

Response to Intervention and EL Learners: Questions and some answers

Sylvia Linan-Thompson

The University of Texas at Austin

April 6, 2006

Acknowledgments

Oracy/Literacy Development Spanish-Speaking Children 1 P01 HD39521-01

- Sharon Vaughn, PhD, University of Texas-Austin
- Sylvia Linan-Thompson, PhD, University of Texas-Austin
- Patricia Mathes, PhD, Southern Methodist University
- Sharolyn Duradola, PhD, Texas a & M University
- Elsa Cardenas-Hagan, University of Houston
- David Francis, PhD, University of Houston
- Paul Cirino, PhD, University of Houston
- Coleen Carlson, PhD, University of Houston

What should research-based interventions look like at Tier 2?

Intervention Framework

- Prevention and intervention are viewed as a continuum
- Basic concepts and foundational skills taught are the same
- The level of intensity varies
- Progress monitoring is used to chart student progress

Interventions

Comprehensive reading interventions that include **phonological awareness** (Vaughn, Linan-Thompson et al. in press; Vaughn, Mathes et al. in press)

word attack (Denton et al., 2004; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson et al. in press; Vaughn, Mathes et al. in press),

fluency (Gunn et al., 2000; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson et al. in press) and

comprehension (Vaughn, Linan-Thompson et al. in press; Vaughn, Mathes et al. in press)

Instructional Design: Integrated Strands

Vocabulary and Concept Knowledge



Phonemic Awareness

Encoding

Letter-Sound Recognition

Word Recognition

Repeated Connected Text Reading

Comprehension Strategies

Design

- **50 minutes per day October-May**
- **1:4 Teacher to Student ratio**
- **Provided in addition to normal language arts instruction**
- **Explicit instruction in synthetic phonics, with emphasis on fluency**
- **Integrates decoding, fluency, and comprehension strategies**
- **100% decodable text**
- **Carefully constructed scope and sequence designed to prevent possible confusions**

Lesson Cycle

- **Reading Lesson (@ 35 minutes)**
- **Embedded Language Support**
- **(@ 5 minutes)**
- **Story Retell (@ 10 minutes)**

Practices

- Grouping format
- Multiple opportunities for practice
- Teaching to mastery
- Teaching procedures

Results for English Intervention Cohort 1

- Statistically significant differences in favor of English Intervention treatment group for outcomes in English. Time × Treatment Interaction effects for:
 - Letter naming fluency
 - Letter sound identification
 - Phonological composite (sound matching, blending words, blending non-words, segmenting words, elision)
 - Word attack
 - Dictation
 - ◆ Passage comprehension

Results for English Intervention Cohort 2

Statistically significant differences in favor of English Intervention treatment group for outcomes in English. Time \times Treatment Interaction effects for:

- Letter sound identification
- Letter word identification
- Phonological composite
- Word attack
- DIBELS, BOY

What works?

■ Instruction that is

- ◆ comprehensive
- ◆ that explicitly and systematically builds English language skills during reading instruction
- ◆ that explicitly teaches English letter/sound correspondences, word patterns and spelling rules
- ◆ that introduces skills in isolation and practice in context
- ◆ that builds vocabulary and emphasizes the relationships between and among words to build oral language skills
- ◆ that includes story retells that target both comprehension and language development

With whom?

- English language learners from Spanish speaking homes receiving core reading instruction in English.

In what contexts?

- In schools that are providing good instruction as measured by state accountability systems
- In schools where on average 98% of students are Hispanic
- In schools with large numbers of EL learners
- In schools in which 85- 100% of students qualify for free or reduced lunch program
- In schools in which the language of instruction is consistent across tiers
- In urban and border areas

Is it enough to outperform a control group or do we also need to determine students' RtI?

If the answer is no, what should
response to intervention look
like?

What is Response to Intervention?

- A practice that includes
 - ◆ High-quality instruction matched to student needs
 - ◆ The use of learning rate over time and level of performance to make instructional decisions

Rationale

- Need to determine what constitutes adequate response to intervention for English language learners learning to read in English.

How do we measure response to intervention?

- Examine the relative number of EL learners at-risk for reading difficulties who meet RtI criteria after an intensive seven month intervention using three different approaches; performance level, growth rate, and discrepancy.

Identification of at-risk students

■ Criteria:

- ◆ Scores below the 25th %ile on LWID

And

- ◆ Unable to read more than 1 word on an experimental word list

Sample

- Longitudinal
 - ◆ 100 student in immersion programs in three sites in TX not in at-risk sample
- At-risk
 - ◆ Intervention 40
 - ◆ Control 36

Response to Intervention Criteria

■ Performance level

- ◆ SSs above 95 on both Word Attack and PC
- ◆ SSs above 95 on both Word Attack and PC and ORF (40/70)

■ Growth

- ◆ ORF (at least 2 words per week; 48 each year)

Response to Intervention

- Matched longitudinal sample on both:
 - ◆ ORF mean gain within year:
 - ◆ English: 33 G1, 25 G2

AND

- ◆ ORF benchmark (mean score)
 - ◆ English: 64 G1, 90 G2

English Intervention Study Cohort 1

	End of Grade 1		End of Grade 2	
	T	C	T	C
SS below 85 on WA or PC	2/22 9%	10/17 59%	1/18 6%	6/11 55%
SS between 85-95 on WC or PC with no scores below 85	6/22 27%	4/17 24%	8/18 44%	4/11 36%
SS above 95 on WA AND PC	14/22 64%	3/17 18%	9/18 50%	1/11 9%

Performance level (WA & PC)

	T (40)	C (36)
Met Criteria in 1st grade	40% (16)	30% (11)
Met criteria in 2nd grade	32% (13)	25% (9)
Met criteria both years	25% (10)	13% (5)
Met Criteria in 1st but not second	15% (6)	16% (6)
Did not meet criteria in 1st but did in 2nd	7% (3)	11% (4)

Performance level (WA, PC, ORF)

	T (40)	C (36)
Met Criteria in 1st grade	7% (3)	5% (2)
Met criteria in 2nd grade	20% (8)	11% (4)
Met criteria both years	5% (2)	5% (2)
Met Criteria in 1st but not second	2% (1)	0
Did not meet criteria in 1st but did in 2nd	15% (6)	5% (2)

Performance level-Comparison

	End of 1st grade		End of 2nd grade	
	T	C	T	C
Both WA & PC above SS 95	16/40 40%	11/36 30%	13/40 32%	9/36 25%
Both WA & PC above SS 95 and ORF (40/70)	3/40 7%	2/36 5%	8/40 20%	4/36 11%

Most students aren't meeting the performance level, but are they making gains?

Growth (2 words/week [48])

	T (40)	C (36)
Met Criteria in 1st grade	5% (2)	2% (1)
Met criteria in 2nd grade	17% (7)	8% (3)
Met criteria both years	5% (2)	2% (1)
Met Criteria in 1st but not second	0%	0%
Did not meet criteria in 1st but did in 2nd	12% (5)	5% (2)

How do they compare to their
peers in the longitudinal sample?

English: 33 G1, 25 G2

Growth

	T (40)	C (36)
Met Criteria in 1st grade (33)	10% (4)	11% (4)
Met criteria in 2nd grade (25)	40% (16)	27% (10)
Met criteria both years	7% (3)	11% (4)
Met Criteria in 1st but not second	2% (1)	0%
Did not meet criteria in 1st but did in 2nd	32% (13)	16% (6)

Growth-Comparison

	End of 1st grade		End of 2nd grade	
	T	C	T	C
2 words/week gain	2/40 5%	1/36 2%	7/40 17%	3/36 8%
No discrepancy w/longitudinal sample	4/40 10%	4/36 11%	16/40 40%	10/36 27%

Performance level

	T (40)	C (36)
Met Criteria in 1st grade (61)	2% (1)	0%
Met criteria in 2nd grade (90)	15% (6)	8% (3)
Met criteria both years	2% (1)	0%
Met Criteria in 1st but not second	0%	0%
Did not meet criteria in 1st but did in 2nd	12% (5)	8% (3)

Matched on both growth and performance level

	T (40)	C (36)
Met Criteria in 1st grade	2% (1)	0
Met criteria in 2nd grade	15% (6)	8% (3)
Met criteria both years	2% (1)	0%
Met Criteria in 1st but not second	0%	0%
Did not meet criteria in 1st but did in 2nd	15% (6)	8% (3)

Summary

- Second year of instruction seems to be critical-- possibly students need the time to acquire more English skills and more practice reading.
- Treatment group performs better than control at second grade.
- The structure, explicitness, and systematicity of treatment many contribute to outcomes.
- Use of just SS on WA and PC seems to over identify responders.

Response to Intervention

- 6 Title I elementary schools in one near-urban district in the Southwest
- All the schools implemented a 3-tier model
- District percentages
 - ◆ 15% AA 69% H 14.3% C 1.7% O

Tier 1

- All K-3 students receive Tier 1 instruction
- Components:
 - Core reading instruction
 - ◆ Critical components of reading instruction
 - ◆ Features of effective instruction
 - Benchmark testing of all students, 3 times/year
 - Ongoing professional development

Tier 2

- Provided **in addition to** 90 minutes of core reading instruction (Tier 1)
- Does not replace any part of core instruction
- 30 minutes a day, 5 days per week for 10-12 weeks
- Provided in groups of 3-5 students (homogeneous)
- Progress monitoring is conducted every 2 weeks

Intervention

- Increased intensity in critical areas of reading
- Explicit and systematic instruction
- Increased opportunities to practice
- Responsive intervention

Tier 3

- Provided **in addition to** 90 minutes of core reading instruction (Tier 1)
- Does not replace any part of core instruction
- 50 minutes a day, 5 days per week for 10-12 weeks
- Provided in groups of 3 students (homogeneous)
- Progress monitoring is conducted every 2 weeks

Intervention

- Critical areas of reading
- Explicit and systematic instruction
- Increased opportunities to practice
- Responsive intervention

First Grade

- 678 students in the district
- 52 (7.6%) qualified for either 1 or 2 sessions of Tier 2 intervention
- 27 intervention students
- 25 comparison students
- Percentage of all first grade students
 - ◆ .8% AA; 71% H, 13.4 C; .2 Other
- Percentage of at-risk students
 - ◆ 11.5% AA; 71% H; 13.4% C; 3.8% O

Representation in risk category

- African American and Caucasian students are slightly under represented
- Hispanic and Asian and Native American students are slightly over represented.

Representation of students eligible for intervention

■ District percentages

◆ 15% AA 69% H 14.3% C 1.7% O

■ 1-2 sessions (n = 52)

◆ Expected

◆ 7.8 35.8 7.43 .8

◆ Actual

◆ 4 19 2 2

◆ 2 18 5

Second Grade

- 612 students in the district
- 42 (6.8%) students qualified for 2 sessions of Tier 3 intervention
- 17 intervention students
- 25 comparison students
- Percentage of all second grade students
 - ◆ 1.3% AA; 3.9%H; 1.6% C
- Percentage of at-risk second grade students
 - ◆ 19% AA; 57.1%H; 23.8% C

Representation in risk category

- African American and Caucasian students are over represented
- Hispanic students are underrepresented
- No Asian or Native American students were in this category

Representation of students eligible for intervention

■ District percentages

◆ 15% AA 69% H 14.3% C 1.7% O

■ 3-4 sessions (n = 42)

◆ Expected

◆ 6.3 28.9 6 .7

◆ Actual

◆ 5 9 3

◆ 3 15 7

Summary

- At both Tier 2 and Tier 3, students are represented in the intervention groups in almost the same proportions as they appear in the general school population
- There are slight over and under representations and these shift over time

Conclusion

- While there are still questions to answer
 - ◆ We do have some answers in terms of the appropriateness of interventions for some groups of students
 - ◆ Students across groups are represented in consistent patterns when RtI is implemented in a 3-Tier model
 - ◆ We still need to determine the best way to define RtI for eligibility determination