

Language Assessment Framework

A note regarding the assessment framework for students with culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds: The primary reason for the present speech-language evaluation was to determine whether an underlying disorder in communication abilities exists. When a child is exposed to two or more languages, this is investigated using a “difference vs. disorder” approach. Any noted errors or differences in communication skills are then analyzed and assigned to three main categories: 1) errors appropriate for the child’s age (developmental errors); 2) errors attributed to the interaction between the two languages spoken (cross-linguistic influence); and 3) atypical errors. **STUDENT** was evaluated in **L1 LANGUAGE** with the assistance of an interpreter under the guidance of a speech language pathologist trained in diagnosing and treating communication disorders in children from bilingual backgrounds **as well as in English**.

Language of Evaluation

Formal testing was conducted in ?? based on a history of exposure to ?? and ?? skills were probed informally.

- OR Based on the findings of informal probes in English and parental report that ?? is only exposed to and only uses Spanish, formal English testing was not indicated for the purposes of assessing ?? underlying language skills.
- OR Formal testing was conducted in English, however, as the student is not represented in the normative sample, standardized scores are not valid and not reported here. Qualitative information from the administration of the English test is included below in a discussion of ’s strengths and weaknesses.

Dynamic Assessment

◇’s difficulties with ??? in formal/informal assessment were specifically targeted as part of a Dynamic Assessment during the evaluation/in one/two separate session/sessions. After a mediated learning experience that provided targeted instruction on the importance of ???, ◇ was given the opportunity to practice this skill and then was given a similar task to perform. ◇’s ability to ??? improved from successfully demonstrating the skill in X/X opportunities to X/X opportunities. He/She improved in this area to the extent that he/she (INSERT EXAMPLE), OR he/she demonstrated her improvement by ???, OR his/her performance on the same type of task improved, however, he/she needed prompts to continue to ???. ◇ had continued difficulty with ???, and he/she was only able to ??? in X/X opportunities during one/two Dynamic Assessment trials. It has been observed that he/she has had limited exposure to ??? and is currently learning ??? in his/her classroom. ◇ was observed to ??? by his/her teacher/parent/the examiner, which indicates that he/she is/is not making improvements in this area as a result of exposure and classroom instruction, and that he/she requires/does not require additional support to be a successful language learner in this area.

CHISEL Language Development Calculator

The results of the Language Development Calculators are reported differently than individual test scores. This is because:

- The probability score is calculated based on examining *a combination of test scores*, each with different weightings.
- ELL Children's length of exposure to English is included in the calculation (as opposed to monolingual children, for whom age is equivalent to exposure).
- Test scores are compared ("norm-referenced") to two comparison groups: typically-developing ELL children and ELL children with language impairment/developmental language disorder.

Here is an example description of how the probability score was obtained and what it means, for reporting purposes:

The child's scores from a group of tests, _____, together with the child's length of exposure to English, were entered into a binary logistic regression formula. Where available, standard scores were entered to take into account the child's age. The formula calculated the probability of that child's test scores patterning like ELL children with typical development as compared to ELL children with language impairment/developmental language disorder. This calculation is a form of norm-referencing to an ELL comparison group across several tests in combination. The probability score _____ can be interpreted as follows:

A score of 0-.49 indicates a low probability of the child having language impairment/developmental language disorder

A score of .50-1.0 indicates a high probability of the child having language impairment/developmental language disorder