GRADUATE PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS IN SERVING ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

Thesis
Submitted to
The School of Education and Allied Professions of the
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
The Degree of
Educational Specialist in School Psychology

By
Morgan J. Aldridge, M.S.
Dayton, Ohio
August, 2013
GRADUATE PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS IN SERVING ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

Name: Aldridge, Morgan J.

APPROVED BY:

__________________________________________
Elana Bernstein, Ph.D.
Advisory Committee Chairman
Clinical Faculty
Department of Counselor Education & Human Services

__________________________________________
Susan Davies, Ed.D.
Committee Member
School Psychology Program Coordinator
Assistant Professor
Department of Counselor Education & Human Services

__________________________________________
Sawyer Hunley, Ph.D.
Committee Member
Associate Professor
Department of Counselor Education & Human Services

__________________________________________
Jennifer Haan, Ph.D.
Committee Member
Assistant Professor
Department of English
©Copyright by

Morgan J. Aldridge

All rights reserved

2013
ABSTRACT

GRADUATE PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS IN SERVING ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

Name: Aldridge, Morgan J.
University of Dayton

Advisor: Dr. Elana Bernstein

The purpose of this study was to examine the amount of time and extent to which NASP approved school psychology graduate programs spend instructing their students on best practices in working with English Language Learners (ELLs). Surveys were completed by both school psychology faculty members and intern school psychologists from across The United States. School psychology faculty members answered questions related to the amount of time and extent of instruction provided to school psychology graduate students on the topic of ELLs. Interns completed a knowledge survey on serving ELLs and provided ratings of how prepared they were to address nine specific responsibilities of school psychologists related to serving ELLs. Results indicated that school psychology programs are not adequately preparing their students to serve the
growing population of ELLs. Faculty members cited time, particularly that which must be devoted to other requirements per state and national standards, as the biggest barrier to increasing instruction on ELL best practices. Additionally, interns rated themselves as feeling less than adequately prepared to serve ELLs effectively during their internship and beyond.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The population of English Language Learning (ELL) students in public schools across the United States is rapidly growing. Recently, this population has more than doubled (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011) and is growing at a faster rate than the general student population (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005). Despite these numbers, research has demonstrated a lack of knowledge among school personnel regarding ELLs (Batt, 2008; Durgunoğlu & Hughes, 2010; Newman, Samimy, Romstedt, 2010; Zetlin, Beltran, Salcido, Gonzalez, Reyes, 2011). This lack of knowledge among educators contributes to the misidentification of ELLs in special education (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005; Sullivan, 2011; Zetlin et al., 2011).

Teachers often consult with school psychologists regarding the best way to instruct and intervene with ELLs. Additionally, school psychologists play an integral role in the evaluation of ELLs for special education services, and therefore, the preparation of school psychologists to serve ELLs is as equally important as the education of teachers (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005). School psychologists also play an important role in the lives of ELLs with both direct and indirect service delivery through consultation and training, the referral and assessment process, progress-monitoring, and
providing psychological services. Districts often rely on school psychologists to provide indirect (consultative) service delivery by providing in-services and workshops to school personnel. In addition, school psychologists play a vital role in direct services with all students--including ELLs--through assessment, monitoring, and intervention plan development (Fagan & Wise, 2007). Therefore, it is imperative that school psychology graduate preparation programs train graduate students on the best practices for ELLs so practitioners can effectively serve this growing population.

There is currently limited research addressing the training school psychologists receive regarding bilingual assessment issues (Ochoa, Rivera, & Ford, 1997; Ochoa, Riccio, Jimenez, 2004). There is also a gap in the literature regarding the amount of knowledge that school psychology interns possess regarding serving ELLs. The current graduate preparation domains published by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP; 2010), by which nationally approved school psychology training programs must abide, do not specifically address the topic of ELLs. Therefore, the amount and type of instruction provided in school psychology training programs on the rapidly growing population of ELLs is largely unknown.

The present study examined the amount and extent of instructional time school psychology graduate students receive regarding ELLs, the barriers that exist to increasing ELL instruction, and the knowledge that current interns possess about the best practices in serving ELLs. Two surveys were administered to both program faculty members and current intern school psychologists and data from both surveys were analyzed and are reported in this thesis.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review summarizes the information about the growing population of ELLs, teachers’ knowledge of ELLs, school psychologists’ knowledge of ELLs, the Second Language Acquisition Process, types of programming for ELLs, the disproportionality of ELLs in special education; the role of school psychologists in serving ELLs, and the NASP graduate training standards. Additionally, the purpose and need for the present study will be discussed.

Terminology

In addition to the term “English Language Learners” (ELLs), these students are referred to as “Limited English Proficient” (LEP), “Second-Language Learner” (SLL), “Culturally and Linguistically Diverse” (CLD), and “bilingual” (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005). For consistency, the term English Language Learners (ELLs) will be utilized in this thesis.

The Growing Population of English Language Learners

In recent years, the population of ELLs in U.S. schools has more than doubled, accounting for 10.8% of all of the students enrolled in public schools in the United States (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011). Fix and Passel (2003) projected that as early as 2015, children of immigrants will comprise 20% of the student
population across the United States. Recent data indicates that between the 1997-1998 school year to the 2009-2010 school year, the number of ELLs enrolled in public schools increased from 3.5 million to 5.3 million—a 51% increase (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011). In the 2008-2009 school year, roughly 5,346,673 ELLs were enrolled in grades pre-K through 12 in public schools across the United States (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011). The National Education Association (2008) has projected that by 2015, the number of ELLs in US public schools will reach 10 million. In the United States, the ELL population is growing at a faster rate than the general student population (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005).

A community survey generated by the United States Bureau of the Census in 2007 indicated that there are 10.9 million school-age children (ages 5-17) who speak a language other than English in their homes. Based on the most recent census data from 2010, it is estimated that by the year 2020, Hispanic students will comprise 50% of the population of people under the age of 18 years old in the United States (Association of Latino Administrators & Students, 2011). The National Education Association (2008) has projected that by 2025, one out of every four students will be an ELL student. These numbers are alarming because recent research points to a lack of knowledge among school personnel regarding ELLs (Batt, 2008; Durgunoğlu & Hughes, 2010; Newman, Samimy, Romstedt, 2010; Zetlin et al., 2011).

**Teachers’ Knowledge of ELLs**
The implementation of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (2001) mandated that schools be held accountable for all students’ achievement, including the achievement of ELLs. NCLB requires schools to report progress of ELLs’ development in English proficiency, reading, and math on a yearly basis. ELLs, like all other students, are required to take high stakes tests, often before they are proficient in English (Batt, 2008). Studies have shown that teacher preparation programs fail to educate teachers on the topic of ELLs; therefore, most teachers are unequipped to effectively teach ELLs (Batt, 2008; Durgunoğlu & Hughes, 2010; Newman, Samimy, Romstedt, 2010; Zetlin et al., 2011). Additionally, the number of English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual teachers has not increased along with the population of ELLs (Batt, 2005; Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005); therefore, to comply with NCLB mandates, general education and special education teachers need adequate knowledge and skills to educate ELLs effectively (Batt, 2008). In a survey conducted by Batt (2008), teachers indicated they believed the educators who work with ELLs in their school systems were not qualified to do so. Another survey of teachers in Ohio found that although teachers are not trained to effectively teach ELLs, the majority of teachers are interested in and willing to pursue professional development on the topic of ELLs (Newman, Samimy, & Romstedt, 2010).

**School Psychologists’ Knowledge of ELLs**

Ochoa, Rivera and Ford (1997) conducted a study examining the graduate training that current NASP members, who were practicing school psychologists in states with large populations of Hispanic students, received regarding bilingual psycho-educational assessment. Results revealed that 69.2% of respondents indicated that their training was
less than adequate regarding bilingual psycho-educational assessment; 80% indicated that their training was less than adequate in the second-language acquisition process; 87% indicated that their training was less than adequate in preparing them to conduct a bilingual psycho-educational assessment; and 81% indicated that their training was less than adequate for interpretation of results from bilingual psycho-educational assessments. Additionally, 81% of the respondents indicated that they did not take a bilingual assessment course in their training program. The Ochoa, Rivera and Ford (1997) study is the most recent study to specifically examine the amount of training that school psychologists receive regarding the assessment of ELLs. This study was conducted in 1997 and there has been a significant increase in the amount of ELLs in schools across the United States since then (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011). Thus, a more recent examination of the training school psychology graduate students receive on assessment/intervention for ELLs is warranted. This information can help graduate programs redesign their curriculum to incorporate appropriate instruction for ELLs.

The Second Language Acquisition Process

It is important for school psychologists to possess knowledge about the second-language acquisition process so they can determine if a student’s academic difficulties are due to their stage in the acquisition process (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005). There are four stages in the second-language acquisition process including: (1) preproduction, (2) early production, (3) speech emergence, and (4) intermediate fluency. Stage one (preproduction) occurs during the first three months the student is exposed to the second
language. Characteristics of this stage include “a silent period,” in which the student rarely speaks and is focusing on comprehending the second language. Stage two (early production) occurs three to six months after the student is exposed to the second language. During this stage, students focus on comprehending the second language, and may use 1-3 word phrases to communicate. Stage three (speech emergence) occurs six months to two years after the student is exposed to the second language. During this stage, students exhibit increased comprehension, use simple sentences, and demonstrate an expanded vocabulary. They also demonstrate grammatical errors. Stage four (intermediate fluency) occurs two to three years after the student is exposed to the second language. During this stage, students demonstrate improved comprehension, sufficient face-to-face conversational proficiency, possess a larger vocabulary, and make few grammatical errors (Roseberry-McKibbin, 2002). Thomas and Collier (1997) found that on average, it takes four to seven years for ELLs who received instruction in their first language to reach national norms on English achievement tests. Additionally, their research demonstrated that the strongest predictor of language development in a child’s second language is the amount of schooling they received in their first language.

**BICS and CALP.** It is important for school psychologists to be able to differentiate between BICS and CALP. Research has determined that two types of language proficiencies exist: (1) basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and (2) cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) (Cummins, 1984). BICS includes social language skills (e.g., students conversing on the bus). CALP refers to the language skills that are needed in school (e.g., speaking, reading, and writing). The research of
Cummins (1984) indicated that BICS normally develop in ELLs between two to three years after they are exposed to the second language and CALP normally develops in ELLs between five to seven years after they are exposed to the second language. It is important that school psychologists understand that the ability to participate in social conversations with peers, teachers, and school psychologists in English (BICS) does not equate to having the language skills necessary to complete academic tasks or assessments (CALP) of cognitive abilities in English (Rhodes, Ochoa, & Ortiz, 2005). It is important for school psychologists to be able to differentiate between BICS and CALP so they can determine if academic and cognitive assessments are (a) appropriate and (b) measuring students’ cognitive and academic abilities or their language abilities (Cummins, 1984).

Rhodes, Ochoa, and Ortiz (2005) suggest that school psychologists ask the following questions regarding the second-language acquisition process when evaluating ELLs: (1) “Can the student’s difficulty in acquiring English proficiency be attributed to his or her insufficient development in his or her first language?,” (2) “Can the student’s academic difficulties or failure in an English-only academic setting be attributed to his or her not having attained CALP in English?, and (3) “Was the student given ample instructional time in his or her first language to develop CALP in this language and demonstrate ability somewhat within the average range of academic performance?” (pp. 73).

**Bilingual and ESL Programs**
Rhodes, Ochoa and Ortiz (2005) suggest that school psychologists need to have knowledge of programming options for ELLs. English as a Second Language (ESL) programs provide instruction in English only, but are not the same as bilingual programs, which provide instruction in both the student’s native language and the English language.

**Bilingual programs.** There are several types of bilingual programs including (1) Transitional/Early-Exit Bilingual Education Programs, (2) Maintenance/Late-Exit/Developmental Bilingual Education Programs, and (3) Two-Way/Dual-Language Bilingual Education Programs. Transitional/Early-Exit Bilingual Education Programs are usually made up of only ELLs who speak the same language and these students are typically enrolled in the program for 2-4 years. These programs build on the child’s first language to transition the child into an English-speaking classroom; English is taught without concern of the child losing his or her first language. Maintenance/Late-Exit/Developmental Bilingual Education Programs are also made up of mainly ELLs who all speak the same language, but usually last 4-6 years and tend to use the child’s native language longer than Transitional/Early-Exit programs. Two-Way/Dual-Language Programs differ from the other types of programs because they include both ELLs and native English speakers. These types of bilingual programs are typically made up of both English speakers and ELLs and aim for English-speakers to learn the language of their ELL peers and the ELLs to become bilingual in developing both their native language and English. Although such programs are generally viewed positively, they are not very common. Generally, when bilingual programs are offered, they fall under the category of Transitional/Early-Exit bilingual programs.
**ESL programs.** ESL programs generally fall under the categories of Content-Based ESL/Sheltered English programs or Pullout ESL programs, which are both common. Content-Based ESL/Sheltered English programs provide instruction in only English and can be comprised of students from the same first language or different first languages. These programs instruct on academic material in English using total physical response (TPR), which uses physical gestures and visual cues to aid ELLs in comprehending the curriculum. The goal is for the ELL student to obtain the English language; focus is not placed on the student sustaining his or her first language. Pullout ESL programs are similar, but students are pulled out of the classroom and instructed with a focus on teaching English-language skills, not academic material. (Rhodes, Ochoa, & Ortiz, 2005).

**Bilingual versus ESL programs.** ELL students in the United States most often receive education in ESL environments; however, some research has demonstrated that these programs do not generate positive academic results when inspected longitudinally (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005). The research of Thomas and Collier (1997, 2002) revealed that the more cognitive and academic development a student has made in his or her first language, the faster the student will develop in his or her second language. This research also suggested that ELLs who participated in maintenance and dual-language bilingual programs preserved their native language and achieved at or above national norms on standardized tests in English in reading, language arts, math, and science. Unfortunately, Two-Way/Dual-Language bilingual programs, which typically result in better long-term academic results, are not common when compared to the number of
ELLs enrolled in ESL, transitional bilingual programs, and immersion settings. Two-Way/Dual-Language Bilingual Programs can be costly, as districts must pay bilingual teachers for each language offered in the bilingual program. Funding for ELLs differs from state to state, but in some states, such as Ohio, districts are given federal funds when they have a large number of ELLs and it is up to the district to decide how to allocate the money they receive (Contact with the Ohio Department of Education, 2012). Bilingual programs require bilingual teachers and it can be assumed that many school districts choose to rely on the ESL model as a result of inadequate funding. In addition, many school districts are faced with a large percentage of ELLs who speak multiple languages, and a bilingual program for each language spoken would simply not be feasible. Additionally, some schools choose to implement ESL programs instead of bilingual programs because of ideological beliefs (e.g., students are in United States, and therefore, they should speak English).

School psychologists can advocate for the use of effective Two-Way/Dual Language Bilingual Programs in their districts. Additionally, school psychologists must determine whether the program that an ELL student has been placed in has intensified academic struggles. While research suggests that bilingual programs are more longitudinally effective, school psychologists should be cognizant of the fact that not all bilingual programs offer the same types of benefits (Rhodes, Ochoa, & Ortiz, 2005).

**Disproportionality of ELLs in Special Education**
The English deficiencies in ELLs are often misidentified as disabilities by educators initiating referrals for special education. Frequent ineffective practices and misidentifications of ELLs in special education reflect a lack of knowledge among general and special education teachers about ELLs (Newman, Samimy & Romstedt, 2010; Sullivan, 2011; Zetlin et al., 2011). Assessment of ELLs may be delayed due to the belief that ELLs are struggling as a result of their limited English proficiency. Consequently, students who are ELLs and also have a disability may be deprived of interventions and additional academic support (Limbos & Geva, 2001). This lack of appropriate practices and placements of ELLs in special education is problematic because research also indicates that ELLs have the highest grade retention, dropout rates, and the lowest college completion rates (Duran, 2008; Gil & Bardack, 2010).

There is a significant discrepancy in the number of ELLs in special education (Sullivan, 2011; Zetlin et al., 2011; Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005). ELLs are overrepresented in special education categories including specific learning disability, cognitive disability, and emotional disturbance (National Research Council, 2002). Examining factors that are associated with this disparity is essential in order to determine what changes are needed to improve the rates of disproportionality of ELLs in special education (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005). Referral questions for ELLs are often focused on whether the student is struggling due to a learning disability or the second language acquisition process and these two factors are frequently differentiated incorrectly (Sullivan, 2011). The problem of disproportionality of special education eligibility determinations among ELLs may be due to improperly trained examiners, insufficient
assessment practices, and failure to comply with federal and/or state guidelines (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005).

Given the role that school psychologists play on evaluation teams, it is important that they are knowledgeable about ELLs and these common misidentification practices, so they can work to reduce the rate of disproportionality of ELLs in special education. The move away from the traditional discrepancy model and the recent implementation of Response to Intervention (RTI) in many schools can aid school psychologists in correctly identifying ELLs (Sullivan, 2011).

**The Role of School Psychologists in Serving ELLs**

School psychologists are often considered to be experts in the schools and are vital members of educational decision-making teams. School psychologists play a vital role in the lives of all students, including ELLs through both direct and indirect service delivery through consultation and training, referral and assessment, intervention, and psychological services (Fagan & Wise, 2007).

**Consultation and training.** School psychologists should be cognizant of the second-language acquisition process and the best practices surrounding ELLs so that they can provide consultation and training to other educators who lack knowledge about ELLs. Districts often rely on school psychologists to give in-services and workshops in areas where the skills and knowledge of school personnel are deficient (Fagan & Wise, 2007). The rapidly growing number of ELLs in public schools across the United States (National Clearinghouse For English Language Acquisition, 2011) and the lack of knowledge about ELLs among teachers (Durgunoğlu & Hughes, 2010) requires that
school psychologists possess knowledge about ELLs so that they can provide teachers and other school personnel with information about the best educational and psychological practices in serving ELLs.

Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz (2005) suggest that school psychologists need to have knowledge about the second-language acquisition process so they can dispel the myths that exist among educators. For example, many educators hold the misconception that bilingual education hinders ELLs from learning English, and therefore, the best way for students to learn English is to immerse them in the language (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005). However, research has demonstrated positive results from maintenance and dual-language programs (Thomas & Collier, 1997, 2002).

Consultation regarding ELLs often occurs during a psychoeducational evaluation for special education. School psychologists are typically involved in most evaluation processes, (Fagan & Wise, 2007) and thus would be called upon to consult and collaborate with other professionals such as bilingual psychologists, ESL teachers, and parents. Often, evaluations involving an ELL student include a bilingual assessment, which the school psychologist may be called upon to interpret. In addition, ongoing or outcome assessment (e.g., Test of English as a Foreign Language) information collected by the child’s ESL teacher is an essential component of an evaluation, and thus ongoing consultation with the teacher is crucial. Finally, consultation with the student’s parents, who may or may not speak English, is necessary to obtain relevant information regarding the student’s educational, developmental, and social history. In addition to consulting with the parents, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004) indicates that
schools must ensure that parents can understand the information provided in IEP meetings; therefore, schools must provide an interpreter if parents do not understand English.

**Referral and assessment.** While it is best practice to have a trained, bilingual professional administering assessments to ELLs (Rhodes, Ochoa, & Ortiz, 2005), this best practice is not always an option. For example, in addition to the shortage of ESL and bilingual teachers, Ochoa, Riccio, Jimenez, Garcia de Alba and Sines (2004) found that only 33% of the respondents from a survey of school psychologists who assess ELLs are bilingual. Therefore, school psychologists often outsource assessment and evaluation responsibilities to a bilingual psychologist who can perform the procedures in a child’s (and parent’s) native language when there is not a professional (e.g., school psychologist) who speaks the child’s first language. School psychologists should ensure that interpreters are knowledgeable about the assessments they are administering and adhere to ethical guidelines (AERA, APA & NCME, 1999; Rhodes, Ochoa, & Ortiz, 2005).

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (2004) requires evaluation teams to ensure that academic deficits are not due to a lack of education and/or limited English proficiency before qualifying a student as having a specific learning disability. School psychologists must possess knowledge about the second-language acquisition process to ensure that a student’s academic deficits are not due to limited English proficiency (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005). The *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (1999) indicate that examiners must understand the type and degree of bilingualism that a student has attained for appropriate test use. Additionally,
IDEA (2004) requires that students are assessed in their native language unless it is not practical. School psychologists need to recognize when it is appropriate to assess ELLs in both languages, in their native language only, or in English only. A student’s English abilities are frequently overestimated or underestimated when making assessment decisions. School psychologists must be knowledgeable about the second-language acquisition process to avoid misinterpreting English abilities on assessment measures.

Ochoa, Riccio, & Jimenez (2004) randomly surveyed practicing school psychologists who were NASP members and found that 50% of respondents used interpreters to translate behavior rating scales that were written in English to parents who do not speak English. Additionally, 25% of the respondents reported using a translator to translate rating scales from English to another language for use with ELLs. While translating a test may be a last resort and sometimes the only option, translating an assessment to a language that the assessment was not normed on results in significant threats to the validity of the assessment and the inferences that can be drawn from the results of the assessment (AERA, APA & NCME, 1999). It is important for school psychologists to be knowledgeable of the populations that standardized tests are normed with in order to determine if the students they are assessing are similar to the normed population. Additionally, school psychologists should consider an ELL student’s educational history (or lack thereof) and determine if the test items are appropriate. School psychologists should consider if assessments with a low verbal response rate are more appropriate than an assessment with a high verbal response rate. As with all
students, no single assessment should be used to make an educational decision regarding special education eligibility (Rinaldi & Samson, 2008).

School psychologists require knowledge about a student’s language abilities in both their first and second language, because learning problems should be present in both languages for the identification of a disability (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005). Understanding whether or not a student has achieved BICS and CALP is important before determining an appropriate assessment method. A student’s ability to carry on conversations in their second language does not indicate that they have attained CALP, nor if they have the skills to be assessed in English (Cummins, 1984). School psychologists must be able to discriminate between BICS and CALP to determine if students’ academic difficulties are due to a lack of CALP in both the student’s native language and/or English (Rhodes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005).

Rhodes, Ochoa and Ortiz, (2005; pp. 145-148) suggest that school psychologists need to consider four factors when examining language proficiency data, including: (1) the context of previous educational services and home literacy factors, (2) the ELL student’s language abilities compared with other second-language learners, (3) the consistency of data across formal and informal language measures, and (4) where the student is along the second-language acquisition continuum.

**Psychological services.** ELLs may experience psychological distress due to the acculturation process (Vernon, 2009). ELLs in English-only educational placements may exhibit frustration, depression, lower self-esteem, stress, and may remove themselves from participating in social interactions (Ochoa et al., 2004). Ochoa et al. (2004) suggest
that the following factors should be considered to determine if the mental needs of ELLs are met: a lack of access to service, a lack of bilingual psychologists, a lack of training, a lack of assessment tools that have shown validity with ELLs, and a lack of research.

**Response to intervention and ELLs.** School psychologists play a vital role in the assessment process of students and subsequent educational evaluation teams (Fagan & Wise, 2007); therefore, it is imperative that school psychologists are trained about ELLs and common misidentification practices so that they can work to reduce the disproportionality of ELLs receiving special education in public schools across the United States.

In an RTI model, all students (including ELLs) should receive research-based tier one core instruction by the classroom teacher. The classroom teacher should make adjustments in instruction to meet the needs of ELLs including re-teaching, smaller groupings, and/or instruction in the child’s first language. Universal screening is utilized to determine students who may need supplemental interventions, usually in the form of small groups, received in tier two. Tier three interventions are provided to those students who do not respond to interventions at tier two and therefore need more intensive and frequent interventions that are often individualized or implemented in small groups (Brown & Doolittle, 2008). The process of referring an ELL student to special education may begin when the student does not respond to these interventions (Brown & Doolittle, 2008; Rinaldi & Samson, 2008).

Implementation of RTI often provides reading interventions to students who are below reading benchmarks on universal screeners without targeting each student’s
specific problem, which can be particularly problematic for ELLs (Linan-Thompson & Ortiz, 2009). Additionally, Linan-Thompson and Ortiz (2009) suggest a gap between the achievement of native-English students and ELLs and describe elements of the school climate that might assist or impede the effective implementation of RTI. These elements include effective leadership, professional development regarding the education of ELLs, and consultation between school personnel, including teachers and speech-language pathologists. For school psychologists to be involved in these elements, they need to be knowledgeable about ELLs and the RTI process.

Progress-monitoring for reading within the RTI framework often involves measuring the growth of students’ oral reading fluency (ORF). ELLs may be overidentified if only timed measures are used to establish their progress in the curriculum. This is because many of the skills that are needed to meet ORF benchmarks may not have yet been attained by ELLs. However, the use of progress monitoring can be helpful in differentiating between ELLs who lack instruction and ELLs who have learning difficulties (Linan-Thompson & Ortiz, 2009). For example, ELLs with learning difficulties will exhibit a slow learning rate when their literacy skills are progress-monitored, whereas ELLs who have lacked instruction and opportunities to learn will make fast and constant progress when they are provided with effective instruction in tier one and tier two (Linan-Thompson, Hickman-Davis, 2002; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, Hickman-Davis, 2003). Despite the limitations mentioned, RTI provides schools with a system to potentially reduce disproportionality in special education, as it offers educators
the ability to identify at-risk students early and provide appropriate instruction and interventions to ELLs (Linan-Thompson, Cirino, & Vaughn, 2007).

**National Graduate Preparation Standards**

The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) has established domains for training that school psychology programs must abide by in order to receive and maintain national program accreditation. Domain 2.8 of these standards is entitled “Diversity in Development and Learning” and requires that “school psychologists have knowledge of individual differences, abilities, disabilities, and other diverse characteristics; principles and research related to diversity factors for children, families, and schools, including factors related to culture, context, and individual and role differences; and evidence-based strategies to enhance services and address potential influences related to diversity.” Additionally, the standards require that “school psychologists demonstrate skills to provide professional services that promote effective functioning for individuals, families, and schools with diverse characteristics, cultures, and backgrounds and across multiple contexts, with recognition that an understanding and respect for diversity in development and learning and advocacy for social justice are foundations of all aspects of service delivery” (NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists, 2010). This domain places a large emphasis on school psychologists possessing cultural competency, but does not specifically address ELLs and their unique linguistic needs. While having cultural sensitivity is imperative for school psychologists, it does not equate to possessing specific knowledge about the rapidly growing population of ELLs and their unique needs. The 2010 NASP Standards
for Training and Field Placement Programs in School Psychology require that “school psychologists demonstrate the sensitivity and skills needed to work with individuals of diverse characteristics and to implement strategies selected and/or adapted based on individual characteristics, strengths, and needs” (NASP, 2010, Domain 2.5). Therefore, school psychologists should be aware of culturally sensitive needs and the legal and ethical issues surrounding ELLs. Additionally, an index search of Best Practices in School Psychology (published by NASP) indicates that out of the five volumes consisting of 141 chapters, comprised of 2,225 pages, only a single, eight-page chapter is dedicated to ELLs.

School psychology programs that wish to receive and maintain accreditation must ensure that their curriculum is designed to adhere to ten general domains that are related to (1) data-based decision making and accountability, (2) consultation and collaboration, (3) interventions and instructional support to develop academic skills, (4) interventions and mental health services to develop social and life skills, (5) school-wide practices to promote learning, (6) preventive and responsive services, (7) family-school collaboration services, (8) diversity in development and learning (the domain listed above), (9) research and program evaluation, and (10) legal, ethical, and professional practice (NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists, 2010). Instruction on ELLs can be tied into all of these domains throughout multiple courses.

It is unknown how much time and to what extent school psychology programs are addressing the topic of ELLs. While it is plausible to assume that ELL instruction is integrated within assessment, counseling, intervention, and diversity courses; it may also
be the case that programs offer a stand-alone course on ELLs during their training. It is also possible that programs offer no instruction on the topic of ELLs at all. There are multiple ways that training programs may deliver instruction on ELLs to their graduate students; however, there is likely little consistency across graduate training programs. This may be attributed to a lack of specific national standards-based requirement regarding ELLs, and therefore, information regarding instruction on ELLs in school psychology graduate programs is largely unknown. Moreover, the amount of instruction on ELLs may not be in proportion to the growing needs of this population in U.S. schools, and therefore may be inadequate. It would be useful to know how much time graduate programs dedicate to preparing graduate students on issues surrounding ELLs, as this may aid training programs when evaluating and adjusting their curricula in order to meet the needs of the growing population of ELLs.

Because the current training domains published by NASP (2010) do not specifically address the topic of ELL services. Thus, it is unknown if any instruction is provided on the best practices surrounding this growing population of students. School psychology graduate students are required to complete an internship that lasts throughout an entire school year (1200 hours) before becoming a licensed practitioner (NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists, 2010) in the year directly following the completion of their coursework. Given the sequence of the internship immediately following the training program, determining the knowledge that school psychology interns possess regarding ELLs will aid training programs in making appropriate adjustments to their curricula.
Purpose of the Present Study

Currently, there is a gap in the literature examining the amount of time that school psychology programs spend training graduate students on the best practices surrounding ELLs. Research has indicated that in the past, school psychologists have not received adequate training on bilingual assessments (Ochoa, Rivera, & Ford, 1997) and have participated in assessment procedures that conflict with national standards and ethics (Ochoa et al., 2004; i.e., using interpreters to translate rating scales for use with ELLs). Additionally, the knowledge level of interns regarding ELLs is also absent from the literature. Examining the knowledge level of interns and the perceptions interns have of their graduate training prior to entering into schools as practitioners is important, as school psychology programs should be aware of their students’ knowledge levels of ELLs so that they can adjust their programs to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population of ELLs.

The present study examined the amount of time and extent to which NASP approved school psychology graduate programs spend instructing on the best practices surrounding ELLs. In addition, the present study also examined the barriers that exist for graduate programs with regards to increasing instruction on the topic of ELLs. Finally, the present study investigated the level of knowledge current interns possess regarding ELLs. To answer these research questions, two surveys were administered. The first survey was administered to program directors of NASP approved graduate training programs examining the amount of instructional time school psychology graduate students receive regarding the best practices surrounding ELLs, and the barriers that exist
for increasing ELL instruction. The second survey was administered to current school psychology interns examining the amount of training they received, the amount of knowledge they possess about ELLs, and their perceptions of preparedness in serving ELLs before entering into the schools as certified practitioners. Because there is a lack of research on ELL instruction in school psychology graduate programs, this research study was implemented to be a precursor for ongoing research. The baseline results of this study and future studies can help school psychology graduate programs design effective curriculums that will prepare school psychologists to serve ELLs effectively.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

This chapter will discuss the three research questions that aided in the design of the present study and the predictions that were made for each of the three research questions. Additionally, the research design, participants, setting, response rate, procedures (including the survey instruments), and types of data analyses completed will also be discussed in this chapter.

Research Questions and Predictions

The following research questions were examined in the present study:

Research question 1. How much time and to what extent do school psychology programs devote to educating their graduate students on the best practices in serving English Language Learners?

Prediction 1. Because research on the time and extent of ELL instruction in school psychology graduate programs was not available prior to this study, a measurable prediction was not made, but rather, the results from this research question should serve as a baseline for future research. The NASP standards (2010) do not specifically require training related to serving ELLs and a study by Ochoa, Rivera & Ford (1997) revealed that practicing school psychologists did not feel as though they were adequately trained...
to conduct bilingual assessments. Therefore, the assumption was made that school psychology graduate programs are not providing an adequate amount of training on the best practices in serving ELLs.

**Research question 2.** What are the barriers to increasing ELL instruction?

**Prediction 2.** It was predicted that school psychology programs would identify barriers to preparing graduate students to serve ELLs including: (a) lack of time to instruct on the topic because other NASP domains must be met and (b) faculty members’ lack of knowledge about the best practices in serving ELLs. This prediction was based on the absence of ELL instruction from the NASP training domains, which in turn may result in instructional time being devoted to meeting other requirements. Additionally, because instruction on ELLs has never been included in the training domains, it is likely that program faculty were not trained on the best practices surrounding ELLs, and therefore it was predicted that their knowledge may also be deficient.

**Research Question 3.** What do school psychology interns know about the best practices in serving ELLs and what are interns’ perceptions of their training regarding ELLs?

**Prediction 3.** Because research on intern knowledge of ELLs and intern perceptions of preparedness in serving ELLs was not available prior to this study, a measurable prediction was not made, but instead, the results from this research question should serve as a baseline for future research. The current NASP standards (2010) do not require programs to train their school psychology students on the best practices surrounding ELLs. Ochoa, Rivera and Ford (1997) found that practicing school
psychologists did not feel they were adequately trained. Thus, it is plausible that internship and field supervisors (practicing school psychologists) are not trained to equip their interns with the necessary knowledge and skills to serve ELLs. If students are not trained to serve ELLs during their coursework and do not receive training from their supervising school psychologists during practicum experiences and internship, it is likely that they will lack knowledge on the best practices and confidence in serving ELLs during their internship year. Therefore, an assumption was made that interns would lack basic knowledge about the best practices in serving ELLs and would not feel prepared to serve ELLs in their internships and beyond.

**Research Design**

Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected using a survey design. Research questions one and three were analyzed quantitatively; research question two was examined qualitatively through open-ended questions on the faculty survey.

**Participants and Setting**

Participants in this study included school psychology program faculty members (n=26) and current intern school psychologists (n=67) from NASP-approved programs across the United States (including: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, and The District of Columbia). See Table 1 for faculty demographic information and Table 2 for intern demographic information.
Table 1

*Faculty Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is your program NASP approved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree(s) Offered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., specialist degree in school psychology)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position(s) in Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator/Director</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship Coordinator</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Intern Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is your program NASP approved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Sought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyD</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., PsyS Specialist Degree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., Middle Eastern, biracial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Languages Spoken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than four</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response rate. Electronic surveys were emailed to 190 faculty members from NASP-approved programs across the United States, from which 28 surveys were returned, yielding a response rate of 14.75%. Intern surveys were completed by 67 interns from NASP approved programs across the United States. A response rate cannot be calculated for the interns who participated in this survey, because it is unknown how many faculty members distributed the survey to their current interns.

Procedures

Approval for this research design was obtained by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Dayton prior to data collection (see Appendix A). The coordinators of all NASP-approved school psychology programs in the United States were sent an e-mail in October-November 2012 describing the purpose of the study and soliciting participation of faculty members over a two-month period. In this same e-mail, school psychology program faculty members were asked to forward a survey to their current interns. The e-mail included links to both the faculty online survey and the intern online survey, which were both created using Qualtrics (an online survey company). One reminder e-mail was sent two weeks after the first e-mail to encourage participation from those who had not yet completed the survey (See Appendix A).

Incentives. Both school psychology program coordinators and interns were given the opportunity to be entered into two separate drawings, in which the names of two coordinators and two interns were randomly drawn to receive $50 gift cards to Amazon.com. Respondents sent a code obtained from the surveys to an alternate e-mail address (schoolpsychology.ell@gmail.com) to be entered into the drawing for the gift
cards. Two drawings (one for the faculty and one for the interns) occurred after the surveys closed. The winners were contacted via e-mail and the gift cards were mailed to the winners.

**Instruments.** Two surveys were created and utilized in this study including (1) the survey for school psychology program faculty and (2) the survey that was forwarded to interns by the school psychology program faculty. The surveys were piloted in July-August 2012 with current and past school psychology program faculty & interns at The University of Dayton. Results from the pilot resulted in minor changes that were made to the wording of the questions, directions, and formatting of the survey.

**Faculty survey.** The faculty survey (see Appendix B) consisted of demographic questions including (a) degrees offered by the school psychology program (b) the respondent’s position in the program, and (c) the state in which the university resides. The survey asked faculty members to report the number of courses in which the topic of ELLs/second language acquisition process is covered in their training programs. Faculty members were asked to list the title of every course in which the topic is covered and indicate the amount of time that the topic is covered in each of the courses listed. Faculty members were also asked to list all of the resources (e.g., textbooks, websites, books, videos, handouts, etc.) that are used in their programs to supplement their instruction on the topic of ELLs. Faculty members were also asked to rate how prepared they believe their graduate students are to work with ELLs. Qualitative questions on the faculty survey inquired about the reasons faculty members devote the amount of time that they do to instructing on the topic of ELLs and faculty members were asked to list barriers that
exist with regard to increasing instruction on the best practices in serving ELLs. The faculty survey took approximately five to ten minutes to complete.

**Intern survey.** The intern survey (see Appendix C) was split into three sections. The first section of the intern survey collected demographic data including whether or not the respondent was currently an intern school psychologist, the accreditation status of their training program, the state in which the intern’s training program is located, and the degree(s) the intern is seeking. Additional questions in this section inquired about the interns’ ethnic background and the number of languages spoken. Interns were asked to indicate the number of courses in which the topic of ELLs and the second-language acquisition process were covered in their training programs. Additionally, interns were asked to report how many courses they completed that addressed ethical and legal issues surrounding ELLs. Interns were also asked to rate overall how well prepared they feel to work with ELLs.

The second section of the intern survey was entitled, “ELL Knowledge,” in which interns were asked to answer ten true/false questions and two multiple-choice questions regarding their knowledge about the population of ELLs. On each of the true/false questions, interns were given the options of answering “True,” “I don’t know,” or “False”.

The third section of the intern survey was entitled, “Perceptions” and asked current interns to rate how well their school psychology program prepared them to complete nine common responsibilities of school psychologists with regards to ELL service delivery (e.g., differentiate between a disability and ELL issues). The final
question in the last section of the survey asked interns to list their primary concerns with regards to providing services to ELLs in their internships and beyond. The intern survey took approximately ten to twenty minutes to complete.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

This chapter will discuss the results of the present study. The results will be presented according to each of the research questions that were described in Chapter III. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the quantitative data and a content analysis was conducted to analyze the qualitative data collected from both the faculty survey and the intern survey. Microsoft Excel was utilized to conduct these analyses. The results of this study can serve as a baseline for future studies examining the ELL instruction in school psychology graduate programs. Tables and figures are provided to illustrate the results reported in this chapter.

Research Question 1

Faculty responses. Several of the questions on the faculty survey aimed to answer this research question. Faculty members were asked to indicate the extent of coverage their program offers by specifying how many courses cover the topic of ELLs (See Table 3) and the Second Language Acquisition Process (See Table 4). Faculty members were also asked to rate how prepared they believed their graduate students are to work with ELLs using a likert scale (See Table 8).
Table 3

Extent of Coverage, Faculty Responses: “How is the topic of ELLs covered in your training program?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage of Faculty Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- A specific course is devoted to the population of ELLs and the topic is covered in other courses</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A specific course is devoted to the population of ELLs.</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The topic is covered in more than four courses.</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The topic is covered in three courses.</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The topic is covered in two courses.</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The topic is covered in one course.</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The topic is not covered at all.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Extent of Coverage, Faculty Responses: “How is the topic of The Second Language Acquisition Process covered in your training program?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage of Faculty Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-A specific course is devoted to this topic and the topic is covered in other courses</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-A specific course is devoted to the population of ELLs.</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The topic is covered in more than four courses.</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The topic is covered in three courses.</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The topic is covered in two courses.</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The topic is covered in one course.</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The topic is not covered at all.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Courses and resources. Faculty members were asked to list the courses in which the topic of ELLs is covered for more than ten minutes and describe the extent of the coverage according to the amount of time spent covering the topic of ELLs in each of the courses. As described later in the limitations section of Chapter V (Discussion), this question was misinterpreted by several of the respondents; therefore, the average amount of time spent instructing on the topic of ELLs cannot be computed. The majority of faculty respondents indicated that the topic of ELLs was taught in already existing courses including cultural diversity courses, assessment courses, practicum courses, and internship courses. Faculty members were also asked to list the resources (e.g., textbooks, websites, books, videos, handouts, etc.) their program uses to supplement instruction on the topic of ELLs. The majority of faculty respondents reported utilizing the textbook, Assessing Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students, by Rhodes, Ochoa, & Ortiz (2005). Respondents also reported using chapters from the series, Best Practices in School Psychology V, by Thomas & Grimes (2008) and the textbook, Essentials of Cross Battery Assessment, by Flanagan, Ortiz, & Alfonso (2007) to supplement their instruction on the topic of ELLs.

Reasons for ELL instruction. Faculty members were also asked to provide an extended response regarding why their programs choose to devote the amount of time they do to instructing on the topic of ELLs. The majority of the faculty respondents reported that they spend time instructing on this topic because of the high population of ELLs in schools. Other reasons cited included, “we don’t do enough” “the development of English provides insight into cognitive/developmental mechanisms,” “state law
(minimum of 3 ELL credit hours), “so students know how to assess ELLs,” and “so students can become culturally competent.”

**Intern responses.** Intern school psychologists were also asked to report the extent of coverage their program offers by specifying how many courses cover the topic of ELLs (See Table 5) and the Second Language Acquisition Process (See Table 6). Additionally, interns were asked to indicate how much training they received regarding the legal and ethical issues surrounding ELLs (See Table 7). Interns were also asked to rate how prepared they believe they are to work with ELLs using a Likert scale (See Table 8).
Table 5

*Extent of Coverage, Intern Responses: “How is the topic of ELLs covered in your training program?”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage of Intern Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-A specific course is devoted to the population of ELLs and the topic is covered in other courses</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-A specific course is devoted to the population of ELLs.</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The topic is covered in more than four courses.</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The topic is covered in three courses.</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The topic is covered in two courses.</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The topic is covered in one course.</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The topic is not covered at all.</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Extent of Coverage, Intern Responses: “How is the topic of The Second Language Acquisition Process covered in your training program?”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage of Intern Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- A specific course is devoted to this topic and the topic is covered</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the topic is covered in other courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A specific course is devoted to the population of ELLs.</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The topic is covered in more than four courses.</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The topic is covered in three courses.</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The topic is covered in two courses.</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The topic is covered in one course.</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The topic is not covered at all.</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Extent of Coverage, Intern Responses: “How much training did you receive regarding the legal and ethical issues surrounding ELLs?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage of Intern Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-I received training in three or more courses.</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-I received training in two courses.</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-I received training in one course.</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-I did not receive training in any courses.</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Intern perceptions of preparedness.** Although some interns reported receiving training on the topic of ELLs, the second-language acquisition process, and ELL legal and ethical issues in one or more courses, investigating the depth of this instruction was beyond the scope of this study. However, analysis of the knowledge and perception portions of the intern survey suggest that although interns are receiving instruction in multiple courses, they are not prepared to serve ELLs. Interns were also asked to rate on a Likert scale how prepared they were to perform some of the responsibilities of school psychologists with regards to serving ELLs. An average preparedness score was computed, based on all nine of the responsibilities that interns rated their preparedness in. Interns reported feeling “successfully prepared” and “over-prepared,” on average, only 20.33% on all nine of these items. The items in which interns felt most prepared included, “being part of a multidisciplinary team serving an ELL student” (33% felt their programs “successfully prepared” them or “over-prepared” them) and “participating in an educational team involving the decision-making process of whether or not an ELL student should be identified as having an educational disability” (28% felt their programs “successfully prepared” them or “over-prepared” them). Interns felt the least prepared to participate in bilingual assessments and deliver in-services to other staff members on the topic of ELLs (See Figures 1 and 2). Intern school psychologists were also asked to provide an extended response about their primary concerns with regards to providing services to ELLs in their internships and in their future careers as school psychologists. The majority of the responses indicated concerns regarding accurate assessment and evaluation of ELLs. Additional concerns cited by more than one intern included
providing interventions to ELLs, assessing ELLs without a bilingual school psychologist, working through the language barrier with parents, lacking experience with ELLs, and the lack of educational resources available for school psychologists.

Table 8

*Faculty and Intern Perceptions of Preparedness to Serve ELLs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty Responses</th>
<th>Intern Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate program does not prepare graduate students to work with ELL students</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate program minimally prepares graduate students to work with ELL students</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate program somewhat prepares graduate students to work with ELL students</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate program successfully prepares graduate students to work with ELL students</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate program over-prepares graduate students to work with ELL students</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Intern Perceptions of Preparedness to Serve ELLs
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Figure 2. Specific Intern Perceptions of Preparedness to Serve ELLs
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Research Question 2

When asked to provide an extended response to the question regarding what barriers faculty members recognized in providing effective instruction to their graduate students on the topic of ELLs, 45.5% of the respondents cited not having enough time in the curriculum (due to other state and national requirements). Other answers cited more than once included limited knowledge of practicum and internship supervisors (22.7%) and a lack of opportunity to practice in the schools (18.1%). A notable response to this question was, “The 72-hour curriculum (including internship) is so jam-packed with courses required for accreditation that we have very little room left in our course of study for any new courses. We can build units into our existing courses, but our students are so locked into required courses, they have little/no room for adding more required or elective courses…”

Research Question 3

Intern knowledge. The majority of knowledge questions (64.9%), were correctly answered by interns; 24.6% of the questions were answered “I don’t know,” and 10.5% of the questions were answered incorrectly. The percentage of ELL knowledge questions that interns answered correctly was 64.9%, the percentage of questions interns answered “I don’t know” was 24.6%, and the percentage of questions interns answered incorrectly was 10.5%. These results indicate that, overall, the intern respondents lack knowledge about some of the basic best practices in serving ELLs, supporting the prediction to this research question. (See Table 9 for additional details regarding intern knowledge).

Perceptions. As previously stated, interns rated themselves as being inadequately prepared to serve ELLs (See Table 8, Figure 1 and Figure 2). Eighteen percent of the
respondents reported that their programs did not prepare them; 30% of the respondents reported that their programs minimally prepared them; 31% reported that their programs somewhat prepared them; 18% reported that their programs successfully prepared them; and 2% reported that their programs over-prepared them to conduct the responsibilities of school psychologists that were asked of them. (See Table 8).
Table 9

*Intern School Psychologists’ Knowledge of ELLs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language (ESL) programs and bilingual programs provide instruction the same way.</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Answer = FALSE</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICS is associated with language skills that are needed to complete schoolwork (e.g., speaking, reading, and writing).</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Answer = FALSE</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is appropriate for a school psychologist to use a translator to translate a behavior rating scale from English to another language and use the English norm-referenced scores of that rating scale in an evaluation (e.g., BASC-2).</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Answer = FALSE</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If a student is able to communicate fluently in a conversation to a school psychologist, this means they have obtained enough English proficiency to take a standardized assessment. 

*Answer = FALSE*

CALP refers to the language that is needed for social interactions. 

*Answer = FALSE*

It is not appropriate for a school psychologist to use a translator to translate a cognitive or academic assessment and use the English norm-referenced scores from the test in an evaluation. 

*Answer = TRUE*

Assessing an ELL student’s skills only in English is appropriate during an evaluation. 

*Answer = FALSE*
The strongest predictor of a student’s success with a second language is the amount of schooling the student received in his or her first language.  
*Answer = TRUE*

Immersing an ELL student in English instruction is the most effective way for the student to acquire academic English.  
*Answer = FALSE*

ELL students with learning disabilities will exhibit a slow learning rate when progress-monitored with curriculum-based measures that measure literacy skills.  
*Answer = TRUE*

Which of the following types of programs has the most positive longitudinal outcomes for ELLs?  
(options given: transitional/early-exit bilingual education programs; two-way/dual-language bilingual education programs; pullout ESL programs; content-based ESL/sheltered English programs; I don’t know).  
*Answer = Two-Way/Dual-Language Bilingual Education Programs*
In what stage of the second-language acquisition process should an educator expect to experience a silent period with an ELL student? (options given: stage one; stage two; stage three; stage four; stage five; I don’t know)

Answer = Stage One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Correct Answers</th>
<th>65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Incorrect Answers</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Answered “I don’t know”</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Review of Purpose and Major Findings

The purpose of the present study was to establish a baseline for ongoing research on ELL instruction in school psychology graduate programs by (1) examining the amount of time and extent to which NASP approved school psychology graduate programs spend instructing on the best practices surrounding ELLs, (2) investigating the barriers that exist for graduate programs with regards to increasing instruction on the topic of ELLs, and (3) exploring the level of knowledge current interns possess regarding ELLs. Results indicated, that first, both faculty members and interns reported that some instruction ELLs is occurring. Second, faculty members identified lack of time to instruct on the topic of ELLs due to other state and national requirements, as a barrier to increasing ELL instruction. Third, interns possessed some knowledge about ELLs, and overall, their perceptions of preparedness indicated that they do not feel confident in serving the population of ELLs.

Interpretation of Findings Relative to Predictions

Prediction 1. Both faculty and interns reported that their graduate programs are providing training on the topic of ELLs, however, the amount of time school psychology graduate students receive instruction on the topic of ELLs is still unknown because the
survey question that aimed to answer this research question was misinterpreted by the respondents.

Although both faculty and interns reported their programs provided some training on the topic of ELLs, interns’ perceptions of their training indicate that the instruction they received was not effective in providing them with confidence to serve the population of ELLs. Results indicated that a higher percentage of faculty members (44%) than interns (21%) believe that their graduate programs “successfully” prepare their students to work with ELLs. However despite this disparity, a correlation between the results from the intern survey and faculty survey cannot be made because it is unknown if faculty and students from the same program or different programs completed the survey, in attempt to protect anonymity. Overall, interns felt less than adequately prepared to effectively serve the growing population of ELLs. The majority of interns (51.3%) reported that their primary concern in providing services to ELLs was their ability to accurately assess and evaluate ELLs (citing examples including ELL vs. SLD and appropriate special education placements). Because assessment and evaluation is the primary role of many school psychologists across the country, this perceived lack of preparedness with regards to assessment of ELLs is alarming. These results are consistent with Ochoa, Rivera, &Ford’s (1997) study, which found that school psychologists reported that their training on bilingual assessments was less than adequate.

Prediction 2. With regards to the examination of barriers that exist to increase ELL instruction, the prediction that faculty would identify lack of time to instruct on the topic of ELLs due to other requirements, was supported. Many faculty respondents
indicated that they do not have time to instruct on the topic of ELLs because of other state and national requirements.

**Prediction 3.**

*Intern perceptions of preparedness.* When asked to report their perceptions of how well they were trained to participate in nine responsibilities commonly expected of school psychologists, interns felt the most prepared in areas that involved working with a team. Working on a team allows a school psychologist to elicit the input of others and this may be the reason for the higher preparedness ratings in these areas. Although both faculty members and interns reported some training on the topic of ELLs, the low levels of preparedness cited by the interns indicate that the instruction is not effective in providing interns with a perception of preparedness for serving the population of ELLs.

*Intern knowledge.* Although the NASP (2010) Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists do not specifically address preparing graduate students to effectively serve ELLs, the domains stress preparing scientist-practitioners who possess the knowledge and skills necessary to address learning and behavior problems. Interns answered 65% of the knowledge questions correctly and this percentage would be considered a “failing” grade in a college graduate level course. Notably, 41% of intern respondents reported that they “did not know” or answered the following true/false question incorrectly: “immersing an ELL student in English instruction is the most effective way for the student to acquire academic English” (answer = false), which is one of the myths commonly possessed by educators reported in the literature review of this thesis. This means that school psychologists are frequently
among the educators who are perpetuating myths about ELLs. Additionally, 53% percent of intern respondents indicated that they “did not know” or answered the following true/false question incorrectly: “the strongest predictor of a student’s success with a second language is the amount of schooling the student received in his or her first language” (answer = true). In addition, 50% of the intern respondents reported that they “did not know” or answered the following true/false question incorrectly: “ELL students with learning disabilities will exhibit a slow learning rate when progress-monitored with curriculum-based measures that measure literacy skills” (answer = true). Both of these incorrect response rates are alarming because incorrect information about both of these ideas would contribute to the misidentification of ELLs. The majority of the questions on the knowledge survey were created based on the basic theories discussed in the literature review of this thesis. An expected knowledge level that intern school psychologists should possess is unknown because this is the first known research study to investigate the knowledge level of interns. However, the overall knowledge level of interns (65%) can serve as a baseline for future research.

Potential reasons for disparities. Because programs report that some instruction is occurring, the knowledge level and low ratings of preparedness among interns with regards to serving ELLs are surprising. It is plausible that this gap is due to interns not applying the knowledge gained from their graduate courses in their field experiences, and therefore, they are not developing the skills required to produce a strong perception of confidence with regards to preparedness. This hypothesis aligns with an additional barrier faculty members cited to increasing ELL instruction—the lack of knowledge
among practicum and internship supervisors. It is also plausible that the gap between training and confidence is due to ineffective instruction. Because the amount of time spent instructing on the topic of ELLs is unknown, it is possible that programs need to increase the amount of time they spend instructing on this topic to produce higher knowledge levels and perceptions of preparedness among their students. The instruction may also be ineffective because faculty members lack the necessary knowledge to instruct their graduate students on the best practices in serving ELLs. Therefore, an appropriate modification to school psychology graduate program curriculums may be to require that students take a course in another department (e.g., Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages—TESOL). The knowledge and confidence levels of interns are alarming considering the recent documented growth and expected future growth of the ELL population in schools across the United States. The knowledge levels and perceptions of preparedness among interns can serve as baseline data for future research investigating ELL instruction in NASP approved programs.

Limitations

This study was limited by several variables. First, the low response rate resulting in a small sample size significantly limits the interpretations that can be made based on the data. Second, the nature of survey research results in several significant limitations. Moreover, because the survey was completed electronically, technical problems preventing proper submission of the survey were possible. It is possible that faculty and students may have deleted the survey for a variety of reasons including unfamiliarity with the sender or annoyance of the high number of surveys that have been sent to their inbox.
via e-mail (Evans & Mathur, 2005). The low response rate among faculty members was not unexpectedly low (14.74%), as research has found declining survey response rates in organizational sciences (Anseel, Lievens, Schollaert, & Choragwicka, 2010).

An additional limitation to this study is that the surveys were administered by e-mail to school psychology program directors, who were asked to complete the survey and forward the e-mail to their current interns. Program directors may have chosen to ignore the survey and not forward the e-mail to their current interns, and therefore, the sample from which the data was derived from this study may not necessarily be representative of all NASP approved school psychology graduate program faculty and interns from across the United States.

Another limitation to this study is the inherent bias in the responses to the survey because the surveys were self-report measures. Faculty members who responded to the survey may have indicated that they spend more time instructing their graduate students on the topic of ELLs than they actually do. Additionally, the school psychology faculty members and interns who chose to participate in this survey may have done so because they have a strong interest in the topic of ELLs; therefore, the percentage of correct responses on the knowledge survey may be elevated. Because online survey responses are anonymous, the researcher could not directly correlate the answers from faculty members with the answers from specific faculty members’ interns who completed the knowledge survey.

An additional limitation that surfaced was the misinterpretation of questions on the survey. The first misinterpretation on the survey occurred on the question in which
faculty members were asked to list every course in which the topic of ELLs is covered for more than ten minutes and describe the type of coverage using the following options: 11-30 minutes; 31-60 minutes; 61-90 minutes; more than 90 minutes. Several of the respondents did not list the number of minutes the class covered the topic of ELLs, listed the number of minutes throughout the semester, or they listed all of the classes in which the topic of ELLs was covered and then selected the option, “more than 90 minutes,” when all of the classes were grouped together. Therefore, descriptive statistics could not be computed on this question. After data analyses, the researcher determined that an additional misinterpretation may have been made by some of the respondents on the intern survey on both of the knowledge questions regarding using a translator to interpret behavior rating scales or cognitive and academic assessments and using the English norm-referenced scores for an evaluation. While the purpose of these questions was to provide a correct answer that neither of these measures would be appropriate, after considering the responses from these questions, it is plausible that interns assumed that this would be only one of the pieces of data collected for an evaluation. It is certainly not appropriate to only use this form of data collection in an evaluation, but it can provide additional information to a scale or other assessment that is given in the student’s native language. Therefore, results from these two questions should be interpreted with caution.

A final limitation of this study was the anonymity of the respondents. Because the results were confidential, the researcher could not ask follow-up questions to any of the responses that were obtained and a correlation could not be connected between faculty and intern responses due to the confidentiality of the responses. Additionally, the
intern questionnaire was administered at the beginning of the interns’ internships, and therefore, it is possible that the duration of their internship would have provided them with more knowledge about ELLs. However, a benefit of conducting this study at this point during the students’ internships was that it allowed the researcher to determine how well prepared students were to serve ELLs based solely on the training they received in their graduate programs. Because many of the faculty members cited a main barrier for effective instruction of ELLs as a lack of knowledge among internship and field supervisors, it is plausible that the interns’ knowledge may not have increased on the topic of ELLs as a result of the duration of their internship.

This study examined the amount of time and extent to which NASP approved programs spent instructing their students on the best practices in working with ELLs and the knowledge interns possessed about ELLs. Other factors that may be of relevance, including the quality of the instruction interns received, were not addressed in this study. Despite these known limitations, the results of this study present a research-based need for increased effective instruction on the topic of ELLs in school psychology programs across the country.

**Implications for Future Research**

This pilot study has provided quantitative, baseline information about the instruction that is occurring in school psychology graduate programs, barriers that exist to increasing ELL instruction, the knowledge that interns possess about ELL best practices, and the perceptions of preparedness of interns in serving ELLs. Future and ongoing research can aid programs in making appropriate modifications to their curriculums so
that school psychologists can be prepared to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population of ELLs.

School psychologists play an important role in the lives of ELLs through both direct and indirect service delivery. Although practitioners can seek out professional development on this topic, required training in graduate school to address this population is imperative because of the significant growth of the ELL population and the multitude of services school psychologists are expected to provide to ELLs. Additionally, school psychologists may be the school-based professionals who are asked to provide professional development to other staff members through in-services.

Given that faculty members cited lack of time due to other state and national requirements as their biggest barrier to increasing ELL instruction, it is hypothesized that ELL instruction in NASP approved programs will increase if ELL instruction is incorporated in future revisions of the NASP training domains. Additionally, this addition to the NASP training domains could provide ongoing data about the extent of coverage and the classes in which programs are providing ELL instruction. This data would be useful in not only ensuring that programs are providing adequate ELL instruction to their students, but also determining how this instruction is being provided. Additionally, adding an ELL topic on summative assessments (such as the PRAXIS) would entice programs to spend more time instructing on this topic and also provide ongoing data about the knowledge level school psychology graduate students possess on the best practices in serving ELLs.
While it would be beneficial to have a course devoted to serving ELLs, the cited lack of time makes this approach unrealistic for many programs. A more realistic approach includes incorporating ELL instruction into already existing courses in a school psychology program, ensuring that more time is devoted to the topic of ELLs throughout broad school psychology courses. Because the majority of interns (51.3%) reported that their primary concern in providing services to ELLs was their ability to accurately assess and evaluate ELLs, programs may wish to focus their training specifically on this topic. Future research should also investigate the confidence level of faculty members in providing instruction to ELLs. This research could provide insight into whether or not students should take courses on language acquisition outside of the department of school psychology.

Suggestions for future research include conducting a follow-up study that attempts to capture a larger sample size. Additionally, more specified research on programs that are effectively training their students to serve the population of ELLs is warranted. Finally, future research on the type of instruction and the amount of time instruction is occurring on the topic of ELLs within school psychology graduate programs is also warranted.

**Conclusion**

The population of ELLs in public schools is rapidly growing (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011) and research has demonstrated a lack of knowledge among school personnel regarding servicing ELLs effectively (Batt, 2008; Durgunoğlu & Hughes, 2010; Newman, Samimy, Romstedt, 2010; Zetlin et al.,
School psychologists play an important role in the lives of ELLs through both direct and indirect service delivery. Research regarding the training of school psychologists to serve ELLs was limited prior to the implementation of this study. The current NASP (2010) training domains do not specifically address the population of ELLs.

Results of this study indicated that both faculty members and interns reported that some instruction on serving ELLs is occurring. Faculty members identified lack of time to instruct on the topic of ELLs due to other state and national requirements as a barrier to increasing ELL instruction. Additionally, interns possessed some knowledge about ELLs, and overall, their perceptions of preparedness indicated that they do not feel confident in serving the population of ELLs. Given the documented growing number of ELLs, the lack of knowledge about ELLs among school personnel, the important role that school psychologists play in the lives of ELLs, and the data produced by this study, there is a need for targeted training among school psychology graduate students regarding the best practices in working with ELLs. Most importantly, there is a need for effective instruction on ELLs that can be translated into knowledge and confidence among school psychology students. Therefore, future research should guide school psychology graduate training programs to make adjustments to their curricula to effectively prepare their students to serve the growing population of ELLs.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

IRB MATERIALS AND CONSENT/ASSENT LETTERS

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON - CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

**TITLE of STUDY:** Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists in Serving English Language Learning Students

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Morgan Aldridge, a school psychology intern from the school psychology program located in the Department of Counselor Education and Human Services from the University of Dayton. Your participation in this study is voluntary. Read the information below, and ask questions about anything you do not understand, before deciding whether or not to participate.

**PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The present study will examine the amount of time and extent to which NASP approved school psychology graduate programs spend instructing on the best practices surrounding ELL students. In addition, the present study will also examine the level of knowledge current interns possess regarding ELL students. Results may inform school psychology program faculty of gaps in their curricula related to English Language Learning students.

**PROCEDURES**

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to complete the online survey link and forward the intern survey link to your current interns to complete.
POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

There are no anticipated risks or discomforts related to this research study.

ANTICIPATED BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS

Program faculty and interns who choose to participate in this study will have the ability to win a $50.00 gift card to Amazon.com via a drawing. Additionally, the data from this proposal can help inform school psychology program faculty of gaps that may exist in their current curricula regarding English Language Learning students.

ALTERNATIVES TO PARTICIPATION

Program faculty members and students have the option to delete the e-mail and not participate in the proposed study.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

Participants who choose to respond to the surveys will be given a code to e-mail to the researcher at the end of the survey. This code will allow the e-mail addresses of two program faculty and two interns to be entered to win one of four $50.00 gift cards to Amazon.com.

IN CASE OF RESEARCH RELATED ADVERSE EFFECTS

“If you are experiencing any kind of discomfort as a result of your participation in this study, you agree to promptly notify the Principal Investigator. You may contact the University of Dayton Counseling Center at (937) 229-3141. The Counseling Center is available free of charge to undergraduate students. If you find yourself experiencing distress after the Counseling Center is closed for the day, you may call the number and you will be connected to an answering service, and a counselor will return your call.

CONFIDENTIALITY

When the results of the research are published or discussed in conferences, no information will be included that would reveal your identity. Only the primary investigators will have access to identifying information. All information received will be incorporated into group data; information about your specific program will not be identifiable to the primary researcher or anyone else. Because you are completing this survey online, absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed due to the limited protections of Internet access. After the drawings of e-mail addresses have been completed, your e-mail address will be deleted.
PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

_Suggested text:_ Your participation in this research is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, that will not affect your relationship with The University of Dayton, NASP, or other services to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without prejudice or penalty.

IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

Morgan Jensen Aldridge, M.S.
Primary Investigator
_Jensenm1@udayton.edu_
(419)-602-0248

Elana R. Bernstein, Ph.D.
Advisory Committee Chairman
_Eberstein1@udayton.edu_
(937)-229-2644

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Dayton: Dr. Mary Connolly, (937) 229-3493, _Mary.Connolly@notes.udayton.edu_.
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CONSENT LETTER

The following letter of consent was administered to the participants through the e-mail they were sent soliciting participation in this research study.

Dear Dr. ______________,

I am a school psychology intern completing my thesis in the school psychology program at The University of Dayton. I am asking all NASP accredited programs and their interns to participate in a study designed to investigate the time and extent to which NASP approved school psychology graduate programs spend instructing their students on the population of ELL students. Additionally, the study will examine the knowledge level of current school psychology interns regarding ELL students. It is estimated that this 11-item faculty survey will only take 5-10 minutes of your time. Data collected will allow me to analyze current practices and training programs, with the end goal of improving school psychology training, and ultimately, services for ELLs in schools.

I am asking that ONE representative from each NASP approved school psychology training program respond to the first survey link and to then forward this e-mail to your current interns. Interns are asked to complete the second survey link, as
stated below. *Program coordinators, please forward this e-mail to your school psychology interns so they may have the choice to participate in this study.*

The survey designed for the **interns** should only take **10-20 minutes** to complete. To thank you for taking the time to provide your input on this important topic, after completing the survey, you will be given a code to e-mail to me at schoolpsychology.ELL@gmail.com, which will **enter you into a drawing to win one of four (two faculty members and two interns) $50.00 Amazon.com gift cards.** After the winners are contacted and their mailing addresses are obtained to receive the gift cards, your e-mail address will be deleted.

**Faculty members**, please click here to access your survey:
https://qtrial.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_2gU5MOC0P5d5FQ1

**Interns**, please click here to access your survey:
https://qtrial.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_2498gGJCWhwoBIF

Your consent to participate in this study will be indicated by your submission of a completed survey. The only identifying information is your e-mail address that you may provide to be entered into the drawing and only the primary researcher will have access to your e-mail address. There will be no way to determine what program the answers were received from on both the faculty and intern surveys, therefore, your answers are anonymous. All information received will be incorporated into group data; information about your specific program will not be identifiable to me or anyone else. Because you
are completing this survey online, absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed due to the limited protections of Internet access. There are no anticipated risks involved in participating in this research.

Program faculty members and interns have the option to delete this e-mail and not participate in the proposed study. Participation is voluntary and can be terminated at any time without penalty. If you choose not to participate, your decision will not affect your relationship with the University of Dayton, NASP, or other services to which you are otherwise entitled.

If you have any questions about the study, you can contact me directly at jensenml@udayton.edu. If you choose not to participate, please disregard this e-mail. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

**Morgan Jensen Aldridge, M.S.**
School Psychology Graduate Student at The University of Dayton
Intern School Psychologist in Madeira City Schools
Faculty Sponsor: Elana R. Bernstein, Ph.D.

Questions about the rights of the participants should be addressed to:

Mary Connolly, Ph.D.
Chair, IRB
Kettering Labs Room 542
Dayton, OH 45469-0104
[Mcconnolly1@udayton.edu](mailto:Mcconnolly1@udayton.edu)
Phone: (937)-229-3493
Fax: (937)-229-2291
APPENDIX B

FACULTY SURVEY

Directions: Please answer the following eleven brief questions about the training in your school psychology program. It is estimated that this survey will take five to ten minutes to complete. Thank you in advance for your time and help. You may skip questions that you feel uncomfortable answering and move to the next question to continue the survey. Remember, your answers will be kept confidential and your responses will in no way be linked to your training program. Thank you in advance for your time and help.

(1) Is your school psychology program approved by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)?
   - Yes
   - No

(2) Please check all degrees that your program offers:
   - Masters Degree
   - Education Specialist Degree
   - Doctorate Degree
   - Other (please specify) ____________

(3) In what state is your school psychology program located?

(4) What is your position in the school psychology program? (check all that apply)
   - School Psychology Program Coordinator/Director
   - Internship Coordinator
   - Full Professor
   - Associate Professor
(5) How do you address the topic of English Language Learning (ELL) students in your training program? (please check only ONE answer that best describes the coverage)

- A specific course is devoted to the population of ELL students and the topic is covered in other courses.
- A specific course is devoted to the population of ELL students.
- The topic is covered in more than four courses.
- The topic is covered in three courses.
- The topic is covered in two courses.
- The topic is covered in one course.
- The topic is not covered at all.

(6) Considering your response to the previous question, please list the title of EVERY course in which the topic of ELL students is covered for more than 10 minutes and describe the extent of coverage in each of the courses you list with one of the following options:

11-30 minutes; 31-60 minutes; 61-90 minutes; more than 90 minutes.

Please format your answers as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Amount of Time Spent Instructing on the Topic of ELL Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(extended response)

(7) Please list the textbook(s) and/or other resources (websites, books, videos, handouts, etc.) that are used in the courses that you previously listed to instruct on the topic of ELL students.
(8) Why does your program devote the amount of time they do to instructing on the topic of ELL students?

(extended response)

(9) How is the topic of the second-language acquisition process covered in your program? (please check only ONE answer that best describes the coverage)

- A specific course is devoted to the second-language acquisition process and the topic is covered in other courses.
- A specific course is devoted to the second-language acquisition process.
- The topic is covered in more than four courses.
- The topic is covered in three courses.
- The topic is covered in two courses.
- The topic is covered in one course.
- The topic is not covered at all.

(10) Please indicate how prepared you believe your graduate students are to work with ELL students on a scale from 1-5.

1= We do not prepare our graduate students to work with ELL students.
2= We minimally prepare our graduate students to work with ELL students.
3= We somewhat prepare our graduate students to work with ELL students.
4= We successfully prepare our graduate students to work with ELL students.
5= We over-prepare our graduate students to work with ELL students.

(11) What barriers do you see to providing effective instruction to your students on the best practices surrounding ELL students?

(extended response)

Thank you for participating in this survey!
PLEASE FORWARD THE E-MAIL WITH THE LINKS TO THE SURVEYS TO YOUR CURRENT INTERNS.

If you are interested in being entered to win one of two $50 gift cards to Amazon.com, please send the code FACULTYELL to schoolpsychology.ELL@gmail.com. You will be notified in December via the e-mail address you send the code from if your e-mail address is selected in the drawing and your mailing address will be requested at that time to send your gift card to you.
APPENDIX C

INTERN SURVEY

Directions: Please answer the following ten questions regarding your training in providing services to English Language Learning (ELL) students to the best of your ability. It is estimated that this survey will take approximately 10-20 minutes to complete. You may skip questions that you feel uncomfortable answering and move to the next question to continue the survey. Remember, your answers will be kept confidential and your responses will in no way be linked to your training program. Thank you in advance for your time and help.

Section One: Demographics

(1) Are you currently an intern in a school psychology program?
   • Yes
   • No

(2) Is your school psychology program approved by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)?
   • Yes
   • No

(3) Please check the degree you are seeking.
   • Masters
   • Education Specialist
   • PhD
   • PsyD
   • EdD
   • Other (please specify) _________

(4) In what state is your school psychology program located?
(5) What is your ethnic background?
- Asian American
- African American
- Native American
- White Latino
- Other (please specify) _________

(6) How many languages do you speak fluently?
- One
- Two
- Three
- Four
- More than four

(7) Please indicate the language(s) you speak fluently.

(extended response)

(8) How are ELL issues addressed/covered in your training program? (please check only ONE answer that best describes the coverage)
- A specific course is devoted to the population of ELL students and it was covered in other courses.
- A specific course is devoted to the population of ELL students.
- The topic is covered in more than four courses.
- The topic is covered in three courses.
- The topic is covered in two courses.
- The topic is covered in one course.
- The topic is not covered at all.

(9) How is the topic of the second-language acquisition process covered in your program? (please check only ONE answer that best describes the coverage)
- A specific course is devoted to the second-language acquisition process and it was covered in other courses.
- A specific course is devoted to the second-language acquisition process.
- The topic is covered in more than four courses.
- The topic is covered in three courses.
- The topic is covered in two courses.
- The topic is covered in one course.
- The topic is not covered at all.
(10) How much training did you receive regarding the legal and ethical issues surrounding ELL students?

- I received training in three or more courses.
- I received training in two courses.
- I received training in one course.
- I did not receive training.

(11) On a scale from 1-5, how well do you feel that your graduate training program prepared you to work with the population of ELL students?

1 = My graduate program did not prepare me to work with ELL students.
2 = My graduate program minimally prepared me to work with ELL students.
3 = My graduate program somewhat prepared me to work with ELL students.
4 = My graduate program successfully prepared me to work with ELL students.
5 = My graduate program over-prepared me to work with ELL students.

Section Two: ELL Knowledge

**Directions:** Please answer the following ten true/false questions and two multiple-choice questions regarding your knowledge about the population of ELL students. Please do not use any outside resources to answer these questions, but rather answer them based on the knowledge you currently possess. You may skip questions that you feel uncomfortable answering and move to the next question to continue the survey. Remember, your answers will be kept confidential and your responses will in no way be linked to your training program. Thank you in advance for your time and help.

For each of the questions in this section, please answer “True” if you know the answer is true, “I don’t know” if you don’t know the answer (please do not guess), and “False” if you know the answer is false.

(1) English as a Second Language (ESL) programs and bilingual programs provide instruction in the same way.

- True
- I don’t know
- False
(2) BICS is associated with the language skills that are needed to complete schoolwork (e.g., speaking, reading, and writing).
   - True
   - I don’t know
   - False

(3) It is appropriate for a school psychologist to use a translator to translate a behavior rating scale from English to another language and use the English norm-referenced scores of that rating scale in an evaluation (e.g., BASC-2).
   - True
   - I don’t know
   - False

(4) If a student is able to communicate fluently in a conversation to a school psychologist, this means they have obtained enough English proficiency to take a standardized assessment.
   - True
   - I don’t know
   - False

(5) CALP refers to the language that is needed for social interactions.
   - True
   - I don’t know
   - False

(6) It is not appropriate for a school psychologist to use a translator to translate a cognitive or academic assessment and use the English norm-referenced scores from the test in an evaluation.
   - True
   - I don’t know
   - False

(7) Assessing an ELL student’s skills only in English is appropriate during an evaluation.
   - True
(8) The strongest predictor of a student’s success with a second language is the amount of schooling the student received in his or her first language.
- True
- I don’t know
- False

(9) Immersing an ELL student in English instruction is the most effective way for the student to acquire academic English.
- True
- I don’t know
- False

(10) ELL students with learning disabilities will exhibit a slow learning rate when progress-monitored with curriculum-based measures that measure literacy skills.
- True
- I don’t know
- False

(11) Which of the following programs has the most positive longitudinal outcomes for ELL students? (Choose only ONE answer.)
- Transitional/Early-Exit Bilingual Education Programs
- Two-Way/Dual-Language Bilingual Education Programs
- Pullout ESL Programs
- Content-Based ESL/Sheltered English Programs
- I don’t know

(12) In what stage of the second-language acquisition process should an educator expect to experience a “silent period” with an ELL student? (Choose only ONE answer.)
- Stage One
- Stage Two
- Stage Three
Directions: Please answer the following brief questions about your school psychology program to the best of your ability. You may skip questions that you feel uncomfortable answering and continue the survey. Remember, your answers will be kept confidential and your responses will in no way be linked to your training program.

(1) To what extent do you feel that your school psychology program prepared you to conduct a bilingual assessment?
Please rate this item from 1-5, where:

1= My program did not prepare me.
2= My program minimally prepared me.
3= My program somewhat prepared me.
4= My program successfully prepared me.
5= My program over-prepared me.

(2) To what extent do you feel that your school psychology program prepared you to differentiate between a disability and ELL issues (e.g., language acquisition)?
Please rate this item from 1-5, where:

1= My program did not prepare me.
2= My program minimally prepared me.
3= My program somewhat prepared me.
4= My program successfully prepared me.
5= My program over-prepared me.

(3) To what extent do you feel that your school psychology program prepared you to **develop and deliver in-services to school staff about ELL students**?

Please rate this item from 1-5, where:

1= My program did not prepare me.
2= My program minimally prepared me.
3= My program somewhat prepared me.
4= My program successfully prepared me.
5= My program over-prepared me.

(4) To what extent do you feel that your school psychology program prepared you to **be part of a multidisciplinary team serving an ELL student**?

Please rate this item from 1-5, where:

1= My program did not prepare me.
2= My program minimally prepared me.
3= My program somewhat prepared me.
4= My program successfully prepared me.
5= My program over-prepared me.

(5) To what extent do you feel that your school psychology program prepared you to **provide other school-age students with information about ELL students**?

Please rate this item from 1-5, where:

1= My program did not prepare me.
2= My program minimally prepared me.
3= My program somewhat prepared me.
4= My program successfully prepared me.
5= My program over-prepared me.

(6) To what extent do you feel that your school psychology program prepared you to provide appropriate school-based interventions for ELL students?

Please rate this item from 1-5, where:

1= My program did not prepare me.
2= My program minimally prepared me.
3= My program somewhat prepared me.
4= My program successfully prepared me.
5= My program over-prepared me.

(7) To what extent do you feel that your school psychology program prepared you to provide accommodations or modifications for ELL students?

Please rate this item from 1-5, where:

1= My program did not prepare me.
2= My program minimally prepared me.
3= My program somewhat prepared me.
4= My program successfully prepared me.
5= My program over-prepared me.

(8) To what extent do you feel that your school psychology program prepared you to progress-monitor the academic progress for ELL students?

Please rate this item from 1-5, where:

1= My program did not prepare me.
2= My program minimally prepared me.
3= My program somewhat prepared me.
4= My program successfully prepared me.
5= My program over-prepared me.

(9) To what extent do you feel that your school psychology program prepared you to participate in an educational team involving the decision-making process of whether or not an ELL student should be identified as having a specific learning disability or be identified under another special education disability category?

Please rate this item from 1-5, where:

1= My program did not prepare me.
2= My program minimally prepared me.
3= My program somewhat prepared me.
4= My program successfully prepared me.
5= My program over-prepared me.

(10) What are your primary concerns with regards to providing services to ELL students in your internship and beyond?

(extended response)

Thank you for participating in this survey!

If you are interested in being entered to win one of two $50.00 gift cards to Amazon.com, please send the code INTERNELL to schoolpsychology.ELL@gmail.com. You will be notified in December via the e-mail addresses you send the code from if your e-mail address is selected in the drawing and your mailing address will be requested at that time in order to send your gift card to you.