown into a brown lake (a cup of coffee). For some questions, she would ask the whole class and choose volunteers to respond. At one point, she asked students to share thoughts with a partner before responding. She made sure that students were clear on the book's events based on the author's description. She added a sub-question to what was already displayed on the Promethean Board, and asked the students to describe the point of view. She recorded students' responses so that the following was displayed:

How does the point of view impact the way events are described in Two Bad Ants?
- *Describe the point of view*
   - *Ants' point of view, 3rd person*
   - *Not just one ant*

Point of View Writing Task. Ms. Callahan read this text with the students on a Thursday. On the following Monday, during the allocated writing time, she shared a writing plan for the week with the students. The entire class sat on the rug, and she first explained verbally that students would be writing essays about the books they were reading in their small groups. She presented a slide on the Promethean Board with the following text:

> *Essay (4 paragraphs or more)*
> *How does the point of view influence the way events are described in* _____ ?
>   *(your small group reading book)*
>
> <u>*Timeline*</u>
> *Today: Planning*
> *Tuesday: Drafting*
> *Wednesday /Thursday: Revising*
> *Friday: Editing*

She read the information out loud and talked through it with the class, explaining that they would first watch a video about Point of View, and then discuss how the point of view impacts the way events are described in different texts. The video, from flocabulary.com included a rap song about point of view with the following lyrics included:

> Everybody wants to know my point view.
> 1st person is me, 2nd person is you.
>
> Everybody wants to know my POV.
> 1st person is me, 2nd person is you.
> 3rd person is he, 3rd person is she.
> (Retrieved from: https://www.flocabulary.com/unit/point-of-view/)

The students were very attentive during this video, and by the end, many were singing along with the chorus. After the video, Ms. Callahan presented a new slide on the Promethean Board with the question: How does the *<u>point of view</u>* <u>impact</u> the way events are described in *Two Bad Ants*? This was the same question she had explored with the students the previous week when they completed the read aloud, though she had used other verbs besides "impact," such as "influence" and "affect." The word choice was also explored during her mini-lessons, as she led students in

discussions about other verbs that held similar meanings. Later, I describe how this explicit focus on language and vocabulary was another successful teaching technique that Ms. Callahan used to support her EB students.

Students were given a minute to share ideas about the question: *How does the* <u>point of view</u> *impact the way events are described in* Two Bad Ants*?* with their assigned carpet partners. At the beginning of the year, Ms. Callahan explained to me that she had made up "rug spots" based on a variety of factors, including linguistic backgrounds, academic strengths and needs, and student behaviors. She attempted to place students in positions on the rug that would facilitate learning and offer certain students support. For example, she tried to place students with different linguistic skills next to one another so that they could support each other in different tasks. These students were assigned "partners" for tasks that involved sharing ideas during whole-class instruction. Therefore, Amanda, a soft-spoken student who had strong English speaking, writing and reading skills, was partnered with Alán, a very vocal student with strong Spanish speaking, reading and writing skills. Thus, when Ms. Callahan posed a question to the whole class, students knew who their assigned partners were, and were able to quickly engage in the speaking task.

This seemed to be beneficial for students who needed more support in the language of the lesson. For example, when it was time for Amanda and Alán to share ideas, Amanda generally participated eagerly, whereas Alán often remained quiet. This occurred in both languages. However, hearing Amanda's input seemed to benefit Alán, because he often raised his hand afterwards and offered his ideas when the whole class reconvened for a discussion. Sometimes, he would repeat something Amanda had said in his own words, and other times, he would come up with an idea. In this example in which Ms. Callahan asked the students to share how the point

of view impacted the way events were described in *Two Bad Ants,* Amanda jumped right in and explained to Alán that everything in the story was giant to the ants. She offered examples of the sugar being perceived as crystals and coffee as a lake. When she was finished speaking, Alán nodded and said that he agreed with her, but he did not offer another example. However, a few minutes later, Alán raised his hand during the whole class discussion and offered a different example, which I document below.

After students had the opportunity to share their thoughts with a partner, Ms. Callahan asked for volunteers to share as a whole class. As each student shared, Ms. Callahan documented the responses using her computer which was connected to the Promethean Board so student responses were recorded and simultaneously displayed for the whole class to view as the following list:

How does the point of view *impact the way events are described in* Two Bad Ants*?*
- *The coffee is described as a boiling lake.*
- *We know when the ants feel anxious.*
- *The wall is described as a mountain and they couldn't see the top.*
- *The sugar is described as crystals.*
- *The running water from the sink is described as a waterfall.*
- *The bread is described as a disk with holes in it.*
- *The mouth of the person is described as a cave.*
- *The outlet is described as a hole or hiding place (They thought it was a safe place).*
- *The narrator talks about what's important to the ants.*

At one point during this conversation, Karen, a student had been identified as an ELL and received intervention services in both literacy and math, shared an example that was already listed. To this, Ms. Callahan responded, "Yes. Great. I think I have that one." She pointed to the example and Karen agreed that it was already there. At another point, Alán raised his hand and the following exchange took place:

Alán: You know the thing to plug?

(Ms. Callahan did not jump in. Instead she waited and this gave another student, Ines, a chance to respond.)
Inés: Oh the outlet
Alán: Yeah, It's like a home
Ms. Callahan (nodding): What did they do in the outlet?
Alán replied: They were hiding there because they thought it was a safe place.
Ms. Callahan (typing her words as she spoke): The outlet is described as a hole or hiding place (They thought it was a safe place).

Ms. Callahan asked if there were any other ideas that students wanted to share, and when no hands went up, she said, "I want to add one more example. The narrator talks about what's important to the ants. This story would be quite different from a person's point of view." She added to the list, "The narrator talks about what's important to the ants," then continued to address the class:

"In a few minutes, you're going to work on this on your own, and make a whole list. You brainstormed for me. You gave me all these examples of how the point of view is important. For my essay, I want two main ways that the point of view affects the story. Today, we are only planning. So that means you are going to make a list like this one, but you are going to use the book you are reading in your small group" (Field notes, February 13, 2017).

After this mini-lesson, which lasted for 20 minutes, students sat in small groups with their reading groups. Ms. Callahan pulled one group to the rug, and I circulated in order to help get students started. Everyone, except for one group of 3 students, began to look at their reading books and work on the task.

Students were in different book groups based on their reading levels and linguistic strengths and needs. One group was reading *The Birchbark House* by Louise Erdrich. This is yet another example of what was described in the previous section, as a multicultural text. In this story, a young Ojibwa girl, Omakayas, lives on an island in Lake Superior around 1847. The author reverses the narrative perspective used in many stories about nineteenth-century Native Americans and instead draws on her family's history to share her account of the settlers and

voyageurs, called "chimookomanug." Readers learn about Omakayas's family and community through her interactions with various family members, neighbors, dreams and nature. Erdrich provides rich details about Ojibwa traditions, customs and spirituality. Thus, Ms. Callahan chose a book with this group, which consisted of students who were reading at or above grade level in English, that could enhance how the point of view can provide perspectives different from dominant narratives. The following is an excerpt from Amanda's final essay on the text:

> The descriptions in *The Birchbark House* show the point of view of the native american family, which in my opinion makes it a lot more interesting. One way is because the family speaks their tribes language and if the narrator was a White man, then he would not have included anything about their tribe and their language. For example,in the book: "'Boozhoo,' called Omakayas. 'Boozhoo' called Angeline. 'Ninoonde wesin' Omakayas yelled." pg. 55. This shows how the author uses their native language in and out through the book.

Amanda mentioned how the narrator's perspective provides insight and information that might have been overlooked or ignored if written from a different point of view, in particular, that of a White man. This sample is a powerful example of how a multicultural text was able to provide a counter story to a dominant narrative, and engage a student in a critical analytic writing practice.

I spent the independent work time circulating to help keep students on task and answer any questions. I also spent a portion of the time observing Ms. Callahan's work on the rug, as she guided one group that included Raúl and Arturo through the process of listing ways in which the point of view impacted the way events were described in their book, *Wonder* by R.J. Palacio. This novel is about 10-year-old August Pullman, who has a genetic facial difference. After being homeschooled, he enters school for the first time as a fifth grader, and must navigate this new setting and a range of reactions to his appearance. Some kids use hurtful language, and some people suggest that Auggie has intellectual limitations because of his facial features. *Wonder* is narrated in the first person throughout, but each part is from a different character's point of view.

92

Each narrator provides different perspectives of Auggie's life and experience in fifth grade, and was thus a strong choice for a unit on point of view.

She prepared the students in this group for the task by modeling how to make a graphic organizer in their notebooks. She displayed her own example using the document camera, which projected her writing onto the promethean board. She simply made a web, with "point of view" written in the middle of a circle and lines exiting the circle. I sat with Arturo and helped keep him on task by repeating the instructions softly to him. She asked students to look through their books, where they had previously "flagged" examples of how the point of view impacted the way events were described. This had been done the previous week during guided reading sessions.

With strong tier 1 teaching strategies, the students in this group, who had been identified as ELLs and struggling readers, were able to access grade level text and meet grade level writing standards. They completed the task by writing essays that described how the point of view changes and thus provides various perspectives about August's experiences. They received support throughout the week, such as the guided work with a graphic organizer described above, but typed up their responses on Chromebooks independently. The introduction to Raúl's short essay below indicates his ability to engage in grade level text and develop a strong paragraph explaining how the points of view impact the story:

> In the book Wonder, by R.j.Palacio, a boy has a face not like ours. The book is written in the 1st person, but there are many points of view. Different characters tell the story at different times. The reader gets to imagine how different characters see things.

In the sample above, Raúl used complete sentences with appropriate syntax and punctuation. His final writing product included 2 short paragraphs, and he struggled to explain some of his details accurately. However, as the above sample shows, he met the overall goal of

the unit and provided information about how this book provided several perspectives from various points of view.

After working with students who were reading *Wonder,* Ms. Callahan saw two other groups during the single reading period, and was able to ensure that all members of these groups were on task and documenting examples of how the point of view impacted the way events were described in their various books. They continued with this assignment for the rest of the week, and wrote responses of various lengths with different types of support. Ms. Callahan used the Promethean Board timer and asked students to work for 10 -15 minute intervals. After each time period, she would lead the students through a stretching or movement activity.

In this lesson, several strong tier 1 teaching strategies were implemented through a Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and differentiation with small groups. Below, I elaborate how the example above exemplifies each of these teaching techniques.

Universal Design for Learning. Ms. Callahan used strategies aligned with a Universal Design for Learning (UDL), a framework developed by the Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST) that provides flexible goals, material, methods and assessments in order to reach diverse learners (Hitchcock, Meyer, Rose, & Jackson, 2002). UDL was developed in the 1990's after reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). During this time, there was an increased focus on inclusion, which placed the majority of students with disabilities in general education classrooms (Edyburn, 2005). In the unit on point of view, Ms. Callahan implemented many diverse strategies to support a wide range of learners. She had assigned rug spots so that students could support each other during conversations about the lesson. The example of Amanda and Alán working together illustrates how Alán, an EB student, benefited from hearing his peer offer examples of the lesson's topic. During this partner

conversation, he did not share an original idea. However, with additional time and after hearing the concept discussed by both his teacher and peers, he offered an original idea during the whole class discussion. Furthermore, once Alán participated, Ms. Callahan guided him to find the words that seemed to best capture his thoughts.

There were different final goals for various students. Some students wrote entire essays on how the point of view impacted the way events were described in their books, such as Amanda. While others, such as Raúl, worked on strong paragraphs.

Ms. Callahan also used a variety of materials, including a diverse selection of multicultural texts and videos. She included texts that presented the perspectives of individuals whose voices often remain unheard in mainstream texts, such as the point of view of a Native American family in *The Birchbark House* or that of a boy with a physical difference in *Wonder*. Various forms of technology were included throughout the unit, including the use of the Promethean Board to document student ideas, present learning objectives and display an engaging short video that captivated the students. Additionally, earlier in the unit she had shown a 5-minute video, *The True Story of the Three Little Pigs* and had asked who was telling the story and how the point of view influenced the way events were described. The various means of representation is typical in the UDL framework and is effective for reaching a wide range of learners.

Ms. Callahan also implemented various teaching methods, including whole class instruction, and small group work to engage students in the reading and writing tasks. She provided scaffolds such as the graphic organizer she created with the students. Student understanding was documented through various forms of assessments including informal observations during small group and individual work time, as well as the final written products.

Differentiation. Differentiated instruction acknowledges diverse student backgrounds, linguistic levels and learning profiles (Hall, 2002). This approach emphasizes the responsibility of the classroom teacher to provide learning experiences that meet the needs of individual learners. This includes recognizes the unique strengths and needs of diverse learners (Subban, 2006). An example of a differentiated instructional technique was the reading groups Ms. Callahan created. Within the first month of school, Ms. Callahan had established routines with guided reading. Students were grouped based on similar strengths and needs in reading, and these groups differed based on the language of instruction. On the wall, there was a clear display of the groups and which ones would meet with Ms. Callahan. She met with three groups daily during independent reading time, which lasted for an hour. This structure was very organized and consistent. Each day, Ms. Callahan had a predetermined focus for the group work. At the beginning of the year, she had made a plan and indicated which texts she would use in English and Spanish at different levels. (See Appendix B for documentation of guided reading plan.) The texts and tasks she chose were differentiated to meet diverse student needs, and as she explained in an interview, "I try to be faithful to the language switches, but if we didn't finish what was meaningful to a book I also want to honor that" (Personal Communication, March 2, 2017). This is another example of what was described in the previous section as a CLRT technique, in which Ms. Callahan had a language policy, but allowed for flexibility when necessary. As the above example illustrates, the small group setting allowed her to work with students who had similar linguistic and academic backgrounds and needs, and provide instruction that was appropriate for their level of comprehension. Thus, although there was a wide range of reading levels among her students, the small group work allowed her to work with students at their individual levels. This is yet another example of how EB students who were identified as struggling readers were able

to have their learning needs met in the general education setting, without what might have been an unnecessary referral to special education. The use of differentiated reading materials and writing assignments supported EB students, such as Karen, Alán and Raúl, in the tier 1 setting. They participated in whole group and small group activities, and displayed an understanding of their text as well as the point of view theme.

Tier 2 Interventions

Ms. Callahan provided high quality instruction to her students daily, which is considered tier 1 of the RTI model. Based on interim assessments, students who showed minimal academic progress were referred to intervention services at two points during the school year. Three interventionists, Ms. Kern, Ms. Sky and Ms. Eliot worked with these students regularly in small groups. Ms. Eliot was a math interventionist, and chose not to participate in the study, but met with students regularly. She provided support both within Ms. White's math classroom, as well as small group settings outside of the classroom. Ms. Sky worked halftime as a literacy interventionist and halftime as a coach. She worked with 5th graders in both English and Spanish and also spent time both in the classroom and in a separate resource room. While there were many different supports offered in this second tier of support of intervention, the work Ms. Kern did with students was especially impressive because of her organization, consistency, and structured lessons. Thus, below I elaborate on how her small group setting provided strong tier 2 interventions for three EB 5th grade students in particular: Arturo, Raúl and Karen.

Ms. Kern. Ms. Kern worked as a half-time intervention, halftime special education teacher. She worked with six 5th grade students, and I conducted the majority of my observations with her when she was providing literacy intervention to Arturo, Raúl and Karen.

She met with this group daily for a 30-minute session outside the classroom. Ms. Kern had a small classroom where she pulled various groups of students daily.

Ms. Kern was clearly passionate about her work. She was organized, compassionate and had a strong rapport with her students. She was eager to share her thoughts with me and we often met to discuss student needs and their progress. Ms. Kern used a variety of strategies and resources when working with this group. In this section, I explain what her typical instruction looked like with this group, highlighting specific examples.

For her work with Arturo, Raúl and Karen, Ms. Kern used the Scholastic Guided Reading as a starting point for most of her lessons. She also used WORDS WORDS WORDS and Wilson Just Words to gather ideas for other phonics activities with this group, but most of the lessons I observed were based on the Scholastic materials. These were guided reading materials available only in English and intended for small group work. Each lesson included teacher prompts including a preview that provided background knowledge about the reading and key vocabulary to review. Furthermore, each lesson provided focus questions and writing prompts. The texts were generally 1-2 pages and short enough to read and discuss in one 30-minute session. Ms. Kern often spent two days on each text. The first day, she would guide students through the reading and the following day, she focused on writing answers to questions about the text. Ms. Kern explained in an interview that she liked the length of the texts, and many of the focus questions the teacher guide provided. However, as most teachers do, Ms. Kern made the lessons her own by modifying the questions and writing assignments and she saw necessary. Each session I observed had a clear focus, and usually began with phonics work. Some days, Ms. Kern would make a connection to the text they were going to read in the latter part of the session. For

example, for one session in late January, the students read a 5th Grade (Level U) text from Scholastic Guided Reading: Short Reads called, "Prometheus the Fire-Giver."

Before presenting the short text, she dictated words and asked the students to write them down on personal whiteboards. The words were *comply* and *defy*. She used this as an opportunity to review the long /i/ sound at the end of the words, and how the spelling changes to -ied when the words are written in the past tense. She reviewed the meaning of the words and explained that they would appear in the text.

As suggested in the Scholastic lessons, Ms. Kern would also provide a background on what the students would be reading before she asked them to read independently. Before the students began to read "Prometheus the Fire-Giver," she made a connection to earlier experiences the students had reading Greek mythology and asked the students to share what they knew about the topic. At first, they were unsure of how to answer, but Ms. Kern encouraged them and offered guidance with questions such as, "Do you remember hearing the name Zeus?" The students did in fact remember this, and were then able to offer responses such as, "Oh yeah - they were stories that weren't true." With more questions such as these, Ms. Kern guided the students in accessing their background knowledge about Greek mythology.

Based on my weekly observations, this type of preview seemed to be typical with Raúl, Arturo and Karen. During the session on Prometheus Greek, Ms. Kern also reminded the students to pay attention to additional text features, such as the box at the top of the first page that read, "In Greek mythology, Prometheus is the helper of humankind and wants people to flourish on Earth. This brings him into conflict with Zeus, king of the Olympian gods." Thus, in addition to presenting vocabulary in the text in a way that reviewed a previously covered spelling pattern and previewing the text by reading a background context, Ms. Kern also drew the

students' attention to a text feature of non-fiction texts. She was explicit about this by asking explaining that features such as these helped readers understand the text.

As a final preparation for reading a text, Ms. Kern would then provide a focus question to the group with additional individualized goals. She would type this ahead of time and present a small strip of paper for each student. For example, during this lesson, the focus question was: *Why do the Greek People still remember the story about Prometheus?* Each student had this written on their slip of paper in addition to the individual goal such as Karen's, "Slow down on longer words (slow check them) and make sure they make sense in the context of the text / story." (Field notes, January 25, 2017).

After setting up the lesson, Ms. Kern typically asked students to read the text individually. If it was a short text, students were often asked to read the entire piece at once. For longer texts, she would choose a stopping point. Students were instructed to think about the focus question after they finished reading.

As students read, Ms. Kern would ask one at a time to read aloud to her. During this time, she would monitor the students' decoding and fluency. If she noticed that some students had finished, she would remind them to be thinking about the focus question, or writing down ideas in their notebooks for the upcoming writing task. Once all the students finished reading a text, Ms. Kern would then lead the group through a discussion of the text, first ensuring that students understood the main points from the text and then addressing the focus question. For example, I recorded and transcribed the following dialogue after the students had read the text on Prometheus:

> Ms. Kern (addressing all 3 Students): Ok, let's make sure we understand the story. What happened?
> Raúl: Prometheus wanted to be a god and overthrow Zeus.
> Ms. Kern: What evidence do you have to support that?

Karen: Zeus didn't want others to have the power/
Raúl (interrupting): Miss how did fire become fire?
Ms. Kern: I don't know how to answer that right now. You guys always ask me such hard questions that show you're really thinking about the text, but I don't know how to answer them. Let's come back to the text now. What did Prometheus do to make Zeus mad?
Karen: He tied him to a mountain.
Ms. Kern: Prometheus did that to Zeus?
Arturo: No Zeus did that.
Ms. Kern: Right. Zeus did that. And why did he do that? What was Prometheus doing?
(The students did not answer. Arturo was looking at the text, Raúl was tapping his hand on the table and Karen was looking at the floor. Ms. Kern addressed the students again.)
Ms. Kern: What was Prometheus doing? Why was Zeus upset? Look back at the text.
(The students look back to the text and then Karen answers.)
Karen: He was teaching people what Zeus didn't want them to know, to be powerful.
Ms. Kern: Oh Prometheus was teaching others how to be powerful and he didn't want that.

Ms. Kern continued with more questions like this, in which she reviewed the important information from the text and engaged students in a conversation about the text. This type of review was typical. After reviewing the main events, Ms. Kern would return to the focus question. Students would take turns answering. After the above conversation on the Prometheus text, there was not enough time to talk about the larger question regarding Greek mythology. However, Ms. Kern explained that the students would continue with the text the next day. During that session, she explained that they would look more closely at the text and focus on the main idea. They would also be addressing the focus question and answer it in writing.

There are several notable techniques exemplified above that were typical of Ms. Kern's work and made for strong tier 2 intervention including the following:

- Strategic Grouping
- Teacher-led preview
- Focus Question
- Individualized goals
- Consistency
- Building on student strengths

Below, I elaborate on each strategy to show how Ms. Kern carried out strong tier 2 supports for 5th grade EB students at Córdoba.

Strategic Grouping. First, students were grouped based on similar linguistic and academic needs. Raúl, Arturo and Karen were three bilingual students reading at late third grade / early fourth grade levels. They were all identified as struggling, and had challenges decoding grade level vocabulary, demonstrating their comprehension of grade level text, and writing responses to literature that demonstrated grade level skills. As I described in the Methods section, decisions about which students needed literacy and English intervention were based on a combination of informal and formal assessments including the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), a reading comprehension assessment, and ACCESS, large-scale English language proficiency assessment administered to Kindergarten through 12th grade students who have been identified as ELLs. Ms. Callahan and Ms. Kern also administered reading assessments using running records. Arturo, Raúl and Karen had been working with Ms. Kern and/or Ms. Sky since they were in 3rd grade, and all had shown progress in their English literacy skills with tier 2 interventions. Students were assessed in Spanish with the Spanish version of the DRA, the Evaluación del desarrollo de la lectura (EDL). This information was also taken into consideration when making decisions for intervention services. For example, Karen began the year working with Ms. Sky and received literacy interventions bilingually. However, her interim DRA and ELD testing showed that she was making more progress in Spanish than in English. Thus, the decision was made to move her to Ms. Kern's group so that she could have more focused literacy instruction in English.

The separate space and focused lessons in tier 2 settings provided students the opportunity to practice important 5th grade reading and writing strategies, including flagging a

text for evidence and using textual evidence to support ideas in writing. These were skills that were also being addressed in Ms. Callahan's classroom, but the structured intervention was an additional support that targeted the specific needs of this particular group of students.

Teacher-led preview. Before asking students to engage in the specific literacy task, Ms. Kern provided some background information on the text and task. She provided content-specific vocabulary words that students might not be able to decipher given the context. She also attempted to build on students' background knowledge by asking questions. When Ms. Kern asked her group what they knew about Greek Mythology, they at first did not answer. However, rather than provide information, she asked a follow-up question, "Do you remember hearing the name Zeus?" With this guidance, students were able to relate the information they recalled about the genre. Ms. Kern also used this time to point out text features that would prepare the students for the reading and assist in their comprehension. This section of the session was generally short, and the remainder of the work was student-centered. However, the preview allowed Ms. Kern to make the most of the short time she had with the students by introducing important vocabulary and setting a specific focus for the session.

Focus questions. For each session I observed, Ms. Kern had a clear and explicit goal for her group. She would present the focus question at the beginning of the session, and often returned to it during reading conversations and writing prompts. She often used the Scholastic Guided Reading Teacher's guide to get inspiration for these questions. When I asked her about how she chose the focus of each lesson, she explained:

> So the focus question - I usually want it to be something they can write for this group [Raúl, Arturo and Karen], since it's a writing heavy group...So, I look at the focus question and think about whether or not it could be turned into their writing. So like, focus on this and flag for evidence, because you'll be writing about this later, but sometimes…. I can't really see a paragraph being developed out of the focus question, so

then it might be something I read in the preview, but then I'll come up with something else… (Personal communication, March 13, 2017).

This focus question helped keep her students on task. For example, when reading about Prometheus, Raúl had asked a question about the origin of fire. Ms. Kern acknowledged that he and his peers asked thoughtful questions, but then quickly, and gently, returned to the focus of the lesson. Furthermore, the focus question served as a guide for writing. For example, one Wednesday in April, I observed Ms. Kern's work with Arturo, Raúl, and Karen as they read an excerpt from *Rules*, by Cynthia Lord. The excerpt depicted a twelve-year old named Catherine, who was self-conscious about her younger brother David because he had autism. The focus question for the day was: *How does Catherine feel about having David around? Flag evidence to support your thinking.* Similar to what was depicted in the earlier example of *Prometheus the Fire-Giver,* Ms. Kern set up the lesson by previewing vocabulary, building on students' background knowledge and presenting the focus question. Then, she asked guiding questions to support students' comprehension of the text and asked that they share the evidence they had flagged.

The next day, Ms. Kern continued with the same text and focus question, but moved on to a writing task. She asked questions to help students remember the important events, and presented the focus question again, explaining that they would write a response in paragraph form. She also helped prepare students for this text by asking warm-up questions, such as "What is Catherine thinking about during this part of the story?" She also asked students to come up a word to describe how Catherine was feeling. Then, Ms. Kern handed out the slips of paper with focus questions again. She read it out loud and said, "I've looked at all the evidence you've all flagged, and it all makes sense. Use the evidence to support your answer. You have ten minutes to write" (Field notes, April 20, 2017). All three of the students began to write independently.

Ms. Kern looked over their shoulders as they worked and said out loud so the whole group could here, "I notice that Arturo is starting to paraphrase the prompt. That's a great way to start the paragraph." As shown in this example, the focus question helped to keep students engaged and on task. The date of this event is especially noteworthy, because it was in the midst of the three-week standardized testing period. The students were exhausted from so much testing, yet able to complete grade level work by reading a 5th grade text and responding to a question with textual evidence.

Individualized goals. For example, during a session in January, Ms. Kern led Raúl, Arturo, and a 4th grade student who had worked in the group for a few months through a reading on astronomers. As usual, Ms. Kern reviewed the focus for the reading and provided each student with a slip of paper: *Read to find out the beliefs ancient astronomers held. As you read, try to determine the author's key points, or the main ideas, along with the details that support them.* Additionally, there were individualized goals. Raúl's slip of paper also read: *Slow down on longer words (slow check them) and make sure they make sense.* Then, when reading with Raúl individually, Ms. Kern provided specific feedback to him by saying, "Good. I heard you slowing down and checking for understanding. Make sure to take your time with the longer words and really think about them." After reading with Arturo, she said "You're doing a good job with your strategies. I want you to work on being a little quicker." When reading with the 4th grade student who was struggling to decode the name Copernicus. Ms. Kern asked, "How can you chunk that out? You know all those sounds." The student was then able to decode the name.

Consistency. Ms. Kern was also consistent with her work. She had 17 students on her caseload and often had just two minutes between different groups. Nonetheless, she was always prepared with lessons that were catered to each group's needs. There were several days when she

would see me in Ms. Callahan's class unexpectedly, and she always made it clear that I was welcome to observe. During each of my observations, Lauren had the appropriate materials ready for student use, as well as very clear objectives for her small group. She had a selected text and goals, and provided explicit focused instruction to the group of students. The students in her small groups new the routine and this helped make the 30 minutes she had daily with them run smoothly and efficiently.

Building on student strengths. When we discussed the students with whom she worked, Ms. Kern consistently highlighted their strengths and progress they had made. Whereas another interventionist might have fallen into the trap of viewing her students through a deficit lens, Ms. Kern consistently valued the skills her students brought to the learning environment. Although she had only worked with students in English, she encouraged the use of Spanish and praised her students for being bilingual. I recorded and transcribed the following interaction between Ms. Kern and a bilingual student, Sylvia, in March, which exemplifies that although Ms. Kern did not speak Spanish, she expressed an interest in the language and an appreciation for her students' bilingualism.

> Sylvia is writing and stops to ask Ms. Kern: Wait, in English do you put a period and then a quote for a quotation?
> Ms. Kern: You put the period and then a quote.
> Sylvia: Okay, because in Spanish you don't.
> Ms. Kern: Really?
> (Sylvia nods.)
> Me: In Spanish, there is a different symbol.
> Ms. Kern: Oh, that's probably something I should know by now.
> (Sylvia demonstrates with writing: - Yo dije.)
> Ms. Kern: Oh, I've seen this, but thought it was a stylistic choice. Thanks, Sylvie, for teaching me something. It's amazing how much you know in two languages. (Field notes, March 6, 2017)

When Ms. Kern says, "Oh that's probably something I should know by now," she is implying that although she only works with students in English, she values the Spanish language and

writing and feels it is important to know about this writing convention. I observed several similar responses from Ms. Kern during her small group interventions with EB 5th graders. She continuously praised students for their bilingual abilities, expressed interest in learning Spanish words or grammar, and encouraged students to use their skills across languages. As a result, students in her small group intervention settings seemed to feel comfortable responding in Spanish when working with Ms. Kern, and did in fact use their knowledge of words or concepts in Spanish to help them make sense of the work they were doing.

During Ms. Kern's math intervention with two 5th graders, Jennifer and Daniela, who were both identified as EB students, she presented a math problem that asked the student to find the sum of two fractions. Ms. Kern read the problem aloud and then asked the students if they knew what the word "sum" meant. Jennifer responded, "It sounds like sumar, so adding?" Ms. Kern asked, "oh is that how you say add in Spanish?" The students and I nodded, and Ms. Kern responded, "That's so great that you were able to use your Spanish to help you. Yes, when you're asked to find the sum of something, you have to add." (Field notes, March 13, 2017). Throughout the school year, Ms. Kern provided positive feedback such as the above examples to her students. She lauded their hard work, set high expectations for them, and encouraged them regularly.

Closing Thoughts on Tier 2 Interventions

The students from Ms. Callahan's class who were working below grade level in literacy received tier 2 interventions with either Ms. Sky or Ms. Kern. There was alignment between tiers 1 and 2, in that both teachers addressed grade level standards and engaged students in Guided Reading activities. Many of the approaches described above from Ms. Kern's work were similar to strategies that Ms. Callahan used. They had clear expectations and goals, and grouped students

strategically for guided reading instruction. However, as recommended with RTI, Ms. Kern provided more individualized and targeted support. She grouped students strategically and worked on developing grade level skills and concepts, such as finding textual evidence to support ideas. She also worked on phonics and vocabulary, as explained above. In the final chapter, I discuss the fact that most of the students who were in intervention had been receiving these services for many years, and still seemed to be performing below grade level on standardized assessments.

Furthermore, in the next chapter, I provide additional examples like this in which teachers implemented strong instruction in tiers 1 and 2 through Culturally and Linguistically Responsive teaching. However, it is also important to note that there were limited opportunities at Córdoba to receive strong tier 2 interventions in Spanish. I analyze this in my discussion and include implications for future steps the school might take to provide adequate support for struggling Spanish-speakers.

Tier 3 Interventions

For students at Córdoba who received tier 2 interventions, and still struggled to progress academically, special education services were available. Tier 3 interventions were available after students had received a special education evaluation and qualified for an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). These interventions included supports from one or both of the special education teachers at the school: Ms. Kern and Ms. Ramond. As described above, Ms. Kern also worked half-time as an interventionist. She worked with 17 students in total, and ten of those had IEPs. Jennifer was the only 5th grader who received tier 3 interventions with Ms. Kern in math. She was placed in a group with Daniela. Ms. Kern explained that because she had two roles, she could combine groups this way if students had similar needs. Thus, the same small group work

and support that Ms. Kern offered was considered tier 2 for Daniela, but tier 3 for Jennifer. This was because Daniela had not been in the school long enough or in the intervention setting enough to know whether or not it would be enough to meet her needs. For Jennifer, she had been diagnosed with an LD and was mandated to receive services. Her IEP would follow her to middle school, where she would ideally continue to receive supports from a special education teacher.

Thus, as illustrated with the examples of Jennifer and Daniela, who received similar supports but through different tiers, there was not always a significant difference between the instruction Ms. Kerns provided in tier 2 and tier 3 interventions. The biggest difference was that tier 3 were mandated services. One other 5th grader received special education services from Ms. Ramond, but as previously stated, his parents did not provide consent for him to participate in the study.

There were two other 5th graders at Córdoba who had IEPs for Speech and Language Impairments, and thus received support from a part-time speech therapist once a week. Additionally, there was a full-time school psychologist who worked with 1 5th grader weekly. There were no other related service providers, such as an occupational therapist or physical therapists.

The limited availability of tier 3 interventions at Córdoba is noteworthy. Given that the school maintained a mission to serve the diverse academic and linguistic needs of all students, it seemed that more special education services might have been beneficial. I discuss the need for more bilingual special education personnel in the chapter on discussion and implication.

Collaboration Among School Practitioners

The collaboration among school practitioners was an integral part of the school's MTSS process. Ms. Ramond was a bilingual special education teacher at Córdoba during the time of my study and worked with students with existing IEPs, in math and literacy. I did not spend time observing Ms. Ramond, because she only worked with one 5th grader who did not have consent to participate in the study. Nonetheless, I interviewed her and she provided valuable insight into the school's MTSS process. When I asked her to describe the school's implementation of MTSS, she emphasized that she believed that Córdoba was a "model school." While Ms. Ramond had not worked at other schools, she was completing a Master's of Education at the time of the study, and learned about other local schools' MTSS process. Ms. Ramond emphasized the important roles of various school practitioners, including the administrators, classroom teachers, and interventionists who supported a successful implementation of MTSS to meet students' needs in the most appropriate setting.

Each Thursday morning at Córdoba, an hour was dedicated to MTSS meetings. This time was devoted to teachers, coaches and related service providers to address and monitor the needs of specific students who were struggling. Teachers from different grades were invited to discuss the MTSS process each week, so the 5th grade teachers were present every 6 weeks. During this time, teachers would discuss any concerns they had about students who seemed to struggle with their current level of support in the classroom. This was also a time for all the practitioners who worked with students to monitor progress and make any suggestions or decisions about future supports. Each student who was part of the MTSS process had an Excel spreadsheet in Google Docs in order to document and monitor progress. Each student's spreadsheet contained the following pages: Basics, Services, Literacy Data, Math Data, Behavior Data, MTSS Meeting

Notes. Relevant information was updated throughout the school year and shared with all staff members who worked with the students.

For example, during the year of my study, Daniela was new to Córdoba, and was identified by her teachers as requiring additional supports in both math and literacy. She was also labeled as an ELL based on data from her previous school, and her first language was Spanish. After initial assessments in late August, including running records and phonics surveys in both English and Spanish, as well as writing samples and math assessments in both languages, Ms. Callahan and Ms. White brought her up in their first MTSS meeting of the year. On the first page of the document, the teachers noted "flags" or the areas of concern for Daniela, which included the following notes from Ms. Callahan: "Phonics: both decoding and encoding, writing: structuring paragraphs, responding to a prompt."

While the documentation might be a bit challenging for an outsider to interpret, and was not consistently updated each month, certain aspects are clear including the various school practitioners who worked with Daniela. This included Ms. Kern, who worked with her in literacy and math, as well as Ms. Eliot who worked with her in math. Ms. Eliot worked with Daniela in the classroom during scheduled math time, and Ms. Kern pulled Daniela out for small group interventions daily for both math and literacy. The documentation also clearly shows the meeting dates during which Daniela's progress was assessed, as well as her scores on assessments and future steps to support her. For example, Daniela's literacy skills were assessed using the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) and her score went from a 24 in September, to a 28 in November, and to a 30 in February. All these scores correlated to a 4th grade reading level, but they showed that she was making progress with the given interventions. Thus, the MTSS team discussed her progress and decided to keep in intervention rather than referring her for a

special education evaluation. Furthermore, the documentation clearly shows the collaborative structure at Córdoba, because several practitioners attended the meetings and were listed as responsible for continuing to work with Daniela. Another note from February 16th meeting states a next step in literacy as: "Having her tell us what she will write before she writes (even sentence at a time to start)," and lists both Ms. Kern and Ms. Callahan as the teachers who would work with her on this. There are also data assessments administered by several school practitioners. And although Ms. Ramond did not work with Daniela, she provided insight at the MTSS meetings. Thus, this is an example of how teachers with different skillsets and perspectives were able to collaborate and help ensure that students' needs were being met within the RTI process. As described earlier, Ms. Kern's tier 2 interventions were administered consistently and she provided well-planned and meaningful instruction that was geared specifically to meet the individual student's needs. While Ms. Kern was only able to provide intervention in English, the findings from this study highlight the effort she made to encourage her bilingual students to use their linguistic resources when working on reading strategies.

Closing Thoughts on RTI

IDEA requires a free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) for all students. By structuring a multi-tiered approach, the 5th graders at Córdoba received an education appropriate to their needs in the LRE. As part of the first tier of instruction, Ms. Callahan provided strong supports in the general education classroom including the implementation of UDL and differentiation techniques. She provided multiple means of representation, engagement and assessment and engaged students successfully. For students, such as Raúl, Arturo, and Karen, who still required additional support in literacy, Ms. Kern provided targeted instruction in a daily intervention setting. She focused on strategies similar to

those Ms. Callahan was addressing in what is referred to as a tier 2 setting of the 3-tiered RTI

model. Several EB 5th graders who had been identified as struggling were able to show progress

through these various levels of support. This avoided referrals to tier 3 interventions, or special

education services. Thus, through a strong implementation of RTI, EB students who struggled in

literacy at Córdoba were able to have their needs met without special education. This was done

through collaboration of colleagues and with instruction that was culturally and linguistically

relevant to the specific student population. In the next findings chapter, I further elaborate on

how teachers used CLRT within the RTI model to best meet the needs of struggling EB students.

Chapter 5: Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching (CLRT) within RTI

A second major finding from this study was how teachers at Córdoba implemented Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching (CLRT) within Tiers 1 and 2 of the RTI model. A culturally responsive approach includes instruction that uses students' "cultural orientations, background experiences, and ethnic identities as conduits to facilitate their teaching and learning" (Gay 2000, p. 614). This concept can be expanded to include instruction that is both culturally and linguistically responsive by incorporating "language objectives and language supports" (Klingner, Boelé, Liñan-Thompson, & Rodriguez, 2014, p. 93). Ms. Callahan, and other teachers at Córdoba, used several teaching methods aligned with this approach. Ms. Callahan created activities that connected to students' lives, devoted time for students to construct ethnic identity, incorporated texts that represented diverse perspectives and experiences, and supported dynamic bilingual practices. Below, I provide examples of each and explain how these teaching methods engaged students.

By implementing CLRT practices, Ms. Callahan and the other practitioners I observed were able to provide an education that was appropriate for their population of students. When teachers fail to use CLRT techniques, there is often a disconnect between instruction and student needs and interests. Students often do not respond well to the instruction, and their struggles may then be attributed to inherent deficiencies rather than a cultural mismatch (Donovan & Cross, 2002; Skiba et al., 2008). The use of CLRT teaching techniques can help address the incongruities between CLD students' home and cultures (Grant & Sleeter, 2006; Shujaa, 1995). Below, I provide examples of how Ms. Callahan implemented a curriculum that addressed the lives of her CLD students, and allowed for meaningful participation.

Connection to Students' Lives

Throughout the school year, teachers centered classroom activities on the lives and experiences of their students. Rather than making superficial connections or mentions of current political events, teachers focused on the events recognizing that they were central to their students.

Morning Meeting. A strong example of the space teachers created for students to share personal experiences was the daily morning meeting. Each day, the 5th graders arrived with just enough time for the teachers to take attendance. Then, they would leave their classrooms and attend specials, such as art, music, or physical education. They returned to the classroom at 9:40, at which point Ms. Callahan and Ms. White would begin the morning meeting with their morning group of 5th graders. The students would sit on the rug in designated rug spots and read the "morning message" that Ms. Callahan had prepared on the Promethean Board. For example, on Thursday, February 2, 2017, the message read:

> *Dear Ghost Peppers,*
>
> *Happy Thursday! Today we will have a normal schedule again. Remember that students do not have school tomorrow!*
> *In February, Valdez is focusing on curiosity. What is curiosity? How can you show curiosity during your day?*
>
> *Sincerely,*
> *Ms. Callahan*

In this example, the teacher used the morning message as a way to welcome the students to school, provide a reminder about a change in the schedule, and prepare students for a short discussion. The morning message was always written in the day's language of instruction, and Ms. Callahan would guide the conversation in that language. However, when students participated, the language policy was flexible. In some cases, Ms. Callahan would encourage a student to use the language of instruction if it was outside his/her comfort zone. In other

instances, she would encourage participation in any language in which the student felt comfortable using. For example, Daniela was a student who is new to Córdoba. She mostly spoke Spanish at home with her mother and siblings, and this was her first year in a DL environment. At her previous school, she had been diagnosed with a Speech and Language Impairment. One morning in January, when the morning meeting was being conducted in Spanish, the students each shared one sentence about their weekend. Each student had shared in Spanish, and when it was Daniela's turn, she asked in English, "In English or Spanish?" Ms. Callahan responded, "Como quieras" letting her know that she could speak in either language. Daniela responded in English, slowly sharing that she had seen a movie with her sister, and Ms. Callahan responded in Spanish. There was no correcting, nor insisting that Daniela speak in Spanish. Seemingly small actions like this one encouraged a safe environment in which students were supported in their bilingual education. I discuss this more when I explain how the teachers used translanguaging techniques.

The vignette at the beginning of the previous chapter includes another example of a typical morning meeting, in which Ms. Callahan brought up topics that were relevant to her students. The message addressed a seemingly minor issue of distributing Valentine's to classmates, and also the important event regarding immigration rights. Both topics were central to students' lives, and thus it was helpful to address them to the whole class. The evening meeting regarding immigration rights was scheduled in response to events that followed the inauguration of President Donald Trump in 2017. After he had been elected to office, many students and families at Córdoba experienced fear and uncertainty about their status in the United States. Discussions about the presidency and what it meant for the students came up regularly.

On January 27, President Trump signed an executive order that halted all refugee admissions to the United States, and temporarily barred people from seven Muslim-majority countries. The media was heavily focused on this, as well as several comments the new president had made regarding his opinions of certain immigrants, including Mexicans. After events like this one, students were frightened. Ms. Callahan made space during the morning meetings for students to share their feelings. Several students with ties to Mexico expressed their fears, and others expressed outrage. One student, a White boy from a middle-class family, asked if he thought anything would change for him and his classmates. Before Ms. Callahan could answer, a classmate Alán responded hastily, "Yeah, because if you're Mexican, you could be deportado! And that means me and my family." Ms. Callahan nodded and again, before she had the chance to respond, another student raised his hand. She called on Leo, a quiet boy who had joined the class recently. He tried to speak, but kept looking down. We asked if he wanted to share in Spanish. Instead, he broke into tears, unable to get the words out. I walked him to the bathroom so he could wash his face and take a break. He told me that his father was still in Mexico, and that he was worried he would never see him again because he would not be able to ever come to the United States. Eventually, Leo rejoined the classroom, and shared this fear with his classmates. Many of them cried as he spoke. Ms. Callahan and I did our best to make our students feel safe, and emphasize that we were allies. However, we both knew that they had reason to fear for their safety and that of their family. The ritual of a morning meeting provided the space the students needed to process daily events that were central to their lives. On some days, this included sharing stories about family events, birthday parties and sporting events. On other days, the conversations were heavier and focused students' challenges, including the

current political events that deeply impacted their lives. Examples of other topics and activities covered during the year's morning meeting included:

- Reminder about the students' field trip the next day
- Students asked to greet each other in alphabetical order, by last name
- One student explaining changes in student council to classmates
- Volunteers sharing about what they did over the weekend
- Students given an opportunity to recognize community members who have been supportive
- Teacher demonstrating how to play an interactive game
- Students choosing an interactive game to play
- Teachers or Students sharing about personal challenges
- Teachers or Students sharing celebrations

An example of an interactive game was "ZIP ZAP ZOP." In this game, the students would stand in a circle on the classroom rug. Someone would begin by pointing to another student in the circle and saying "ZIP!" Then that student, would point another and say, "ZAP!" That student would point to yet another, and say "ZOP!" This pattern would continue, and the words would have to be said in the same order: ZIP, ZAP, ZOP. When a student made a mistake, and said a word out of order, he/she would then be out of the game. During an interview, I asked Ms. Callahan about the incorporation of games like this one. She explained that some were community building, and some were more focused on language development. This game, ZIP ZAP ZOP, was fun and engaging for students, and helped them practice their concentration and focus by looking out for their turn.

The morning meeting was also a space for both students *and* teachers to share about their personal lives. For example, Ms. Callahan often talked about her beloved family dog, Coco, with the class. Coco had been with Ms. Callahan's family for 15 years and was very well-loved. Ms. Callahan shared stories and videos of her dog, and talked about how she was aging. When Coco passed, Ms. Callahan shared this news with the class. She began to cry, seemingly surprising herself and saying, "I guess it's harder to talk about this than I thought it would be." The students

were compassionate and understanding. Jennifer offered, "It's ok, Miss. Everyone cries." Karen jumped in saying, "I'm sorry for your loss," and many students repeated this. The vulnerability Ms. Callahan showed seem to deepen the connection she had with her students, and open an invitation for others to share their emotions in this safe space.

Celebrations were also shared during the morning meeting. Ms. Callahan gave her students opportunities to complement one another during this time. Many students commented on how hard they saw others working. Some thanked each other for assistance during group work or on the playground. It was during a morning meeting when I shared my own news that I was expecting a baby over the summer, and the students were eager to share in my excitement and ask me questions about my due date and possible baby names. The morning meeting offered a space where the community came together to support one another during both challenges and celebrations.

It was clear that through this daily ritual, Ms. Callahan made an effort to connect to her students' lives. On November 2, students were asked to share about their loved ones who had passed in honor of Día de los Muertos. On the first day after winter break, Ms. Callahan asked students to share one person with whom students had spent their vacation. In a follow-up conversation, I asked about the decision to make this question the focus for the meeting. Ms. Callahan acknowledged that students came from very different socioeconomic backgrounds and this often influenced the ways in which different families spent their vacations. Asking students about the people involved in their vacation rather than the experiences allowed everyone to share in a way that was hopefully less likely to make some feel bad about what their family might be able to afford to you. She also wanted to highlight the importance of community by asking students to reflect on their experiences with people in their lives.

Making connections to students' lives and centering activities on their experiences is an example of a curriculum that is culturally responsive (Gay, 2002). Ms. Callahan and her colleagues took into account the events that were central to their students' lives and centered activities around these. Discussions surrounding politics will vary depending upon the context, and at Córdoba, they were specific to the given population of students. These conversations engaged students and made them feel comfortable in the classroom. In another setting, students like Alán and Leo might not have been comfortable sharing their vulnerabilities as they did when discussing immigration. However, Ms. Callahan and her colleagues made it clear that they were allies, through comments made during morning meetings and events like the meeting about immigration rights, which was held completely in Spanish. By enacting this element of CLRT, students could engage authentically in classroom activities.

Construction of Ethnic Identity

An essential aspect of successfully teaching in multicultural settings is ethnic identity development. It is critical for educators to understand and promote students' ethnic identities, and comprehend the impact it has on learning and teaching (Clark & Flores, 2001). Throughout the year, Ms. Callahan created activities and implemented lessons centered on student identity. A noteworthy example was the use of the text *My Name was Hussein* by Hristo Kiuchukov (2004) in her ELD class to introduce a unit on identity. In this story, Hussein, or "Hugsby" as his parents call him, is a boy from a Roma family in India living in Bulgaria. The author describes the food Hussein and his family eat during holidays, the prayers they recite and preparations for Ramadan. The mood of the book shifts, from a joyful description of what Hussein loved about his life to a time in which soldiers came and forbade them from speaking their own language and visiting the mosque for Ramadan. Eventually, Hussein's family was sent to the mayor who

forced them to adopt new Christian names. After getting a new name, Hussein explains that at home his parents still call him Hugsby, but at school and in the streets his name is Harry.

Ms. Callahan used this powerful story as a starting point to engage students in a discussion of identity, and many students made meaningful connections to feeling like their identity as Mexican-Americans was in jeopardy because of the presidency. For 45 minutes each day, the 5th graders at Córdoba were divided into two groups based on their teachers' assessment of their language strengths and needs. During this time, Ms. Callahan worked with students who were considered to need additional support in English. In the next chapter, I include a discussion about this practice and considerations about why it might not have been entirely effective given the wide range of linguistic backgrounds in this group. However, it is important to first acknowledge how Ms. Callahan presented identity with the students in this group, who were Mexican-American with various ties to Mexico. Some students had lived in Mexico, and others had family members who had lived there or still lived there. As with any group of students, there were diverse cultural and linguistic experiences. Nonetheless, Ms. Callahan chose to ask about connections that many might make to Mexican culture.

During one of the first lessons surrounding this text, Ms. Callahan presented the concept of identity by explaining that identity is "who you are." As with all her ELD lessons, this was conducted in English, and she included teaching strategies to support English development. For example, when she presented the definition of identity, she also used a hand motion pointing to herself as she said this, and asked students to do the same. The students repeated, "Identity: who you are," and each pointed to his/herself. Ms. Callahan explained that the hand motion would help their brains remember the term. She also did this several times, offering repeated opportunities for students to read, hear, and say the word.

While reading the first portion of *My Name was Hussein,* Ms. Callahan engaged the students in her ELD class in a conversation and writing activity on identity. On the first day of reading the text*,* Ms. Callahan paused at the beginning of the book during which Hussein describes his family and certain traditions. She asked if any of the students could relate to the character by recognizing aspects of their Mexican-American identity. More than half of the students raised their hands and shared examples. Arturo explained that in his family, he would eat tamales on Christmas. Ms. Callahan asked if others did the same and many nodded or raised their hands enthusiastically. On the next day, Ms. Callahan continued the exploration of identity with the students. As the students entered the classroom for ELD instruction, she asked them to read the directions on the board:

Warm up with Partner 2:
What is one aspect of your identity that is important to you?
One aspect of my identity that is important to me is _____ because _____/
OR
I'm _____, and being _____ is important to me because _____.

After the students had a chance to read the above warm-up, she asked "What is identity again?" Several students called out, "who you are!" Ms. Callahan replied, "Let's do that with our action again." She modeled this, by repeating "who you are" and pointing to herself. The students copied this action. Next, Ms. Callahan asked all the students to read the sentence frames together. She pointed to the board as the students followed along. Ms. Callahan demonstrated this, saying "I'm a sister, and being a sister is important to me because my sister and I support each other." She then asked the students to do the same with a partner. I sat with two students, Arturo and Jennifer. Jennifer shook her head when Arturo asked if she wanted to share, so Arturo offered to go first. He looked up at the board and said, "I'm a brother and being a brother is important to me because I love my family." Jennifer still did not want to share, and Arturo asked

me if he could give another example. I nodded and he said, "I'm Mexican and being Mexican is important to me because I'm proud to be Mexican." Before Jennifer had a chance to answer, Ms. Callahan addressed the class and presented the next activity, which focused on exploring verb tenses in the story. Although Jennifer did not participate verbally during this activity, she seemed focused and engaged. She looked at Arturo as he spoke, and followed her eyes to the board as Arturo followed the sentence frame. This activity allowed Arturo to reflect upon aspects of his identity, as a brother and as a Mexican. Furthermore, it encouraged his participation by centering on his experiences. Arturo was a student who was identified as a struggling EB student (see Methods chapter for a more in-depth description). His contribution here is noteworthy, because he was on task and participated verbally using compound sentences. He used the scaffolds provided, and shared verbally with his classmate. Later, these skills transferred to writing when students were asked to use the language prompts to write about their own identity. Thus, through this lesson, Ms. Callahan engaged students in an exploration of their identity, which is considered to be part of CLRT. Furthermore, by creating tasks that centered on students' experiences and lives, students were encouraged to participate.

The effectiveness of CLRT was also evident during Ms. Callahan's guided reading lessons. In the previous chapter, I explained how Ms. Callahan used guided reading groups to provide differentiated instruction, a strong component of effective Tier 1 teaching. An example of how she used CLRT in this setting was the construction of identity by connecting with literature used during guided reading sessions. Children's literature that represents Latino/a cultures and experiences can be very influential in assisting Latino/a students in development of their ethnic identities. Incorporating texts in which diverse cultures are portrayed realistically and positively can positively impact this identity development among culturally and linguistically

diverse students (Naidoo & Quiroa, 2016). At the beginning of the school year, when discussing her literacy plan for the year, Ms. Callahan emphasized her commitment to incorporating texts that represented diverse cultures and perspectives, and in particular, ones to which her Latino/a could relate. Furthermore, in order to meet the diverse learning and academic needs of her students, she selected texts that were appropriate for students' reading levels and linguistic backgrounds.

For example, Andrea, Daniela, and another Spanish-speaking Latino student who was identified also struggling and reading below grade level, read the chapter book, *My Name is María Isabel* by Alma Flor Ada (1993) during their guided reading sessions. In this book, María Isabel, a bilingual Puerto Rican girl growing up in the mainland U.S., faces challenges in her new classroom when her teacher changes her name to "Mary." The book is available in English and Spanish and lends itself to discussions on self-identity and biculturalism. So much of María Isabel's family history is captured in her name, and Ms. Callahan used this story in her small group to engage students in conversations about their own names, families and identities. For a group of students reading at a higher level, which included both White and Latino/a bilingual students, Ms. Callahan led a book group with the text *Gaby Lost and Found* by Angela Cervantes (2013). In this intermediate-level novel, 11-year old Gaby has been uprooted after her mother has been deported to Honduras. The book follows Gaby and her friends as they volunteer at an animal shelter and help find homes for abandoned pets. Cervantes addresses Gaby's own feelings of abandonment through the parallel experiences of the pets, and readers are given a perspective of immigration very different from the one that President Trump and others in positions of power were portraying at the time of this study. *Gaby Lost and Found* also highlights the strong sense of community among Latino/as, providing a positive depiction of this culture. While I did not

observe the reading groups Ms. Callahan guided with this text, in a conversation surrounding the 2016 election, she commented on the importance of using texts like this one to help promote positive images of Latino/a communities and immigration. This practice can help promote a positive identity development among Latino/a students in the classroom, which Ms. Callahan believed was critical especially given the current political climate. Below, I describe more about the how the materials Ms. Callahan used were another example of CLRT that benefited struggling Latino/a EB students.

Materials

Another strong example of how Ms. Callahan implemented CLRT was through her thoughtful the selection of multicultural literature. Even in classrooms with CLD students, most materials represent characters, people and perspectives from a single dominant culture. Advocates of multicultural education argue that school curricula and materials are too often irrelevant to CLD students from historically marginalized communities (Sleeter, 2005). CLRT includes incorporating texts and materials that represent a wide range of perspectives, cultures and languages. At the time of this study, Córdoba's district had officially adopted the Expeditionary Learning curriculum for reading and writing, and some social studies and science themes as well. The K-5 Language Arts curriculum is part of Engage NY and is described as a "comprehensive, standards-based core literacy program that engages teachers and students through compelling, real world content and builds equitable and inclusive learning opportunities for all students" (retrieved from http://curriculum.eleducation.org/ October 11, 2017). EngageNY was developed and is maintained by the New York State Education Department (NYSED) to support the implementation of key aspects of the New York State Board of Regents Reform Agenda. All curriculum materials are available for free online. As part

of Race to the Top federal funding, NYSED worked to develop this curriculum for grades Pre-K to 12 in Math and English Language Arts (ELA), and in 2015, added Social Studies lessons.

Ms. Callahan explained that she and her colleagues "approach[ed] [the curriculum] with a lot of flexibility," and chose additional texts as they saw relevant for their students (Personal Communication, February 23, 2017). She attempted to find texts that represented diverse perspectives and experiences, especially those of people who have been historically marginalized. As described in the previous chapter, Ms. Callahan included texts that presented the perspectives of individuals whose voices often remain unheard in mainstream texts, such as the point of view of a Native American family in *The Birchbark House*, and that of a boy with a physical difference in *Wonder.* The texts described earlier in this chapter, *My Name was Hussein, My Name is María Isabel,* and *Gaby, Lost and Found,* are additional examples of multicultural texts because they present stories perspectives different from dominant narratives.

Furthermore, one guided reading group in Ms. Callahan's class read the chapter book, *Anna Hibiscus* by Atinuke (2010), which follows the adventures of a little girl who lives in a beautiful white compound surrounded by her extended family. Her mother is originally from Canada, and the family now lives in Africa, though the author does not name which country. The first story follows Anna and her mom, dad, and twin baby brothers as they try to take a beach vacation without their extended relatives. They soon realize how much they rely upon the help of their extended family, and are relieved once they join them. Through this story, Atinuke presents the benefits and support of growing up with cousins, aunts, uncles, and grandparents around at all times. The author's failure to mention the name of the exact city or country in the story is perhaps problematic because it paints a generic image of Africa rather than honoring the vast diversity in the continent. Nonetheless, Atinuke emphasizes the beauty of a culture and setting

that is often portrayed through deficit lenses in the U.S. Similarly, students in another guided

reading group read the text *Eight Days: A Story of Haiti* by Haitian author Edwidge Danticat.

This book tells the story of Junior, who is trapped beneath his collapsed house after an

earthquake for 8 days and uses his imagination to comfort himself by conjuring up beautiful

images and memories from his country. Texts like these present different global perspectives and

provide students with new possible ways to connect with literature.

In order to adhere to the school's language policy and provide instruction in Spanish, Ms.

Callahan also selected books in Spanish to use during her literacy activities. As described earlier,

Ms. Callahan would teach approximately one literacy unit for 3 weeks in English, and then

another in Spanish. She alternated this throughout the year. Her guided reading groups would

read one book for 3 weeks, in the same language of instruction. Some of the Spanish titles she

included in her guided reading groups were:

- *Cajas de Cartón: Relatos de la Vida Peregrina de un Niño Campesino*, by Franscisco Jimenez
- *Cuando la Tia Lola vino a quedarse,* by Julia Alvarez
- *Me Llamo María Isabel,* by Alma Flor Ada
- *Nacer Bailando,* by Alma Flor Ada
- *Papelucho,* by Marcela Paz
- *Querido hijo, estás despedido,* by Jordi Sierra i Fabra

Some of these texts were lighthearted, like *Papelucho* by Chielan writer Marcela Paz. The book

is written in the form of a diary from the perspective of a middle-class 8-year-old boy in

Santiago. The main character, Papelucho, documents his everyday life, in which he is

continuously able to find humor. Other selected texts addressed more challenging issues, like

poverty or immigration. For example, *Cajas de Cartón* is a powerful story from the perspective

of a young boy whose family immigrates from Mexico to California to work as farmers. The

book follows the family as they move within the U.S., trying to find work. Like *Gaby, Lost and*

Found, the book offers a story of immigration that counters Trump's negative rhetoric by portraying a humanizing experience. Providing texts like this in their original Spanish version helps support Spanish literacy development and place value on a language that is often considered inferior to English in the U.S. Many of the lessons I observed were taken from or built on the Expeditionary Learning curriculum, including the earlier described activities focusing on the text, *My Name Was Hussein*. Below, I provide more in-depth examples of Ms. Callahan's implementation of CLRT with multicultural materials by describing how she used another text, *Esperanza Rising,* to address grade level concepts while privileging the voices and experiences of people of color.

Esperanza Rising. As a class, Ms. Callahan's students read the book *Esperanza Rising* by Pam Muñoz Ryan, which is a young adult historical fiction that chronicles the life a Mexican migrant farmworker in the 1930s. At the beginning of the book, Esperanza's wealthy father is killed by bandits in Mexico. This tragedy is followed by her uncle setting fire to her house and family ranch in order to pressure her widowed mother to marry him. Esperanza and her mother flee to California, where Esperanza tries to adjust to the demanding life of a farmworker. With support from family and friends, Esperanza is able to work for a new future. The book captures aspects of life for migrant farm worker during the 1930s and the characters navigate the realities of strikes, discrimination, sickness and harsh living conditions. The author also portrays several characters' resilience, compassion and humanity throughout the novel. The use of this novel engaged students in meaningful conversations about life challenges, including losing loved ones and immigration experiences.

Above, I elaborated on how Ms. Callahan used the text, *My Name Was Hussein* to present and discuss the concept of identity. Using this text allowed students to engage in an exploration

of their own identities, which for many included elements of a non-dominant culture. On the first day of reading this text, a student asked a question regarding the main character's religion. Raul raised his hand and asked, "He's Muslim? Aren't those the ones that people say do the bombs?" Ms. Callahan replied, "Hussein is Muslim. Look at this picture of him and his family. They are a peaceful family. Sometimes, we hear things about groups of people and they aren't true. This is a Muslim family and they are very peaceful." The discussion ended with this comment, and I believe it was a powerful one. During several lessons and discussions, students in the class shared their outrage about the newly elected president's comments regarding Mexicans. The text used in this lesson provided a peaceful portrayal of a religion that had often been described negatively in the media. Including a different perspective of a non-dominant group in this manner is an example of how Ms. Callahan engaged in a multicultural curriculum.

This was especially relevant during the 2016 presidential election. Many students were distraught, especially those with ties to Mexico. Ms. Callahan created safe space for students to share their experiences, fears, and frustrations, and they incorporated literature that could help students make sense of the current events. Solórzano and Yosso (2002) present the notion a "counter-story" as a "method of telling the stories of those people whose experiences are not often told (i.e., those on the margins of society)" (p. 32). These narratives hold the potential to "challenge the dominant discourse on race, and further the struggle for racial reform" (p.32). During the time of this study, the newly elected president of the United States repeatedly made hateful remarks about Mexican immigrants. For example, in June 2015 when announcing his candidacy for president, he was quoted as saying, "When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending the best. They're sending people that have lots of problems and they're bringing those problems. They're bringing drugs, they're bringing crime. They're rapists and some, I assume,

are good people" (retrieved from www.newsday.com on October 12, 2017). Thus, he created a

dominant narrative about Mexican immigrants as criminals, with "good people" as an

exception. Solórzano and Yosso describe this type of narrative as a "majoritarian story" which

they explain, "distorts and silences the experiences of people of color" (p. 29).

In *Esperanza Rising,* Muñoz presents a counter-story to this negative portrayal. The

characters in her novel had been wealthy and were able to obtain legal documentation to come to

the United States. Although this status facilitated their immigration experience, they still faced

poverty and marginalization upon their arrival. Esperanza had been born into a wealthy and

highly educated family, yet found herself in a labor camp babysitting instead of attending school

and she struggled to learn English. *Esperanza Rising* has been highlighted by scholars as a

"critical fiction" (e.g., Media 2006), in which "Muñoz looks into her past to tell a story that

speaks to life and reality faced by previous generations and passes it to new ones (p. 74). Rather

than adhering to the master narrative that President Trump repeated, Muñoz's characters are

strong, resilient and law-abiding. This was also true in the book described earlier, *Gaby, Lost

and Found,* which Ms. Callahan used with a small group during guided reading. These novels

thus serve as counter-stories, or tools for "exposing, analyzing, and challenging the majoritarian

stories of racial privilege" (Solórzano & Yosso 2002, p. 32) and they humanize the

undocumented immigrant experience (Naidoo & Quiroa, 2016). *Gaby, Lost and Found* portrays

the love and strengths of a community among Latino/as and *Esperanza Rising* offers a story of

immigrants who despite their wealth, education and documentation status in the U.S., faced

severe hardship and discrimination. This use of a counter-story is part of what Solórzano and

Yosso describe as a critical race methodology in education, or one that "generates knowledge by

looking to those who have been epistemologically marginalized, silenced, and disempowered"
(p. 36).

Students read *Esperanza Rising* as a class, meaning that each day, it was expected for all
students to be on the same chapter and moving at the same pace. This took on different formats
throughout the unit. As with other class texts, Ms. Callahan began by reading the first section of
the book as a whole class. She read aloud while students followed along with their own copies.
She would pause after sections and ask questions to both clarify concepts and encourage higher
order thinking. Supports were built in for students with various reading skills, similar to
strategies I explained previously when I present the Tier 1 and 2 interventions through RTI. The
text provided a starting point for various class discussions and writing assignments. For example,
after reading Chapter 6 of the text, entitled "Los Melones," Ms. Callahan posed the following
quote and subsequent question to the class:

> *On page 99, Marta tells Esperanza, 'Just so you know, this isn't Mexico. No one will be*
> waiting *on you here.' What does she mean? How is Esperanza's life different in*
> *California? Cite details from the text to support your answer.*

One of the learning targets for this chapter from Expeditionary Learning states, "I can make
inferences using quotes from the text." (Retrieved from:

https://www.engageny.org/resource/grade-5-ela-module-1-unit-2/file/4166 on October 16, 2017).

Teachers have the flexibility to choose specific sections or quotes and implement learning
activities that reach any number of the learning targets. When I asked Ms. Callahan about the
decision to discuss this particular quote, she explained, "Well I like that this question asks
students to compare and contrast. That's an important 5th grade skill. And also, a lot of the
students have experiences living in different places. Some have lived in Mexico. So I think it's
helpful to engage them and get them interested in the reading. It's hopefully something that some

of them can relate to." (Personal communication, December 6, 2016). Furthermore, this lesson was building up the end of unit assessment, in which students were asked to write an analytical essay about how Esperanza changes over time.

Indeed, the students with whom I worked were in fact engaged with this text and made meaningful connections. Before this lesson, Ms. Callahan had asked that I work with a small group of students to support this task of looking for textual evidence that could answer the proposed question of how life was different for Esperanza now that she had left Mexico. For this task, I sat with Andrea, Karen, Arturo and Raúl. All four students had been identified as needing intervention services based on their progress in 5th grade. Furthermore, all were identified as ELLs, with varying degrees of linguistic abilities. Andrea and Karen often chose to use materials and speak in Spanish when given the option. At this point in the school year, these students had been identified as reading in English at a 2nd and 3rd grade level, with Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) scores of 24 (Karen) and 30 (Andrea). However, for this task, the students were able to participate and find examples how Esperanza's life had changed from the text, which was considered to be at a late 5th grade reading level.

I first asked the students to look for evidence about what Esperanza's life had been like in California. Karen offered that she had lived with her father, and Andrea explained that she had had people who worked for her. Both students were able to remember details from chapters they had read previously, displaying a comprehension of this higher-level text. During our small group work, Andrea offered up connections to her own family, explaining what her mother had shared about how life was different in Mexico. After taking notes on an example of how the character's life was different, she offered, "Miss, this is like my mom but different. In Mexico, she said there wasn't a good school for me, but here I get to go to a good school" (Field notes,

December 6, 2016). Karen responded by offering a similar example about her grandmother's experiences, saying that her life was better here and adding, "That's why she's scared because...no tiene papeles." Karen switched to Spanish mid-sentence to explain that her grandmother was nervous, because she did not have documentation to be in the U.S. This example elicits how two Latina EB students who had been identified as "struggling" based on standardized assessments, were able engage deeply with a text and make personal connections. While the character's Esperanza's life changed from one of wealth to poverty, Andrea and Karen shared experiences from their families about how immigration had offered a different type of change. Using this text also gave Karen the opportunity to connect to something that was central to her life at the time: the fear her grandmother experienced because of her immigration status. As Solórza and Yosso explain, Storytelling and counter-storytelling these experiences can help strengthen traditions of social, political, and cultural survival and resistance (p. 32). They authors encourage educators to continue sharing the counter-stories of those individuals who have been historically marginalized as a method of challenging oppression. Therefore, Ms. Callahan's text selection, as well as the surrounding activities, can be seen as powerful tools for centering on the lived experiences of her CLD students.

She chose a text with characters who shared a culture and language similar to many of her CLD students. She adhered to 5th grade standards by having her students write comparisons and use textual evidence, and chose to do so with a quote that she believed would engage the students. As the example of Karen and Andrea's work displays, this instructional choice engaged students who had been identified as EBs who struggled academically, and they were able to participate with grade level text. It is likely that if Ms. Callahan had used a different text to which the students could not easily relate, they would not have engaged and perhaps would have

not shown the participation and progress that they ultimately did. Thus, with the use of this text as well as additional support from teachers, including myself, within the classroom, unnecessary special education referrals were avoided because these students were able to achieve the content objectives. As a final assessment, students were asked to write an essay answering the question "How did Esperanza change over time?" Although students had read the text in English, this writing assignment was completed in Spanish. I describe below how this is an example of translanguaging and reflects a commitment of what can be referred to as "dynamic bilingualism" (García & Kleifgen, 2010). Karen and Andrea both wrote essays in Spanish in which they were able to provide textual evidence of how Esperanza changed in the novel. Andrea offered examples of how Esperanza learned to care for others, and described how she helped baby-sit and earn money for her family. Karen wrote about how Esperanza learned to be generous, and how even though she faced challenges, she was able to look at the bright side. One paragraph from her final essay read:

> Esperanza cambia de tener todo a no tener todo pero todavía estar feliz igualmente. Esperanza no tenía nada porque su casa se quemó y ahora está viviendo en una cabaña. Cuando estaba en la cabaña en california esperanza dijo. "Mama we are living like horses how can you sing how can you be happy we don't even have a room to call our own". Esto muestra que no está feliz porque está viviendo en una cabaña chiquita. Sin embargo cuando se acostumbró a vivir allí y era su cumpleanos ya estaba feliz. Cuando era su cumplanas esperanza dijo. "It wasn't exactly the birthday of her past. But it would still be a celebration". Esto muestra que porque no tiene todo pero todavía puede ser feliz. también ella todavía está feliz aunque esta batallando.

In the excerpt above, Karen explains how earlier in the novel, when Esperanza lost her home to a fire and had to live in a cabin in California, she complained to her mother and expressed her frustration. By the end however, she got used to her surroundings and on her birthday, was able to be happy. Her translated work reads:

> Esperanza changes from having everything to not having everything but still is happy. Esperanza didn't have anything because her house burned and now she is living in a cabin. When she was in the cabin in california, esperanza said. "Mama we are living like

horses how can you sing how can you be happy we don't even have a room to call our own". This shows that she is not happy because she is living in a small cabin. However after she got used to living there and it was her birthday, she was happy. When it was her birthday esperanza said. " It wasn't exactly the birthday of her past. But it would still be a celebration". This shows that because she doesn't have everything but she can still be happy. also she is still happy even though she is struggling.

While her writing shows some technical errors, including inconsistent punctuation and some unconventional spelling, Karen was nonetheless able to meet the content objective and analyze Esperanza's changes in the novel. She also used appropriate textual evidence to support her arguments.

Dynamic Bilingualism

García and Kleifgen (2010) describe *dynamic bilingualism* as "the development of different language practices to varying degrees in order to interact with increasingly multilingual communities" (p. 42). I observed several examples of Ms. Callahan and her colleagues implementing practices that reflect this perspective, which disrupts a commonly held belief that languages are autonomous. Rather than adhering to a strict separation of Spanish and English, the teachers at Córdoba allowed for flexibility in their language policy. While they did allocate a specific language to particular days and lessons, they encouraged students to use language together in order to develop new academic and linguistic knowledge. Furthermore, they encouraged students to participate in community activities by allowing them to use the two languages together.

For example, in March I observed a morning meeting in Ms. White's classroom. Two students had celebrated a birthday, and the students sang happy birthday to them in a mix of Spanish and English, alternating between languages for each verse. The morning message was written in Spanish, and Ms. White led the conversation in Spanish. Amanda, a bilingual Latina student, shared about her trip with her family to local hot springs. She shared in Spanish, and

included the English word for waterfalls, with raised eyebrows and a high intonation to her voice, indicating that she was unsure of how to say the word in the Spanish. Ms. White offered, "cascadas?" and the student responded, "Sí, cascadas." Then, Raúl spoke about his weekend, during which he had celebrated his grandmother's birthday. He spoke mostly in English, inserting a few Spanish words every now and then. When he was done speaking, his classmates asked questions. Amanda asked in Spanish when Raúl's grandmother's actual birthday was. To this, Raúl answered, "el mismo día que tu cumpleaños" explaining that it was the same day as Amanda's birthday. As described earlier, the morning meeting was a daily activity in both 5th grade classes that centered on the lives and experiences of students. Through this daily ritual, teachers created a strong sense of community. The encouragement to flow between two languages allowed students to participate authentically and use their knowledge across languages to engage in community building conversations and activities. Throughout the school year, each student was given a chance to share. By not adhering strictly to a forced separation of language, students were more likely to participate. For example, Raúl often resisted using Spanish. On more than one occasion I had approached him while he was working independently and spoke to him Spanish. He would answer me in English, explaining that Spanish was hard for him and that he didn't like speaking it. Raúl rarely offered to participate in Spanish during instruction. However, as his participation in this example shows, when the language policy was fluid, he did in fact use Spanish.

Ms. Callahan's strategic use of multicultural texts also supported a dynamic bilingual practice. For example, as a read aloud, she chose to read the book, *Tomás and the Library Lady* by Pat Mora. In this picture book, Tomás is a son of migrant workers. The book follows the main character and his family as they travel from Texas to Iowa every summer to follow the crops

which they tend to in the fields. The family gathers nightly to hear the grandfather's stories, and this offers a beautiful depiction of the storytelling tradition and the strength of family and community. Furthermore, the text moves between English and Spanish seamlessly, offering a realistic depiction of how bilingual speakers use both languages together, rather than keeping them strictly separated. This is yet another example of what I described earlier surrounding Ms. Callahan's use of multicultural literature to implement CLRT in Tier 1, and it also offers a model of bilingualism to which students can relate.

Translanguaging. García (2009) describes the notion of translanguaging as the cognitive functions and processes in which students and teachers engage in discursive practices to communicate in multilingual settings. This includes the practice of code-switching, or shifting between two languages, as well as other bilingual practices. For example, students may read a text in one language and then take notes or have a discussion about the text in another language (García & Kleifgen, 2010). There were several examples of this discursive practice among the 5th grade students and their teachers at Córdoba. One day before the winter break in December, students were completing writing assignments on the book *Esperanza Rising,* which they had completed reading the week before. Although the students had read the text in English, they were now writing about the text in Spanish. The goal was for students to describe challenges that the main character had faced. That day, Ms. Callahan modeled notetaking. She led the conversation in Spanish and returned to sections of the text that she had previously "flagged" by placing post-its with short comments such as, "Esperanza faces a challenge when her father is killed." Then, she modeled to her students how to re-read this (in English), and then wrote a description of this event in her notebook in Spanish. All of Ms. Callahan's explanations and instructions were in Spanish. Later, when I asked Ms. Callahan what had motivated her to use the two languages in

this way, she explained, "This is what made the most sense for us. *Esperanza Rising* has strong

examples of a character overcoming challenges. We spent a while reading the book, and that was

in English. Now it's time to work on our writing skills in Spanish. It's a good opportunity for

students to practice new skills across languages" (Personal communication, December 14, 2016).

Similarly, the excerpt included earlier of Karen's final essay on *Esperanza Rising* offers another

translanguaging practice in which students were writing in Spanish about a text they had read in

English. In Karen's example, she uses both English and Spanish appropriately to exemplify a

change in Esperanza. All her descriptions are in Spanish, yet when she includes quotes as textual

evidence to support her answer, she includes the original writing in English. This practice honors

the ability of a biliterate student to use both languages together in a way that makes sense to

bilingual readers.

In January, I observed another example of Ms. Callahan implementing teaching

techniques that encouraged translanguaging. For reading instruction, Ms. Callahan had the

following two goals written on the board in Spanish:

Metas del aprendizaje
1. Puedo **transferir** mi vocabulario de la selva del inglés al español.
2. Puedo **evaluar** la fiabilidad de una fuente.

In English, this translated to:
Learning Goals
1. I can transfer my rain forest vocabulary from English to Spanish.
I can evaluate the reliability of a source.

Ms. Callahan focused on the first goal, which asked students to transfer their vocabulary about

the forest from English to Spanish. She led the conversation in Spanish, starting with a review of

the word *transferir.* She asked students to provide other words that were related, in either

English or Spanish. Two students offered words in Spanish, "cambiar," and "mover," and one

student offered the English cognate, "transfer." Ms. Callahan continued to address the class in

Spanish, explaining that they would continue their study of the rainforest, which they had started weeks earlier in English. She explained that they would know be learning about the rain forest in Spanish, and thus would start by translating the vocabulary they had to Spanish. She displayed a short video that provided information about the rain forest in Spanish, and asked students to write down key words or concepts that they would need. Then, as a class, they used these words and matched them to their English translations that they had displayed on chart paper. After this mini-lesson, I observed the students looking through their own notebooks and completing a new chart with side-by-side vocabulary in English and Spanish. They would later reference this list as they continued to learn about the rain forest. Thus, students worked across the two languages to develop new understandings. Furthermore, language objectives were embedded in the learning goals.

García and Kleifgen (2010) maintain that it is important for bilingual teachers to have "a clear language-in-education policy," yet also "provide space for translanguaging as an important sense-making mechanism within these instructional spaces" (p. 46). Ms. Callahan and Ms. White alternated the language of instruction systematically and consistently. Yet, as the examples above display, they also built in opportunities for students to use both languages in order to facilitate their verbal participation as well as their academic skills.

Cognates. Students at Córdoba were also encouraged to identify and use Spanish and English cognates in their literacy practices. One afternoon in March, I observed Ms. Callahan working with a group of 5 students during reading. They were reading the text, *Maniac McGee.* Before reading for that day, Ms. Callahan would review one or two words that the students would encounter that might be new for them. On this day, she presented the word "solitary." Rather than simply providing the definition, which many teachers might do in this situation, Ms.

Callahan asked the students to use their linguistic resources to determine the word's meaning. She asked if anyone could think of a cognate, and Karen offered, "Solo means alone." Ms. Callahan responded, "and that root gets you to the meaning, because solitary means alone." She had previously written the word solo on the board, and as Karen spoke, wrote "solo = alone." This is another example of how teachers encouraged students to use their linguistic resources as a tool for learning, which is an important element of CLRT, and was also exemplified in the previous chapter when Ms. Kern complimented Jennifer's use of the Spanish word "sumar" to determine the meaning of "sum" during math instruction.

Critical Multilingual Awareness. One day in April before the upcoming state assessments, Ms. Callahan presented a video from school's website, that focused on how the school had shown great academic growth the previous year. She explained that Córdoba was rated as a "Green School," and that if the students did well on the state exams again, they would be given more freedom and flexibility. She explained, "This is an important way to show that bilingual schools can work well. We can do as well or better than English only schools." Then, Amanda, a White student whose home language was English commented, "It's funny that the literacy test is only in English. It should be English and Spanish." Her classmate, Charlotte, who was also a White English speaking student, added, "It's not fair if you're not allowed to take the test in your first language." She added that she didn't like how the focus is on English, because since the test is meant to measure reading progress, students should be able to show that growth in Spanish. Ms. Callahan agreed and told these students that she appreciated how they were thinking about equitable learning. These comments reflect what García and Kleifgen (2010) refer to as "critical multilingual awareness" in which students recognize and examine the "social, political, and economic struggles" embedded in different language practices. In this example,

White students were upset and vocal about language policies that they felt were unfair and reflected a hegemony of English. At other points of the school year, Ms. Callahan had encouraged students to bring this critical awareness to policies and practices within the school. For example, after the election results, she asked her White students to think about how they could be allies to their peers. Creating space for a critical awareness about culture and race is another example of how Ms. Callahan and her peers implemented CLRT techniques that centered on the lives and experiences of their students of color.

Conclusion

Researchers in the field of bilingual special education have explored how RTI can be implemented in a way that best supports struggling EB students' needs (Brown & Dolittle, 2008; Ortiz et al., 2011; Rivera et al., 2009). In order for RTI to be successful for EBs, all tiers of instruction must be "both *linguistically* and *culturally* congruent" (Brown & Doolittle 2008, p. 67). This includes not only addressing, but also honoring the diverse cultural, linguistic and learning experiences of learners. Ms. Callahan implemented CLRT in a Tier 1 general education setting by making meaningful connections to her students through daily practices like the morning meeting. She also incorporated activities that promoted a positive construction of her Latino/a EB students' ethnic identities, most notably, through her selection of classroom texts that represented cultures, communities and experiences to which her students could relate. She also used materials that included what Solórzano and Yosso (2002) describe as "counter-stories," or narratives that challenged the dominant negative discourses surrounding immigrants from Mexico. Her use of CLRT was aligned with CRT's tenet of privileging the voices and experiences of people of color. Through these approaches, she was able to engage EB students who struggled academically in grade level tasks, such as essay writing.

Furthermore, Ms. Callahan and Ms. White engaged in practices that reflected what García and Kleifgen (2010) describe as dynamic bilingualism through their use of translanguaging and recognition of the skills their bilingual students brought to the classroom. These techniques resonate with a Holistic Bilingual perspective, in which students are encouraged to use their knowledge and skills across two languages. In the previous chapter, I also included examples of Ms. Kern's strong interventions in a Tier 2 settings. The value she placed on students' ability to use Spanish is another example of how teachers at Córdoba implemented instruction that was linguistically responsive. Chapter 4 elaborates on how strong Tier 1 and 2 instruction prevented what might have been unnecessary or inappropriate referrals to special education. Struggling EB students were able to access grade level content in the general education classroom and small group intervention settings, which reflects DSE's commitment to inclusive models (Connor, Gabel, Gallagher & Morton, 2008). The examples provided in these two findings chapters illustrate how teachers at Córdoba provided appropriate academic supports in Tier 1 and 2 settings through the use of CLRT strategies. In the final chapter, I discuss these findings and offer implications for future steps that Córdoba, and schools who serve similar populations, might consider to further develop strong instruction for struggling EB students.

Chapter 6: Discussion and Implications

The findings from this qualitative case study suggest that teachers can support EB students who are struggling academically by using Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching (CLRT) teaching techniques. These teaching strategies seemed to be particularly successful for supporting students at Córdoba because they were implemented through Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) that aimed to meet students' needs in general education and small group intervention settings. Specifically, teachers in the first and second tiers of the Response to Intervention (RTI) model within a MTSS framework met the needs of struggling EB students and avoided what might have been inappropriate referrals to special education.

Research in the field of bilingual and special education has shown that EBs in DL programs outperform those in English-only programs on academic achievement assessments (e.g., Krashen, Rolstad & McSwan, 2007; Slavin & Cheung, 2005). Furthermore, EB students who struggle academically benefit from bilingual instruction (e.g., August & Siegel, 2006; Maldonado, 1994). A DL program, such as the one that existed at Córdoba, can provide adequate instruction in two languages, which also benefits EB students who are struggling academically. Córdoba aimed for a 50/50 language distinction and in the upper grades (3-5), all teachers were bilingual and provided instruction in both English and Spanish. While this setup seemed to be the most beneficial for EB students' language acquisition and for supporting EB students who struggle academically, there are additional approaches that the school, and other similar settings, might take in order to better serve its population of students. Below, I provide a discussion of the findings and implications for further meeting the needs of struggling EB students.

A supportive setting

Ms. Kern and Ms. Callahan were strong teachers who provided culturally and linguistically relevant instruction to their students. One thing that seemed to make this possible was the supportive context Córdoba's DL program provided. There are several dominant narratives in education that inform the teaching of students who are navigating more than one language. Among these narratives is the notion that students who enter school speaking a language other than English present problems or challenges (Escamilla, 2000; Orellana, 2001; Shin, 2013). DL programs reflect a commitment to dynamic bilingualism (García & Kleifgen, 2010) and reframe language as a resource by placing value on the development of *two languages* (De Jong, 2011; Palmer, 2009). Furthermore, they aim to offer opportunities for more equitable learning opportunities for Latino/a students (Valdés, 1997; Valenzuela, 2002). DL programs, including the one at Córdoba, explicitly support students of color in the maintenance and further development of their family's language while simultaneously developing skills in English. A common goal of DL education is to create positive attitudes across different cultures by, among other things, intentionally diversifying schools (Howard & Sugarman 2007).

However, research in the field has also documented the role that White, English-speaking families have played in DL education. For example, Palmer (2010) drew on CRT's principle of interest convergence to examine a DL program that attracted middle-class White students to a predominantly Black and Latino/a community, yet only included some Latino/a students and almost no Black students. Córdoba presented a different, and perhaps unique, case in which the neighborhood was experiencing gentrification during the time of the study, yet the principal, Ms. Bennett, made a strong effort to continue enrolling Latino/a Spanish-speaking students. In a conversation with Ms. Bennett after the completion of the study, I asked about her ability to

maintain this balance given the dramatic changes in the neighborhood. She acknowledged that it was a challenge, and explained that she was surprised that she was able to continue enrolling a diverse group of students. Each year, she held about ten spots in the Early Childhood Education (ECE) enrollment until close to the start of the school year, with the plan that Latino/a Spanish speaking students would fill these spots, which at the time of this study's completion, continued to work out. She also explained that she doesn't do any "recruiting," because she believed it would be unfair to take students away from other neighborhood schools. One factor that she thought impacted the enrollment of Spanish-speaking Latino/a students was the community of families who attended Córdoba. Most of the focal students in this study had older siblings and cousins who had graduated from Córdoba. Furthermore, although many traveled 30 minutes or more each way to attend the school, some had relatives who lived in the area. For example, Karen did not live close to Córdoba, but her grandmother resided in the neighborhood and would pick her and her sister up each day after school and stay with them until their mother could come get them after work. Thus, although Córdoba was situated in an area that was becoming increasingly White, 63% of the student population were Latino/a at the time of the study.

Events like the meeting regarding immigration rights in February following President Trump's inauguration highlighted the school's commitment to serving the Latino/a community at Córdoba. This meeting was led by the principal and school psychologist and held completely in Spanish. Acts like these highlighted the administration's commitment to protecting and serving students and families of color. Also, the 5th grade graduation ceremony included a notable allocation of languages. Ms. Bennett started by addressing the community in Spanish. While there were community members in attendance who did not speak Spanish, she did not seem to feel the need to translate. Then, performances and speeches were presented in either English,

Spanish or a combination of the two: The fourth-grade chorus sang a song in English, a 5th grader gave a speech in English and then another 5th grader spoke in Spanish. Two 5th graders presented a "slam poem," bilingually, code-switching beautifully between lines and stanzas as they reflected on their years at Córdoba.

Raúl gave a speech in Spanish, about what it meant to be bilingual. (See Appendix C for full speech in Spanish.) He started off by explaining that he learned Spanish for his father, and then paused, unable to continue through his tears. He struggled to speak, and only did so after Ms. Bennett walked up to him on stage, rubbed his back, and remained by his side with her arm around him. He spoke about the importance of speaking Spanish, and his ability to help others by translating for them, He also mentioned several countries he would be able to easily navigate because of his bilingual skills. After the ceremony, Raúl told me that he had felt emotional talking about his father, and nervous to speak in front of everyone. He also felt proud that he was able to deliver his speech and talk about what it meant to be bilingual, especially in Spanish because he felt much more comfortable speaking in English.

The graduation highlighted the school and Ms. Bennett's commitment to valuing students like Raúl. The comfort she was able to provide Raúl as he began crying on stage showed her connection to the individual students. Having the space in front of the entire school community for Raúl to elaborate on his pride as a bilingual student illustrated the value the school placed on honoring Spanish as a language as well as bilingualism.

Ms. Kern, Ms. Callahan, and other practitioners with whom I spoke consistently highlighted Ms. Bennett's strong leadership, as well as the school's DL and MTSS model. As shown in the findings, the teachers in this study addressed the needs of their students of color by implementing CLRT techniques. They created safe spaces in the school for students and

families to process the 2016 election results and share their fears. They sought out materials and texts that represented diverse perspectives as well as "counter stories." They encouraged their Spanish-speaking Latino/a students to use Spanish as a resource and were flexible with their language policy. And they were not alone; this type of CLRT was reflected and supported by administrative actions. The approaches shown at Córdoba can be described using CRT's tenet of privileging experiential knowledge. Teachers and administrations recognized that students of color held valuable knowledge, which is considered critical in CRT to transforming racism (Delgado Bernal, 2002; Yosso, 2005). As scholars of CRT in education describe, this approach favors the voices of individuals who have experienced oppression (Ladson-Billings, 1998) and the experiences of students and families of color are privileged and recognized in various methods, such as Raúl's speech (Yosso, 2005). Furthermore, the teachers' flexibility with the school's language policy, as well as the use of Spanish during school-wide events such as the graduation ceremony reflect dynamic bilingual practices and are considered ideal from a Holistic Bilingual Perspective. In these contexts, rather than considering students as two monolinguals in one, learners were encouraged to use their knowledge of two languages together in order to create and share meaning.

School administrators can use Ms. Bennett's leadership as an example of how to support teachers who work with struggling EB students. Having a strong MTSS process and modeling culturally and linguistically responsive approaches can set the tone for teachers. When speaking with me, Ms. Bennett emphasized that she was committed to working with Latino/a families, and worried about the day that she would no longer be able to at Córdoba because of the changing demographics in the neighborhood and city. She also acknowledged that many of her teachers had sought out employment at Córdoba in order to work with CLD students, but many were

being priced out of the neighborhood as well. It will be interesting to observe if and how the continuing gentrification of this neighborhood and price increase in housing impact the future student and teacher population, and what this might mean for addressing issues of special education in a DL environment and even the DL program itself. Currently, many White, English-speaking families are eager to have their students attend Córdoba, in part so that they can learn Spanish. The city in which this study took place participated in School Choice at the time of the study, and many White families were waitlisted annually to enroll at Córdoba. Also, Córdoba had "Innovation" status, which provided additional freedom to control its educational program, budget, staff, time and other incentives. Thus, Ms. Bennett was able to make decisions about the DL model and student enrollment as she and the community deemed fit. It was clear that the many decisions were made with Latino/a Spanish-speaking families' best interests in mind, and it will be interesting to see if and how this continues in the wake of further gentrification.

Next steps. The teachers observed in this study, Ms. Callahan, Ms. Ramond, Ms. White, Ms. Sky and Ms. Kern were White, English-speaking women. All except for Ms. Kern also spoke Spanish, which they learned from studying in school and in some cases, living in Latin America. Although they identified as bilingual, they each expressed feeling much more confident speaking, reading, and teaching in English and had insecurities about their Spanish teaching skills. The ability to speak Spanish may not be enough to implement a successful DL curriculum in a context like Córdoba's. While there are several documented examples of Ms. Callahan's use of CLRT, the literacy curriculum she implemented in Spanish was mostly a translation of the skills, concepts and strategies she addressed in English. As is the case in many Spanish/ English DL programs within the U.S., the Spanish literacy program at Córdoba was developed based on

148

English literacy teaching practices, rather than theories surrounding Spanish literacy instruction (Escamilla, 2000). Furthermore, Ms. Callahan, despite her commitment to teaching in two language and implementing approaches that reflected a Holistic Bilingual Perspective, had not received any education in DL education. This was evident in many of her Spanish literacy lessons, in which she translated concepts and materials directly from English. This approach is not aligned with a Holistic Bilingual Perspective, because it fails to recognize the differences in education between languages. Córdoba and other schools that attempt to implement a DL curriculum would benefit from a deeper understanding of how literacy instruction varies across languages. Teacher training that specifically addresses the diverse needs of students learning in two languages might also promote pedagogical practices that better serve the unique student population.

Furthermore, despite the school's attempt to create an equal balance between English and Spanish by having a 50/50 model in the upper grades, English still seemed to be valued over Spanish in some cases. Students like Arturo who were identified as struggling in literacy and showed resistance to speaking, reading and writing in Spanish, were excused from many Spanish activities. They participated in whole class instruction in Spanish, but were often encouraged to complete tasks in English. This decision was made with the intention of supporting students who were struggling, because teachers believed that it was better to develop strong skills in one language rather than have students struggle with two. However, this practice inadvertently sends a message that it was not as important for students to continue to develop their skills in Spanish. Decisions like these were made on a case-by-case basis, and they did not seem to be grounded in any empirical research. The school might benefit from professional development that explores

research on bilingual instruction for struggling students and how additional supports might help all students develop bilingual and biliterate skills.

My connection to the community did present some challenges in addressing the complexities I noticed at Córdoba. At the beginning of the study, administrators had emphasized their desire to learn more about how to address special education in the DL environment, but they did not want to agree to a study in which their downfalls would be highlighted. I hesitated to include data that focused on problematic practices, such as Ms. Sky's challenges in delivering high quality instruction in a tier 2 setting. Ultimately, I chose to organize this study as one that could contribute by offering positive examples of how teachers were implementing RTI and was therefore to avoid documenting what I saw from Ms. Sky. However, I also recognize the danger is presenting an unrealistic image of Córdoba as a perfect school. While the teachers I spent most of my time observing, Ms. Callahan and Ms. Kern, delivered high quality instruction in tiers 1 and 2, there continue to be problematic patterns at Córdoba. For example, although Ms. Kern's instruction was consistent and strategic, the students in her intervention group had been receiving tier 2 services for years. Ideally, after receiving this type of targeted support, students should be able to participate in the general education setting without it. However, at Córdoba, once students were in interventions, they did not seem to leave.

Furthermore, although administrators and teachers were visibly committed to educational equity for their diverse student population, there were nonetheless notable patterns of Disproportionate Representation (DR). From observations as well as interviews with classroom teachers and special education teachers it seemed that most, if not all of the students with IEPs at Córdoba were Latino/a. In 5th Grade, all of the students who had IEPs or received tier 2 interventions identified as Latino/a and most of them were also labeled as EB students.

Furthermore, there was a gifted and talented program for the 5th graders. Math and Literacy instructors would pull groups of students out for a portion of the day. I noted the alarming pattern from the group of 20 students with whom I spent most of my time. For math, *all* of the White students, except for one, would leave the math classroom for 45 minutes twice a week. Only one of the Latino/a students, Alán, who had been identified as an EB student, participated. The same pattern was true for the literacy gifted and talented program, but a different student, Elizabeth, attended. I asked Ms. Callahan about this and she commented that Elizabeth's scores weren't as high as the other students who were selected for the enrichment program, but that she had recommended her mostly to have at least one non-White student attend. Despite Ms. Callahan and other practitioners' awareness of problematic patterns of DR, and their efforts to address them, there continued to be an overrepresentation of students of color in tier 2 and 3 interventions, and an underrepresentation in enrichment programs.

The patterns described above of remaining in intervention for years as well as patterns of DR raise questions about the instruction and assessment at Córdoba, and for whom they are designed. Perhaps with curricula and activities that were *designed* specifically for culturally and linguistically diverse students, rather than modified or translated, Spanish-speaking Latino/a students would receive fewer "struggling" labels and have more opportunities for enrichment programs like their White peers. Future research might explore this reality of DR in a DL setting and identify the specific factors that contribute to the ongoing trends.

Language of Instruction

In the earlier grades at Córdoba, students receive the majority of their instruction in the language that is identified as their stronger language. By 4th grade, all students receive half of their instruction in English and half in Spanish. Thus, in 5th grade, Ms. Callahan and Ms. White

attempted to provide a 50/50 balance of instruction in English and Spanish in Tier 1 settings. In Tier 2 interventions, Ms. Kern only offered instruction in English and Ms. Sky occasionally provided supports in Spanish. When determining which students would receive intervention from either Ms. Kern or Ms. Sky, student language proficiency was a major factor. The teachers believed that some students would benefit more from receiving literacy support in Spanish. As a result, they were assigned to work with Ms. Sky For example, Andrea and Daniela were two students who, when given the option, usually chose to speak and read in Spanish. They were also identified as struggling academically. These students, and others who had similar needs, were then assigned to work in Ms. Sky's intervention group with the intention of receiving supports in Spanish or English, as needed. However, Ms. Sky expressed insecurity about her Spanish skills, and when I observed her, it was clear that she struggled to address academic concepts in Spanish. She communicated much more effectively in English. I did not include details about Ms. Sky's intervention work with students, because it was hard to find evidence to show that this was a successful support for EB students, and my goal was to share strategies that were supportive for this population. Research suggests that students like Andrea and Daniela who were considered EBs and struggling academically, can benefit from instruction in their home language (August & Siegel, 2006). However, in the case at Córdoba, the intervention with Ms. Sky, which was at the second tier of the RTI model, was not strong. I was relieved to see that these two students were not referred to special education because of a lack of progress in this Tier 2 setting, because it seemed that continuing struggles would likely have been attributed to weak instruction rather than an inherent disability. Instead, halfway through the year, they switched groups and began receiving intervention supports from Ms. Kern, all in English. This was based on schedule changes and a belief that as they prepared for English-only middle schools, they would benefit

152

more from receiving more instruction and intervention in English. This is yet another example of a decision that inadvertently depicts English as a dominant language and contradicts the intentions of DL education. If students are not held accountable for developing skills in Spanish, they might not see the language as valuable as English. The lack of DL education at the middle school level is already worrisome, and increased English instruction in Tier 2 meant less instruction in Spanish even earlier than expected.

Ms. Kern, as I described in the findings, was a very strong teacher who worked with her students in intervention, a tier 2 setting, and special education, a tier 3 setting. She had been at the school for over a decade and expressed a commitment to providing strong intervention and special education services for her students. And although she was unable to provide instruction in Spanish, she encouraged the use of Spanish amongst her students and showed an appreciation for her students' bilingual skills. Her students seemed to enjoy working with her. They worked hard in her setting and felt comfortable making connections to their personal lives. Through writing samples and running records, it was evident that the students in her small group intervention improved in their literacy skills over the course of the year. The distinction between the services Ms. Sky struggled to provide in Spanish and the strong supports Ms. Kern provided in English can be used to examine options for struggling EB students. While it seems that strong tier 2 supports in students' home language would be beneficial, the case at Córdoba illustrates how English-only Tier 2 supports, such as those implemented by Ms. Kern, can still be linguistically responsive and thus beneficial for EB students.

Moreover, Ms. Sky's supports in Spanish did not seem extremely effective because she did not have a strong grasp on her Spanish speaking and reading skills. She also had several roles at Córdoba at the time of the study, and admitted to not being able to give her intervention

153

responsibilities as much planning and dedication as she would have liked. As a result, she often did not feel comfortable having me observe her lessons even though she had agreed to participate in the study. I respected this and only joined her lessons when I was invited. During these observations, she often apologized for her lack of preparation, and she seemed uncomfortable with me there. I therefore limited these observations, and instead focused on the strong interventions Ms. Kern provided. My goal in this study was to highlight effective strategies, rather than expose inadequate ones. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that the current RTI system at Córdoba would benefit from stronger Tier 2 interventions, especially those available in Spanish to support struggling EB students. A Holistic Bilingual Perspective supports instruction across languages, rather than creating binaries between Spanish and English. Thus, an interventionist who has strong reading and writing skills in both languages could support struggling EB students by offering instruction and support bilingually. Such an educator might be able to support students to develop their academic and linguistic skills in English and Spanish, and could recognize students' capabilities in and across both languages.

There was one special education teacher at Córdoba who was bilingual: Ms. Ramond. She worked with some students in Spanish if teachers believed this would be most beneficial. However, she also expressed insecurity about her instruction in Spanish, and after observing her Spanish speaking skills, it was clear that she too was much more effective at communicating in English.

Ms. Kern and Ms. Ramond left Córdoba at the end of the school year. They had been at the school for over a decade, but both were moving out of the state for personal reasons. The fall after I completed this study, the school was still searching for bilingual special educators to work with Spanish-speaking students who were struggling and had IEPs. After months of searching,

they had hired one special educator who did not speak Spanish and were still searching for a bilingual special educator as I completed this writing in the Spring of 2018. The challenge in finding candidates for this position speaks to the need for educators who are truly bilingual and/or have strong speaking and instructional skills in Spanish to serve the Spanish-speaking EBs who struggle academically.

Next steps. While the intervention and special education teachers at Córdoba seemed committed to implementing teaching strategies that viewed bilingualism as an asset, students would benefit from having stronger supports available in both English and Spanish. A Holistic perspective recognizes the variety of individual differences and social contexts that must be considered when understanding the development of bilingualism in individual students. The ability to address students' academic needs across languages is critical for providing appropriate intervention supports.

When I last spoke with Ms. Bennett about this need, which she acknowledged, she mentioned that she and her colleagues were investigating the option of having current bilingual teachers at the school receive training and education in special education. It seems that this would be a possible solution to address the lack of personnel who can support Spanish-speaking EB struggling students in both English and Spanish. Furthermore, the teachers observed in this study all spoke Spanish as a second language. It seems that it would be beneficial to employ teachers who are simultaneous bilinguals, Spanish as a first language, and/or are more proficient in Spanish in order to provide stronger instruction and intervention for the EBs at this school. Ms. Bennett said that it was a challenge for her to find instructors who met this criterion, which implies a need for different recruitment methods at Córdoba, as well as in teacher education programs. Administrators might consider opportunities for current bilingual staff members to

pursue special education degrees and offer appropriate incentives. Continuing to pursue education when one is a classroom teacher is a large undertaking, both financially and time-wise. Yet, deepening the understanding of the complexities involved in the bilingual special education interface would greatly benefit struggling EB students. In fact, during the year following this study, Ms. Callahan reached out to seek my advice about pursuing a degree in special education. While she was eager to improve her ability to meet the needs of varied learners, she worried about how she would balance the responsibilities of teaching and graduate school. An educator like Ms. Callahan, who already provides strong Tier 1 education, could offer even more valuable supports to EBs with a stronger understanding of developmental variations among EB learners. Providing opportunities for professional development and/or support for further teacher education could make the most of the valuable knowledge and skills bilingual educators hold and help provide stronger supports through RTI in a DL setting.

Furthermore, teacher preparation programs can address the need for skilled teachers in the field by offering dual degrees in Bilingual and Special Education. While it can be challenging to find professors and researchers with an in-depth knowledge of the two fields, experts from different areas can collaborate to offer comprehensive programs. Furthermore, issues of race, ethnicity, culture, and language are often missing from special education coursework, but must be addressed in order to best prepare teachers working with EB students in special education (Mccray & García, 2002). This can support teachers in understanding and addressing the larger societal factors that often contribute to inequitable learning opportunities for students of color in special education.

English Language Development

All 5th grade students at Córdoba participated in a daily 45-minute block called "Second Language Development" or L2. Ms. Callahan taught the English Language Development (ELD) block for 45 minutes a day to 5th graders who were considered to be Spanish-dominant and her partner teacher, Ms. White, taught a Spanish Language Development (SLD) block to the students who were considered English-dominant. Ms. Callahan said the determination of students' language dominance was "imperfect," and based on a combination of ACCESS test scores, information from previous teachers, family members, and informal observations. When I asked her about this distinction, and how decisions were made for simultaneous bilinguals, Ms. Callahan explained:

Certain kids are clear, in terms of which language they learned first, or speak at home. For others if it's not as clear, so we think about what they need to work on to be successful. So for Arturo and Raúl, someone in the family speaks Spanish, but there's also a lot of English. They have been stronger in English orally, but need help accessing the information so we are focusing on English literacy. They are in English L2 so that we can work on English academic language (Personal communication, February 23, 2017).

Because all 40 of the 5th graders at Córdoba were split into only 2 groups for L2 instruction, each group had a wide range of learners with different levels of language proficiencies and academic strengths and needs. During Ms. Callahan's L2 instruction, which was devoted to ELD, she provided clear language and content goals, such as the ones surrounding *My Name was Hussein.* When I asked Ms. Callahan about how she developed the units and lessons for this ELD block, she explained that she and Ms. Sky, the instructional coach and interventionist, had discussed coming up with a scope and sequence for the year, "but then

decided to let it be more flexible and unit by unit look at what the kids needed and how we wanted to use that time" (Personal Communication, February 23, 2017).

In the findings, I explained how Ms. Callahan used culturally and linguistically responsive materials and pedagogy during her ELD block to construct ethnic identity, revisit skills that were being addressed in reading and writing, and to review English vocabulary, grammar and syntax. Saunders and Goldberg (2010) present guidelines for targeted, focused instruction on ELD for EB students. Based on a synthesis of the research in the field, the authors found that EBs benefit from a specific block of instruction that is explicitly focused on developing language skills in order to develop English proficiency. This was attempted at Córdoba through the daily ELD block for the EBs who, according to their teachers, could benefit from additional English support rather than Spanish support. Ms. Callahan met with the students daily and had well-planned lessons aimed at developing English speaking, reading, writing and listening skills. Saunders and Goldberg also stressed the importance of grouping EB students carefully according to language proficiency for ELD instruction. This was more of a challenge for Ms. Callahan, given the structure of Córdoba's L2 designation.

She had one group of students who had a wide range of language proficiencies. She had students who were simultaneous bilinguals with strong verbal and literacy skills in both English and Spanish, as well as students who had received only a year or so of formal education in English and were struggling academically. Some days, Ms. Callahan would prepare and deliver a single lesson with very little differentiation for the students with different levels of proficiency. Other days, she would create stations and group students who had similar needs. Some would work independently on their Chromebooks, either on reading or writing tasks, and some would work with a teacher support. Ms. Sky would often be in the classroom during this time and work

with a group, which she and Ms. Callahan planned ahead of time. Ms. Callahan also planned for me to work with a group with a specific task when I was present. Having multiple teachers in the classroom during this time facilitated more appropriate grouping for ELD instruction and speaks to the benefits of collaboration amongst school practitioners when supporting EB students. It seems that more consistent use of multiple practitioners at Córdoba during this ELD block could make the instruction more targeted and better address the specific needs of students at the various language proficiency levels.

Saunders and Goldberg also noted that EBs need ELD instruction even after they have reached early and advanced proficiency levels in order to continue developing their skills. At Córdoba, all students received L2 support. Thus, students at every level of proficiency received some additional support in either English or Spanish.

Next steps. As Ms. Callahan had explained, the practice of determining the groups from L2 was imperfect. From a Holistic Bilingual Perspective, this created what seemed to be a false binary between dominant English and Spanish speakers. There were not any clear considerations for the students who were "simultaneous bilinguals," or those who are not monolingual in either Spanish or English upon entering school, but instead begin speaking both languages from a young age (Escamilla & Hopewell, 2010). This binary can be problematic because it can fail to appropriately meet the linguistic strengths and needs of EB students. Although Ms. Callahan attempted to differentiate implement small group work within her L2 class, she also often delivered whole class instruction, meaning that there were 20 students at varying levels of English proficiency.

Based on Saunders and Goldberg's recommendations, as well as the examples of Ms. Callahan's L2 instruction, it seems as though a more systematic approach to 5th graders ELD

instruction could benefit the 5th grade EBs at Córdoba. Rather than dividing all students into two groups during the allotted L2 time, students would benefit from working more consistently in smaller groups with other students who have similar levels of language proficiency. The presence of only two 5th grade teachers poses a problem for this suggestion. However, given the collaborative nature at Córdoba, it seems reasonable to include more participation from other practitioners, such as Ms. Sky, into the development and implementation of ELD. It seems that a better planned out scope and sequence, as well as specific activities that targeted the unique needs at each level of proficiency would offer more benefits for EB students, and might better support those who are struggling academically.

Córdoba would also likely benefit from using assessments to consider what students can do across languages, rather than in each language separately. A Holistic Bilingual Perspective emphasizes that bilingual students are not merely "the sum of two complete or incomplete monolinguals" (Grosjean 1989, p. 3). This lens encourages assessments that fully capture EB students' abilities in both languages rather than what they are able to do in one language without considering the other. Through the practice of L2 designations, at Córdoba received what seems to be arbitrary labels about their language strengths and needs. Teachers used the Developmental Reading Assessment, Second Edition, PLUS (DRA2+), a formative reading assessment in English in which teachers observe, record, and evaluate changes in student reading performance. Teachers also used the Spanish equivalent of DRA2, the second edition of the Evaluación del desarrollo de la lectura (EDL2+). 5th graders at Córdoba who scored below grade level on the DRA2 in English were automatically considered for Tier 2 literacy interventions with Ms. Kern or Ms. Sky. The ultimate decision about student grouping was made at a meeting among 5th grade teachers and interventionists in a scheduled MTSS meeting. Students who only scored

below grade level on the ELD2+ were *not i*dentified as needing interventions in Spanish from one of the school's specialists. Instead, these students were placed in the SLD block with Ms. White for the 45-minute daily L2 block. Relying on monolingual assessments like these does not provide adequate information about EBs' literacy development (Hopewell and Escamilla, 2014). At Córdoba, information from these assessment tools was used to group students into certain intervention and L2 groups. Instead, the school might benefit from using a more holistic bilingual approach and considering bilingual assessments that can provide deeper insight into the unique development of the EBs at Córdoba. This could result in more targeted and appropriate instruction that better supports the linguistic and academic strengths and needs of the students.

Transition to Middle School

Córdoba was a school that served students in grades Pre-K through 5th. At the end of the school year, I attended the 5th grade students' graduation ceremony, and observed their excitement and apprehension about the next stage of their education: middle school. With the exception of three students, all of the 5th graders at Córdoba were heading to one of two local middle schools: Steele, a local middle school or Blaise, a local charter school. It is important to note that *all* of the Latino/a students, except for two, were heading to Blaise Charter and *all* of the White students were enrolling at Steele, except for one student who was going to a private school. I spoke to Ms. Kern and another interventionist about this after the students' graduation ceremony. Ms. Kern said that she worried about the students who were heading to Blaise, and she questioned their discipline approach that she described as being very rigid. She felt that other students she had taught who attended Blaise were labeled as "good or bad," and that many of her students would return to her saying, "Miss, I'm bad now," which is very telling and troublesome. She expressed concern for Raúl and Arturo, who were both planning to attend Blaise. She

thought that they might "get in trouble," which they did not deserve. She explained how she

perceived students calling out or interrupting one another during instructional activities as a form

of engagement, and understood that this type of participation often varied based on family

culture. She worried that teachers at Blaise would punish students unfairly for this type of

behavior. Trends like the one Ms. Kern described have been noted by researchers who study the

overrepresentation of students of color in special education and the cultural biases in the referral

and evaluation process (e.g., Harry & Klingner, 2014; Skiba et al., 2006). When Harry and

Klingner (2014) explored the cultural contexts of schools that surrounded the special education

classification and placement processes, they explained how public contexts, including schools,

favor a dominant culture, which in the United States is that of White, middle-class "Americans."

The authors found that although their study focused on schools with mostly Latino/a and Black

student populations, middle-class White culture was the "normal currency" (p. 43) of the

classrooms. In their qualitative case study, there was a clear presence of racial bias in teachers'

tones and manners towards children. At a time when many teachers from a dominant culture are

educating students of color, it is troublesome to consider the strong impact these biases have

when it comes to discipline and special education referrals. Teacher education programs must

explicitly address issues of race and power before working with culturally diverse students in

order to avoid these problematic trends.

Chapter 4 of this study details Arturo and Raúl's focused participation during Ms. Kern's

interventions. During most of my observations, they were on task and engaged in the reading and

writing activities. They consistently participated in meaningful discussions about the text and

provide written responses displaying their understanding of the reading. Arturo and Raúl were

both very talkative and curious. They often talked out of turn and over one another as they

enthusiastically made connections to texts and new discoveries. They asked questions that to some, might have seemed unrelated to the content objectives, but were in fact sparked by some connection they were making to the class activity. Ms. Kern rarely became visibly frustrated or upset with Raúl, Arturo, or any other student. Instead, she gently redirected them and expressed appreciation for their curiosity. She was patient, supportive, encouraging and never punitive. As a result, her students were engaged and on task. As Ms. Kern expressed, it is troublesome to consider how their behaviors might be addressed in a middle school with a different discipline system that does not tolerate behaviors such as calling out. Raúl and Arturo were enthusiastic learners, and the implications of entering a middle school that does not value various forms of participation is cause for concern.

Furthermore, neither Blaise nor Steele Middle Schools provide DL education. Ms. Sky implemented Tier 2 literacy interventions in Spanish for some of the 5th grade students, but as she explained in an interview, she worked with students mostly in English by the end of the school year in order to better prepare them for an English-only learning environment in middle school. In Córdoba's neighborhood, there was only one DL option for middle school, and only one Spanish-speaking Latino student from the study was attending. This lack of DL education beyond elementary school warrants consideration, given that the bilingual model at Córdoba is considered to be most beneficial for EB students. Students would benefit from continued instruction in both language in order to better develop biliteracy skills. It is worrisome to consider the types of supports, or lack thereof, that students like Raúl, Arturo, Karen and Daniela might receive at Blaise Charter. Additionally, because these students received Tier 2 interventions, but did not have IEPs, there was no guarantee that they will continue to receive similar academic supports in middle school. The effort at Córdoba to keep students out of special

education if it was unnecessary is commendable, yet the lack of a special education label also seemed to mean that they would not be mandated to receive supports when they transitioned to a new school. When I asked the interventionists at Córdoba about Tier 2 services at the middle school level, they were unsure of the resources available. The scope of this research project did not enable me to properly investigate what Tier 2 and 3 services, if any, exist in these middle schools. The field of bilingual special education could benefit from future research that examines the supports available for the focal students as they transition from Córdoba's DL setting to middle school

Next steps. Looking forward, it would be helpful to understand if and how the supports at Córdoba had lasting impacts on the EB students who struggled academically. Future research might examine how the students in this study performed academically at the middle school level. Based on teachers' knowledge about Blaise and Steele, it also seemed that the CLRT supports students received through RTI at Córdoba might not be available at the middle school level. Thus, it is worth considering whether the lack of an IEP might in fact have been a disservice for EB students who struggled academically. Disabilities in Education Studies is a framework for addressing special education that is committed to social justice and inclusive models (Connor, Gabel, Gallagher & Morton, 2008). Teachers at Córdoba were able to keep struggling EB students in the general education classroom by providing appropriate academic supports in strategic Tier 1 and 2 settings through a successful implementation of RTI. Therefore, rather than separate students who needed support in special education settings, struggling students were supported in their classroom alongside their peers as well as in intervention settings. Avoiding unnecessary special education labels and separated special education placements is important, especially given the alarming trend of the overrepresentation of students of color with IEPs and

the negative stigma associated with many disability labels. However, it is also concerning to consider if and how the EB students in this study would be supported academically moving forward as they transitioned to middle school. Furthermore, using CRT in Education encourages a re-examination of this system that requires students to be labeled in order to receive appropriate supports. This perspective recognizes how racism is embedded in the culture of our country and thus, contributes to inequitable learning experiences for students of color. Future research might address the tension that arises when trying to support struggling EBs academically without the stigmatization of a disability label that might result in an inappropriate special education placement and contribute to the overrepresentation of students of color in special education. This concern also speaks the importance of having *all* educators, not just special education teachers and interventionists, receive preparation for working with students who have a variety of linguistic backgrounds as well as learning strengths and needs. If general education teachers are able to provide differentiated support in Tier 1 settings, there will be less of a need to refer students to intervention and special education services. IDEA mandates that all students are entitled to a free and appropriate education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Thus, general education teachers must be willing and able to provide meaningful educational experiences to all students that are appropriate for their specific learning needs and take into consideration diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The findings from this study imply that this can be done by implementing instruction that is both culturally and linguistically responsive, as well as differentiated. The same should be true at the middle school level in order to continue meeting the needs of struggling EB students. Following the students from this study, or others with similar linguistic and learning profiles, through middle school

could contribute to a deeper understanding of how to best support EB struggling students in K-12 settings.

Role of Researcher

As I described in my methodology, one of my main goals as a participant observer in Ms. Callahan's classroom was to ensure that the participants would "receive the benefits" of my research (Creswell 2014, p. 98). I relied on Paris's (2011) description of "humanizing research" as I collected data and participated in classroom activities. I observed and analyzed student and teacher actions, but also offered instructional support as needed. I also participated in morning meetings and outside classroom activities, and shared personal details about my own life and experiences before asking that students share about themselves.

I developed close relationships with Ms. Callahan and Ms. Kern, as well as with several students, especially Raúl. He often confided in me about personal challenges he was experiencing, including the trauma and fear he experienced after Donald Trump's election and inauguration. Many days, as soon as I entered the classroom, he would tell me about a recent event, including when his uncle was in a detention center and then later released. He also shared in personal victories, such as his baseball championships, and asked me about my personal life and family. I would sometimes bring my daughter, who was 1 year old during the time of this study, to Córdoba for special events, and Raúl, as well as others, loved spending time with her. After completing the study, I maintained close relationships with several staff members and families. One family in particular remains central to my life and helps provide care for my younger daughter, who was born the month after I completed the data collection for this study. Thus, rather than leaving the community after the study ended, I remain invested in the students' learning and plan to stay involved in the school through different roles.

My involvement in this study shows the potential researchers have to build meaningful relationships with teachers and students, and how we can attempt to have reciprocal relationships with members of the communities we study. While I cannot pretend to have taught the students and teachers nearly as much as they taught me, I believe that my presence there did offer some value. I was able to provide instructional support, and more importantly, emotional support to Raúl and other students whose trust I earned. I am forever grateful for the invitation to be part of this unique and special community. I hope others in the field of education can learn from this experience and engage in research that celebrates teachers, administrators and families like those at Córdoba, and develop positive relationships with community members.

Limitations

Because of my experiences as an educator, as well as the well-established research on inappropriate referrals, evaluations, placements and instruction for CLD students (e.g., Harry & Klingner, 2014; Heller, Holtzman & Messick, 1982), I entered this research study with certain personal biases. Mainly, I feared that many students who were identified as "struggling" or referred to special education might not actually have any intrinsic special needs. I worried that possible factors such as lack of adequate teacher preparation, misunderstandings of language acquisition, and inappropriate assessments would contribute to inappropriate referrals to intervention and special education. Therefore, before beginning my data collection, I developed an open-ended note-taking chart for field note observations and open-ended interview questions. These tools helped me observe and record patterns in a manner that limited room for my own judgments. Furthermore, I collected data from a variety of sources in order to provide more support in my findings that is based on empirical evidence. In the end, I found that instead of an over-referral of Spanish-speaking students to special education, the teachers at Córdoba did their

best to meet theses students' needs in tier 1 and 2 settings of the RTI model. I was also presented with challenges that I hadn't predicted. Mainly, I struggled to present data that shed light on problematic patterns and practices at Córdoba, such as the fact that all of the 5th graders in intervention settings identified as students of color despite practitioners' efforts to address problematic patterns of DR. Ultimately, I chose to organize the study and findings in a way that could share the positive practices I observed, with the hope that teachers who work with similar populations might benefit from the examples documented. As I mentioned earlier in this chapter, I do also recognize the downfall in providing an unrealistic image of the perfect school, and I hope that the sections in which I focus on "Next Steps" shed enough light on the aspects of instruction at Córdoba that were not ideal.

The main limitation of this case study design was the lack of generalizability, or "transferability to other contexts" (Miles, Huberman & Saldaña 2014, p. 101) since data was collected from a single classroom at only one school. However, as Stake (1995) argues, "People can learn much that is general from single cases. They do that partly because they are familiar with other cases and they add this one in, thus making a slightly new group from which to generalize, a new opportunity to modify old generalizations" (p. 85). This case study provided me with long-term, in-depth exposure that can contribute to a better understanding of how special education issues are addressed in DL education and how educators can support EB students who struggle academically. Córdoba is a unique school with a strong MTSS model and a commitment to meeting the needs of Latino/a Spanish-speaking EB students through DL education. Thus, despite the fact that this is a study of a single case, educators in the field who work with similar population can learn from the findings and implications of this study and implement similar CLRT approaches in different tiers of intervention to best meet student needs.

References

Abedi, J. (2014). English language learners with disabilities: Classification, assessment, and accommodation issues. *Association of Test Publishers*,*10*(2), 1-30.

Ada, A.F. (1993). *My name is Maria Isabel.* New York: Atheneum.

Annamma, S. A., Connor, D., & Ferri, B. (2012). Dis/ability critical race studies (DisCrit): theorizing at the intersections of race and dis/ability. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, (December 2012), 1–31.

Artiles, A. J., & Ortiz, A. A. (Eds.). (2002). English language learners with special education needs: Identification, assessment and instruction. McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics.

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), 283-300.

Atinuke. (2010) *Anna Hibiscus*. Tulsa, OK: Kane Miller.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2008). *Developing reading and writing in second-language learners: Lessons from the report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Taylor & Francis.

August, D., & Siegel, L. (2006). Literacy instruction for language-minority children in special education settings. In D.L. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.*

Averill, O. H., & Rinaldi, C. (2011). Multi-tier system of supports. *District Administration*, *47*(8), 91.

Baca, L. M., & Cervantes, H. T. (2004). *The Bilingual Special Education Interface* (Fourth Edi.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Merrill.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2014). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States* (4th ed.). Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Bell, D. A. (Ed.). (1980). *Shades of Brown: New perspectives on school desegregation*. Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Bell, D. (1987). *And we are not saved: The elusive quest for racial justice*. New York: Basic Books.

Benavides, A. (1988). High risk predictors and prereferral screening for language minority students. In *Schools and the culturally diverse exceptional student: Promising practices and future directions* (pp. 19–31). Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Brown, J. E., & Doolittle, J. (2008). A cultural, linguistic, and ecological framework for response to intervention with English language learners. T*eaching Exceptional Children, 40*(5), 66–72.

Burr, E., Haas, E., & Ferriere, K. (2015). Identifying and Supporting English Learner Students with Learning Disabilities: Key Issues in the Literature and State Practice. REL 2015-086. *Regional Educational Laboratory West*.

Carspecken, P. F. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide*. Psychology Press.

Cervantes, A. (2013). *Gaby, Lost and Found*. Scholastic Inc..

Clark, E. R., & Flores, B. B. (2001). Who am I? The social construction of ethnic identity and

self-perceptions in Latino preservice teachers. *The Urban Review*, *33*(2), 69-86.

Connor, D. J., & Ferri, B. (2007). The conflict within: resistance to inclusion and other

paradoxes in special education. *Disability & Society*, *22*(1), 63–77.

Connor, D. J., Gabel, S. L., Gallagher, D. J., & Morton, M. (2008). Disability studies and

inclusive education - implications for theory, research and practice. *International Journal

of Inclusive Education, 12* (5-6), 441-457.

Crenshaw, K. (1993). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence

against women of color. *Stanford Law Review* 43: 1241–99.

Creswell, J. (2013). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods

approaches*.   SAGE Publications.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual

children. *Review of educational research*, *49*(2), 222-251.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational

success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.),

Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework (pp. 2-49). Los

Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.

Davis, L. J. (2010). Constructing normalcy. In Davis, L. J. (Ed.). (2006). *The disability studies

reader*. Taylor & Francis.

De Jong EJ (2011) Foundations for Multilingualism in Education. Philadelphia: Caslon

Publishing.

Delgado Bernal, D. (2002) Critical race theory, LatCrit theory and critical raced-gendered

epistemologies: recognizing Students of Color as holders and creators of   knowledge,

Qualitative Inquiry, 8(1), 105–126.

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2001) *Critical race theory: an introduction*, (New York, New York University Press).

Donovan, M.S., & Cross, C.T. (Eds.). (2002). *Minority students in special and gifted education.* Washington, D.C: National Academy Press.

Dorner, L. M. (2011). Contested Communities in a Debate Over Dual-Language Education: The Import of "Public" Values on Public Policies. *Educational Policy*, *25*(4), 577–613.

Dunn, L. M. (1968*). Special education for the mildly mentally retarded: Is much of it justifiable?* Exceptional Children, 23, 5–21.

Dray, B.J. & Vigil, P. (2014) Educating Latino/a students with special needs. In Obiakor, F. E. and Rotatori, A. F. (Eds.). (2014). *Multicultural Education for Learners with Special Needs in the Twenty-First Century*. Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing.

Edyburn, D. L. (2005). Universal design for learning. *Special Education Technology Practice*, *7*(5), 16-22.

Erdrich, Louise. (2002). *The birchbark house.* New York: Hyperion Paperbacks for Children.

Erevelles, N. (2000). Educating unruly bodies: Critical pedagogy, Disability Studies, and the politics of schooling. *Educational Theory, 50* (1), 25-47.

Erevelles, N., & Minear, A. (2010). Unspeakable offenses: Untangling race and disability in discourses of intersectionality. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, *4*(2), 127-145.

Escamilla, K. (2000). "Bilingual Means Two: Assessment Issues, Early Literacy and Spanish Speaking Children," *Proceedings: High Standards in Reading for Students From Diverse Language Groups: Research, Practice & Policy*: 100-128.

Escamilla, K., & Hopewell, S. (2010). Transitions to biliteracy: Creating positive

   academic trajectories for emerging bilinguals in the United States. *International*

   perspectives on bilingual education: Policy,

   practice, and controversy, 69-93.

Ferri, B. A., & Connor, D. J. (2005). Tools of Exclusion: Race, Disability, and (Re) segregated

   Education. *Teachers College Record*, *107*(3), 453–474.

Figueroa, R. a. (2005). Dificultades o Desabilidades de Aprendizaje? *Learning Disability*

   Quarterly, *28*(2), 163.

Finn, J. D. (1982). *Patterns in special education placement as revealed by the OCR*

   survey. In K. A. Heller, W. Holtzman, & S. Messick (Ed.), Placing children in special

   education: A strategy for equity (pp. 322–381). Washington, DC: National Academy

   Press.

Ford, D. Y. (2012). Culturally different students in special education: Looking backward

   to move forward. *Exceptional Children*, *78*(4), 391-405.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2006). Introduction Response to Intervention: What , why , and how

   valid is it ? Explaining the R in RTI. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *41*(1), 93–99.

Gabel, S. L. (2005). *Disability studies in education: Readings in theory and method* (Vol. 3).

   Peter Lang.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* Malden, MA:

   Wiley/ Blackwell.

García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and*

   practices for English language learners. Teachers College Press.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of teacher education*,

53(2), 106-116.

Gay, G. (2002). Culturally responsive teaching in special education for ethnically diverse

students: Setting the stage. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*,

15(6), 613-629.

Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, Beware! The Bilingual Is Not Two Monolinguals in   One

Person. *Brain and Language*, *36*, 3–15.

Hall, T. (2002). *Differentiated Instruction. Effective Classroom Practices Repor*t. National

Center on Accessing the General Curriculum, CAST, U.S. Office of Special Education

Programs.

Hamayan, E. V., Marler, B., Lopez, C. S., & Damico, J. (2013). *Special education*

considerations for English language learners: Delivering a continuum of services (2nd

ed). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon, Inc.

Harry, B. (1994). *The Disproportionate Representation of Minority Students in Special*

education: Theories and Recommendations. Washington, D.C.: National Association of

State Directors of Special Education, U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Educational

Research and Improvement, Educational Resources Information Center.

Hitchcock, C., Meyer, A., Rose, D., & Jackson, R. (2002). Providing new access to the general

curriculum: Universal design for learning. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *35*(2), 8-17.

Holtzman, W. H., & Messick, S. (1982). *Placing children in special education: A strategy for*

equity. K. A. Heller (Ed.). National Academies.

Hoover, J.J., & Soltero-González (2018). Educator preparation for developing culturally and

linguistically responsive MTSS in rural community elementary schools. *Teacher*

Education and Special Education.

Hopewell, S., & Escamilla, K. (2014). Struggling reader or emerging biliterate student?

    Reevaluating the criteria for labeling emerging bilingual students as low achieving.

    Journal of Literacy Research, *46*(1), 68-89.

Hosp, J. L., & Reschly, D. J. (2003). Referral Rates for Intervention or Assessment: A

    Meta-Analysis of Racial Differences. *The Journal of Special Education*, *37*(2), 67–80.

Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Rogers, D. (2007).

    Guiding principles for dual language education. Washington, DC: Center for Applied

    Linguistics.

Kiuchukov, K. (2004). *My name was Hussein*. Boyds Mills Press.

Klingner, J. K., Artiles, A. J., & Barletta, L. M. (2006). English Language Learners Who

    Struggle With Reading Language Acquisition or LD?. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*,

    39(2), 108-128.

Klingner, J. K., Boelé, A., Linan-Thompson, S., & Rodriguez, D. (2014). Essential components

    of special education for English language learners with learning disabilities: Position

    statement of the Division for Learning Disabilities of the Council for Exceptional

    Children. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *29*(3), 93-96.

Klingner, J. K., Soltero-González, L., & Lesaux, N. (2010). Response to intervention for

    English language learners. In M. Lipson & K. Wixson (Eds.), *Successful approaches to*

    response to intervention (RTI): Collaborative practices for improving K-12 literacy (pp.

    134-162). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). Bilingual education and second language acquisition theory. *Schooling*

    and language minority students: A theoretical framework, 51-79.

Krashen, S. D. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition and use* (pp. 1-27). Portsmouth,

NH: Heinemann.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field

   like education?. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*(1), 7-24.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American*

   educational research journal, *32*(3), 465-491.

Leonardo, Z., & Broderick, A. (2011). Smartness as property: A critical exploration of

   intersections between whiteness and disability studies. *Teachers College Record*,

   113(10), 2206-2232.

Linan-Thompson, S., Vaughn, S., Hickman- Davis, P., & Kouzekanani, K. (2003).

   Effectiveness of supplemental reading instruction for second-grade English language

   learners with reading difficulties. The Elementary School Journal, 103, 221–238.

Liu, Y., Ortiz, A. A., Wilkinson, C., Robertson, P., & Kushner, M. (2008). From early childhood

   special education to special education resource rooms: Identification, assessment, and

   eligibility determinations for English language learners with reading-related learning

   disability. Assessment for Effective Intervention, 33(3), 177–188.

Lord, C. (2013). Rules. Scholastic Inc.

Macswan, J., & Rolstad, K. (2006). How Language Proficiency Tests Mislead Us About Ability :

   Implications for English Language Learner Placement in Special Education. *Teachers*

   College Record, *108*(11), 2304–2328.

Maldonado, J. A. (1994). Bilingual special education: Specific learning disabilities in

   language and reading. Journal of Education Issues of Language Minority Students, 14(2),

   127-147.

Matsuda, M. J. (1991). Voices of America: Accent, antidiscrimination law, and a

jurisprudence for the last reconstruction. *Yale Law Journal*, 1329-1407.

McCray, A. D., & García, S. B. (2002). The stories we must tell: Developing a research agenda for multicultural and bilingual special education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *15*(6), 599-612.

McGhee, B. M. (2011). Profiles of elementary-age English Language Learners with reading-related learning disabilities (LD) identified as speech and language impaired prior to, at, or after identification as LD (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Texas at Austin: Austin, TX.

Medina, C. L. (2006). Interpreting Latino/a literature as critical fictions. *Alan Review*, *33*(2), 71.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. SAGE Publications, Incorporated.

Mora, Pat. (1997). *Tomás and the library lady*. New York: Knopf : Distributed by Random House.

Naidoo, J. C. (2011). *Celebrating cuentos: Promoting Latino children's literature and literacy in classrooms and libraries*. ABC-CLIO.

Naidoo, J.C. and R.E. Quiroa. (2016). Beyond calaveras and quinceañeras: Fostering bilingual Latino students' identity development with culturally relevant literature. In E.R. Clark, B.B. Flores, H.L. Smith, and D.A. González (Eds.), *Multicultural Literature for Latino Bilingual Children: Their Words, Their Worlds,* (pp. 51-68). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Nguyen, H. T. (2011). General Education and Special Education Teachers Collaborate to Support English Language Learners with Learning Disabilities. *Issues in Teacher Education*, *21*(1), 127–152.

Obiakor, F.E. & Green, S.L. (2014). *Educating Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners with Special Needs: The Rationale*. Multicultural Education for Learners with Special Needs in the Twenty-First Century, 1.

Obiakor, F.E. & Rotatori, A.F (2014). Educating Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners with Special Needs: Preface. Multicultural Education for Learners with Special Needs in the Twenty-First Century. In F.E. Obianko & A.F. Rotatori (Eds.), *Multicultural Education for Learners with Special Needs in the Twenty-First Century,* (pp.ix-x). Charlotte: IAP, Inc.

Ochoa, S. H., Rivera, B., & Ford, L. (1998). An investigation of school psychology training pertaining to bilingual psycho-educational assessment of primarily Hispanic students: Twenty-five years after Diana v. California.*Journal of School Psychology*, *35*(4), 329-349.

Oller, D. K., & Eilers, R. E. (Eds.). (2002). *Language and literacy in bilingual children* (Vol. 2). Multilingual Matters.

Orosco, M. J., & Klingner, J. (2010). One school's implementation of RTI with English language learners: "Referring into RTI". *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *43*(3), 269-288.

Ortiz, A. A., & Yates, J. R. (1983). Incidence of exceptionality among Hispanics: Implications for manpower planning. National Association for Bilingual Education Journal, 7(3), 41-53.

Ortiz, A. A., Robertson, P. M., Wilkinson, C. Y., Liu, Y.-J., McGhee, B. D., & Kushner, M. I. (2011). The Role of Bilingual Education Teachers in Preventing Inappropriate Referrals of ELLs to Special Education: Implications for Response to Intervention. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *34*(3), 316–333.

Palacio, R. J. (2012). *Wonder*. London: Doubleday.

Palmer, D. (2009). Middle-Class English Speakers in a Two-Way Immersion Bilingual

    Classroom: "Everybody Should Be Listening to Jonathan Right Now..." *TESOL Quarterly*,

    43(2), 177–202.

Palmer, D. (2010). Race, Power, and Equity in a Multiethnic Urban Elementary School with a

    Dual-Language "Strand" Program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *41*(1), 94–114.

Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on

    language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual

    language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, *98*(3), 757–772.

Paneque, O., & Barbetta, P. (2006). A study of teacher efficacy of special education teachers of

    English language learners with disabilities. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *30*(1), 171–193.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy: A Needed Change in Stance, Terminology,

    and Practice. *Educational Researcher*, *4*(3), 93–97.

Puar, J. (2007). *Terrorist assemblages: Homonationalism in queer times.* Duke University Press.

Ramirez, J. D., Yuen, S. D., Ramey, D. R., Pasta, D. J., & Billings, D. K. (1991). Final report:

    Longitudinal study of structured immersion strategy, early-exit, and late-exit transitional

    bilingual education programs for language-minority children. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre

    International.

Rivera, M. O., Moughamian, A. C., Lesaux, N. K., & Francis, D. J. (2009). Language

    and Reading Interventions for English Language Learners and English Language

    Learners with Disabilities. *Center on Instruction.*

Ryan, P.M. (2000). *Esperanza rising*. New York: Scholastic Press.

Shakespeare, T. (2010). The social model of disability. In L. F. Davis (Ed.), *The Disability

    Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Shannon, S. (1995). The hegemony of English: A case study of one bilingual classroom   as a

      site of resistance. *Linguistics and Education: An International Research   Journal*, 7(3),

      177-202.

Shujaa, M. J. (1995). Cultural self meets cultural other in the African American experience:

      Teachers' responses to a curriculum content reform. *Theory into Practice*, *34*(3), 194-

      201.

Skiba, R. J., Simmons, A. B., Ritter, S., Gibb, A. C., Rausch, M. K., Cuadrado, J., & Chung, C.

      G. (2008). Achieving equity in special education: History, status, and current challenges.

      Exceptional Children, *74*(3), 264-288.

Slavin, R. E., & Cheung, A. (2005). A Synthesis of Research on Language of Reading

      Instruction for English Language Learners. *Review of Educational Research*, *75*(2), 247–

      284.

Sleeter, C. (2005). Un-standardizing curriculum. *Multicultural teaching in the standards-based*

      classroom. New York: Columbia University.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an

      analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative inquiry*, *8*(1), 23-44.

Spradley, J. 1979. *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Subban, P. (2006). Differentiated instruction: A research basis. *International education journal*,

      7(7), 935-947.

Sullivan, A. L. (2011). Disproportionality in special education identification and   placement of

      English language learners. *Exceptional Children*, *77*(3), 317-334.

Sullivan, A. L., Abplanalp, S. L., & Jorgensen, J. (2013). Leadership for Transforming

districts into Inclusive Systems. *Ability, Equity, and Culture: Sustaining Inclusive Urban Education Reform*, 174.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement.

Turnbull, A., Turnball, R., Wehmeyer, M. & Shogren, K. (2013). *Exceptional Lives: Special Education In Today's Schools*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.

U.S. Department of Education. (2000). *Twenty-second annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.* Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *A Response to Intervention Process Cannot Be Used to Delay-Deny an Evaluation for Preschool Special Education Services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*: *Memorandum from U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.* Washington, D.C: Ryder, R.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *The Condition of Education 2017* (2017-144), English Language Learners in Public Schools. Retrieved from: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2015*.

U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences. (2012). [Table displaying students served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), by race/ethnicity and type of disability in 2011-12]. *Digest of Education Statistics.* Retrieved from: https://nces.ed.gov.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights. (1994*). Elementary and secondary*

school civil rights compliance report. Washington, DC.

Valdes, F., & Culp, J. M. (2002). *Crossroads, directions and a new critical race theory*. Temple University Press.

Van Allsburg, C. (1988). *Two bad ants*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Vaughn, S., Mathes, P. G., Linan-Thompson, S., & Francis, D. J. (2005). Teaching English Language Learners At Risk for Reading Disabilities to Read : Putting Research into Practice. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *20*(1), 58–67.

Wilkinson, C. Y., Ortiz, A. A., Robertson, P. M., & Kushner, M. I. (2006). English language learners with reading-related LD: Linking data from multiple sources to make eligibility decisions. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 39(2), 129–142.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *8*(1), 69–91.

Zehler, A. M., Fleischman, H. L., Hopstock, P. J., Pendzick, M. L., & Stephenson, T. G. (2003). Descriptive study of services to LEP students and LEP students with disabilities: Findings on special education LEP students [Special Topic Report 4]. Washington, DC: Development Associates.

Appendix

Appendix A: Ms. Callahan's Unit Plan for Point of View

February English Unit 1/30-2/17
Mini Literary Analysis—Point of View
-Monday—some work on types of prompts, what questions are asking; transferring writing skills and vocab back to English
-Tentative—transfer, interim on 31st , reteach; start novel work
-Maybe largely focused on novels
-Some application to short readings (plus novels)
Standards:
CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.5.1
Quote accurately from a text when explaining what the text says explicitly and when drawing inferences from the text.
CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.5.2
Determine a theme of a story, drama, or poem from details in the text, including how characters in a story or drama respond to challenges or how the speaker in a poem reflects upon a topic; summarize the text.
CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.5.5
Explain how a series of chapters, scenes, or stanzas fits together to provide the overall structure of a particular story, drama, or poem.
CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.5.6
Describe how a narrator's or speaker's point of view influences how events are described.

Main learning targets: How a narrator's or speaker's POV influences how events are described

Assessment: Essay analyzing the impact of the narrator's point of view on the way events are told in novel read for group
Routine:
Short read aloud
Practice: discussion/writing with shared text
Practice with novel

Week 1: Gathering evidence/practicing articulating POV impact
Week 2: Writing essay

Transfer to English	Interim	Interim follow-up	Interim follow-up/ Non-fiction	
Naming and describing POV Read aloud: *Encounter* Naming POV; 1st, 2nd, 3rd	**Identity of the narrator** Reread sections of *Encounter*; discuss narrator's identity	**How the identity of the narrator affects their story** J: Finish writing describing book POV	**How POV affects the way the story is told: finding and using evidence** Read aloud:	**How POV affects the way the story is told: finding and using evidence** Revise/finish;

	Writing: Describe the POV of the book. Other writing: Describe the POV of your book.	Discuss how POV changes *Encounter* Students: Write about how POV impacts Encounter -SG to talk about their book	*Two Bad Ants* All practice: planning short essay on how POV impacts how events are described -Intro; two main ways; conclusion	show example from *Encounter*
Planning POV essay Example: *Encounter* or *Ants*	Drafting POV essay	Revising POV essay, Day 1	Revising POV essay, Day 2	Editing/finishing POV essay

Obvious to start:
Encounter
True Story of the Three Little Pigs
Two Bad Ants
Black Beauty/Secret Garden passages

Who the narrator is; how that affects how they tell the story:
Dyamonde Daniel
Dog Days
Football Double Threat
Wonder
Maniac Magee
The Birchbark House

Appendix B: Ms. Callahan's Overview of Guided Reading Group's for the School Year*[*]

Start of 3 Week Unit	Year at a glance	Yellow	Green	Teal	Purple	Blue
8/18 *Pre-SLO Assessment*	R/W Workshop	• No GR at first, some groups in 2nd/3rd week • Set up IR; confer • Assessments, decisions on groups				
9/12	NF reading/writing	• GR with articles/short texts				
10/3 *Progress check*	Esperanza • Lit analysis	• *Zapato Power* • Short GR	• *Zapato Power* • *Dyamonde Daniel*	• Esperanza in SG	• Articles/poems	• Articles/poems
10/24 or 31 *Lit Analysis Interim*	Esperanza Essay • Lit analysis	• Continue ZP; short GR	• Short GR •	• *MLK*	• *Roberto Clemente*	• *Cajas de cartón*
11/28	Rainforest—NF	• *Zapato 2; short GR* • Short GR	• *Anna Hibiscus* • *Dog Days*	• *Gaby, Lost and Found*	• *The Birchbark House*	• *Maniac Magee*
Winter Break						
1/9 *Research Simulation Interim*	Rainforest—NF	• *Anna Hibiscus*	• Rainforest books; MLK	• *Tía Lola* •	• *Papelucho*	• *Nacer bailando*
1/30 *Progress Check Lit Analysis*	Mini Literary Analysis—connected or not to themes	• *Dog Days* • *Zapato Power*	• *Gaby, Lost and Found*	• *Wonder*	• *Maniac Magee*	• *The Birchbark House*

---

[*] GL refers to Grade Level; IR refers to independent reading; GR refers to Guided Reading; NF refers to Non-fiction;

2/21	Natural disasters (cause/eff ect, text structure) or Sports (	• *Gaby, Lost and Found*	• *Tí a Lol a*	• *Papelucho*	• *Nacer bailando*	• *Devolve al remitente*
3/13 *SLO Assessme nt?*	Natural disasters (multina tional organiza tions) or Sports (	• *Gaby, Lost and Found* • *Dyam onde Daniel*	• *The Birch bark Hous e*	• *Man iac Mag ee*	•	• *The Give r*
4/10 PARCC	PARCC Window /other module (light)			• *Devo lver al remi tent e*		• *Quer ido Hijo*
5/1 *SLO Assessme nt?*	Spanish Night/ot her module (light)	•		•	• *The Giver*	
	Spanish Night/ot her module (light)			• *Pape luch o*	• *Devolver al remitent e*	•

Spanish books:

Starting below 20	GR/Poetry		GR/Poetry	Short book L/O	Novel N (María Isabel)	

Starting 20s	GR/Poetry	Novel N (María Isabel)	Novel P/Q (Nacer bailando)	Novel (Papelucho o Tía Lola)	
Starting 30/34	GR/Poetry	Novel P/Q (Nacer bailando)	(Papelucho?)	(Tía Lola)	
Starting close to 40	GR/Poetry	(Cajas de cartón)	(Tía Lola)	(Papelucho)	(Querido hijo)
Starting 40-50	GR/Poetry/Articles	(Cajas de cartón)	(Historia de una gaviota)	(Querido hijo)	(Devolver al remitente)

English Books:

Starting below 20	Asses; GR/Poetry	Esperanza + *Z Power*	*Dyamonde*	*Anna H.*	*Dog Days*	*Gaby, Lost and Found*
Starting 20s	Asses; GR/Poetry	Esperanza + *Dyamonde*	*Anna H.; Dog Days*		*Gaby, Lost and Found*	*Taking Sides*
Starting 30/34	Asses; GR/Poetry	Esperanza + level	*Taking Sides*	*Gaby, Lost and Found*		*Wonder*
Starting close to 40	Asses; GR/Poetry	Esperanza	*Gaby, Lost and Found*		*Wonder*	*Maniac Magee*
Starting 40-50	Asses; GR/Poetry	Esperanza	*Wonder; Taking Sides*	*Maniac Magee; Taking Sides*	*The Giver; Roll of Thunder*	

Appendix C: Raúl's Grduation Speech

Yo soy bilingüe. Yo aprendí español por mi papa. Mi primer idioma es español, y yo aprendí a hablar inglés en el primer grado, entonces yo soy bilingüe. Por eso es importante para que traduce o ayude.

A mi ser bilingüe es importante porque puedo ayudar a gente. A mí es importante porque puedo trasladar de un idioma al otro idioma. Una vez le estaba ayudando a mi familia cuando tenían problema y le traduje. Eso es muy importante porque si no habla el idioma entonces le puedo traducir. Otra cosa es que si alguien tiene problemas le puedo ayudar. Por eso es muy importante.

A mi comunidad es importante porque comunicar a la gente. Si yo puedo comunicar puedo ayudar a los inmigrantes de otros países. Estaba un inmigrante de México y yo le ayude. Si tiene problema puedo hablar. Cómo una vez había una familia que tenía problema con un cajero y yo puedo comunicar para los inmigrantes. A mi comunidad también es muy importante porque puedo comunicar.

Al mundo es importante porque casi en todas partes hablan español. Si no todos hablaran el mismo lenguaje entonces no puede comunicar. En Sudamérica casi todo los países habla español cómo en Chile, Costa Rica y en otros países. Yo he ido a Sudamérica y necesitaba comprar algo y no hablaba el idioma y lo trate hablar y puede comunicar. Eso es muy importante.

En conclusión, hablar otras idiomas es muy importante a mi cultura, a mi familia, y a mí. Ser bilingüe es importante para mí.