Identifying the Salient Variables in Making ELL Assessment Accommodation Decisions: Results from the LEP SCASS Workshop

Barbra S. Plake, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Nikki Mattson

South Carolina Department of Education

July 6, 2008

Identifying the Salient Variables in Making ELL Assessment Accommodation Decisions: Results from the LEP SCASS Workshop

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to summarize the results of a study designed to identify the salient variables in making assessment accommodation decisions for English Language Learners (ELLs). This study is a part of a larger grant project that is designed to examine a variety of assessment issues related to English Language Learners, called Adding Value to Accommodations Decision-making (AVAD).

This study addressed some of the critical variables used in making accommodation decisions for assessments for English Language Learners. One of the goals of the study was to inform refinements in the algorithms used by the Selection Taxonomy for English Language Learner Accommodations (STELLA), a software system that recommends appropriate accommodations given certain collected student information (Kopriva & Carr 2006). In addition, the study provides summary information about the saliency of some ELL background characteristics when considering specific assessment accommodations for English Language Learners.

Design and Methodology

On advice from the AVAD project committee (Therese Carr, Rebecca Kopriva, Nikki Mattson, Lariza Miranda, Phoebe Winter, and Barbara Plake), five ELL background variables were selected for consideration in making assessment accommodation decisions: English Language Proficiency in Reading, Writing, and Listening; Native Language Proficiency (L1) in Reading; and Cultural Proximity. These variables, and their levels, are summarized in Figure 1. Using data from STELLA's Tri-

State Data Collection (2005) which amassed 114 cases of student data from North Carolina, Maryland, and Texas, student profiles were constructed to vary the levels of these five variables in constructing ELL student profiles. From the 114 cases of student data, 108 were complete enough to use their data for the purposes of the current study. Accordingly, 108 profile permutations were initially created; this full set of profiles was reviewed by ELL specialists to identify ones that were either unrealistic or not relevant for making assessment accommodation decisions (for example, when a student had the highest levels on each of these variables). After eliminating some variable combinations that would not be realistic for making accommodation considerations, a total of 52 unique ELL profiles were created. Although for the most part, these ELL student profiles were based on the information from actual student data from STELLA's Tri-State Data Collection (2005), in some cases profiles were constructed to match variable permutations that were not represented in the Tri-State student data. Narrative information was added to the student profiles, beyond the variables identified above, to provide more contextual support to the student's variable levels. This additional information included student age, native language, and instructional program. A full listing of these unique ELL student profiles is shown in the appendix.

In addition to the student background characteristics, the project team also chose a subset of the possible ELL accommodations to focus on for this study. From the larger set of possible accommodations, the project team identified five for use in this study: L1/Side by Side, Bilingual Word List, Picture Dictionary, Oral English, and Oral L1. These accommodations are described in Figure 2. Finally, three rating categories were selected for evaluating these assessment accommodations for ELL students:

effectiveness, validity, and endorsement. All three of these categories were rated using a three-point scale, where 1 = low, 2 = moderate, and 3 = high. Definitions of these three categories are provided below:

Effectiveness: How well this accommodation will help the student access the test; how well this accommodation will remove barriers created by the student's limited English proficiency (1 = low; 3 = high).

Validity: How well the validity of the construct, for the individual student under consideration, is maintained under this accommodation (1 = low; 3 = high).

Endorsement: How appropriate this accommodation is for a particular student (1 = low; 3 = high).

A total of 58 student profiles were prepared for rating: 52 unique profiles and 6 duplicate profiles that were inserted randomly to check for intra-rater consistency.

LEP SCASS Workshop

These 58 student profiles with the accommodation rating scales were prepared for administration at the LEP SCASS Workshop September 24-25 in Nashua, NH. The agenda for the workshop is in the appendix. Following a welcome by Elizabeth Jones, SD DOE, the workshop participants were provided with an overview of the STELLA project (led by Rebecca Kopriva) and the goals of the workshop (led by Barbara Plake). Following the orientation, the panelists met in small groups of 4 – 5 panelists to work

through their consensus ratings on 5 exemplary profiles. These consensus ratings for each of the 9 small groups were summarized and shared with the workshop participants. The goal of this practice exercise was to help clarify the definitions of the rating categories and the tasks that the panelists would be asked to complete independently the next day. The presentation of the summary results from this practice activity, led by Barbara Plake, focused on those rating categories where there was the most disagreement (as evidenced by the magnitudes of the standard deviation of the panelists' ratings). Panelists were also asked to fill out a participant background information form that sought to gather information about the level of involvement the panelists had with ELL students and their educational and professional experiences. A copy of the Participant Information Form is contained in the appendix.

The next day, the panelists were each given a booklet that contained the 58 student profiles for their ratings. Each booklet presented the profiles in the same randomized order and each profile was identified only by a numeric or alphabetic code. The panelists were asked to work independently and to rate the five identified accommodations on the three rating categories (effectiveness, validity, endorsement) based on the student background information presented in each profile. A total of 4 hours were allocated to the rating process.

Analyses

Two different analytic approaches were applied to the data from the LEP SCASS workshop. The first approach considered the summary descriptive statistics from the ratings, first for each of the profiles and then by the profile variables (e.g., by levels of each of the student background variables of English Reading, English Writing, English

Listening, L1 Reading, and Cultural Proximity). This allowed for interpretations of whether, by knowing the ELL students' levels on the background variables, either in combination at the profile level, or singly for each level of the background variables, panelists' ratings of effectiveness, validity, and endorsement would change for each of the five choices of accommodations.

The second approach used a variation of the Multi-Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT) to capture the underlying policies that panelists used in making the endorsement ratings for each of the five accommodation decisions. This approach involved running separate regression analyses to predict, for each panelist, their endorsement ratings for the five accommodations (dependent variables) as a function of the levels of the student background characteristics (independent variables). This was done separately for each of the five accommodations. For each accommodation, and for each panelist, the significant/salient variables in the regression of the dependent variable (endorsement rating) on the independent variables were identified using a .05 significance level. Then, a tally was made of the number of times, across the panelists' regressions, that each of the independent variables showed a significant regression coefficient. For each accommodation, therefore, it was possible to summarize the salience of the independent variables by reporting the percent of times these independent variables showed significant regression coefficients across the panelists' regression analyses. These salient variables are then summarized for each of the five dependent variables, allowing for an interpretation of which independent variables appear to have the greatest impact, or saliency, in the decisions by the panelists in endorsing an accommodation for ELL students with these background characteristics.

Results

A total of 34 panelists' ratings were used in the analysis. Ratings from one of the panelists were not included in the analysis because the panelist indicated that they had "very low confidence" in these rating on the workshop evaluation. Of these panelists, 23 (68%) indicated that they are currently working directly with ELL students. Almost all of the panelists had advanced degrees (Masters or Doctorate degrees). The panelists were also asked to indicate their current employment position on the Participant Information Form; several were working with Title III as a consultant, coordinator, or director. Several others indicated they worked with ELL populations as an ELL specialist, English as a second language program consultant or director of ESL programs. A number of panelists indicated that they worked directly with assessment programs, either as an ESL test coordinator, an assessment consultant, or a director or co-director of an assessment office. Others indicated that they worked with other special populations, such as developmentally delayed or alternative assessments. There were panelists from the National Clearinghouse on English Language Acquisition, NCEO, CCSSO, Delaware Department of Education, and the WIDA Consortium. Therefore, the panelists showed a variety of professional experiences, most related to assessment, accommodations, and working with English Language Learners.

Descriptive Statistics Results

The mean, standard deviation, and median rating for each of the rating categories were determined for each of the profiles used in the study. These ratings are displayed in Tables 1 – 5 for L1/ Side by Side, Bilingual Dictionary, Picture Dictionary, Oral English, and Oral L1 accommodations, respectively. These tables show that the ratings varied as a

function of the background characteristics presented to the panelists through the student profiles, because these ratings change when these background variables change in the student profiles.

To better understand the relationship between the ratings of effectiveness, validity, and endorsement for the varying levels of the student background variables reflected in the profiles, these background variables were considered singly to evaluate the magnitudes of the panelists' ratings in isolation for each particular background variable.

English Reading Proficiency. The panelists' ratings were considered for each of the three levels of English Reading represented in the student profiles. The ratings for English Reading, for the five accommodations, are presented in Table 6. For students with low and medium levels of English Reading proficiency, for the L1/Side by Side accommodation, the median panelists' ratings for effectiveness, validity, and endorsement did not vary; these median ratings were uniformly 2 (moderate). This was also the case when the level of English Reading proficiency was high for the ratings of effectiveness and validity; however the median rating for endorsement dropped to a 1.0 for the L1/Side by Side accommodation for students with high levels of English Reading proficiency.

A similar pattern of ratings for differing levels of English Reading proficiency was found for the Bilingual Word List, Picture Dictionary, and Oral English accommodations. In general, regardless of whether the English Reading proficiency level was low, medium, or high, the median ratings for effectiveness were uniformly 2.0 (moderate). However, for the validity rating, panelists' median rating for Bilingual Word

List increased to a 3 when the students' English reading level was reported to be a 2. For the Picture Dictionary accommodation, the median validity rating was also a 3 when the students' English reading level was reported to be low (1). As seen with the endorsement rating for L1/Side by Side for students with high levels of English Reading proficiency, the panelists' median level of endorsement for Picture Dictionary dropped to low (1.0); however, it remained at 2.0 for Bilingual Word List and Oral English endorsement. The ratings for L1 Oral administration, however, revealed a different pattern of ratings by the panelists. For students with low levels of English Reading, the median level of effectiveness and validity were high (3.0). All the other median ratings were 2.0 regardless of level of English Reading proficiency. So, even when the level of English Reading proficiency was low, and the panelists asserted that the Oral L1 administration was effective and valid, their median rating for endorsement was only moderate. Likewise, when the students' levels of English Reading proficiency were either medium (2) or high (3), the ratings for effectiveness, validity, and endorsement remained at the moderate (2) level for the Oral L1 accommodation.

English Writing Proficiency. The results for English Writing are shown in Table 7. English Writing proficiency had 2 levels presented in the student profiles: low and high. Ratings on the effectiveness, validity, and endorsement for L1/Side by Side, Oral English, and Oral L1 administration accommodations did not appear to be affected by the differing levels of English Writing proficiency. All median values for the three ratings (effectiveness, validity, and endorsement) were consistently 2.0 regardless of whether the student's English Writing level was reported as high or low. However, there were differential reactions to the Picture Dictionary and Bilingual Word List accommodations

depending on the levels of English Writing proficiency indicated in the students' profiles. In particular, when the students' level of English Writing was high, their median rating for the validity of the Bilingual Word List accommodation was viewed uniformly as high (3.0); for all other ratings for the Bilingual Word List accommodation, the ratings for effectiveness and endorsement were 2.0; the validity of this accommodation also had a median rating of 2.0 when the level of English Writing was low. A different pattern of results was found for the use of a Picture Dictionary as a function of the English Writing level for ELL students. For the Picture Dictionary, all the median ratings were 2.0 for effectiveness and validity, regardless of the level reported for English Writing proficiency. However, the median endorsement level for the Picture Dictionary accommodation dropped to 1.0 when the English Writing level was high; it remained at 2.0 when that skill was reported as low for the ELL students.

English Listening proficiency. For two of the five accommodations (L1/Side by Side and Picture Dictionary), the ratings of effectiveness, validity, and endorsement did not vary as a function of the students' levels of English Listening proficiency. These results are presented in Table 8. Regardless of whether the student's Listening proficiency in English was shown as a 1, 2, or 3, the median ratings for all three categories were uniformly 2.0. However, differential ratings were seen for the Bilingual Word List, Oral English, and Oral L1 administrations for different reported levels of English Listening proficiency. For the Bilingual Dictionary accommodation option, the median panelists' rating for validity was 3.0 when the ELL students' level of English Listening was reported as low (1), and 2.0 when their levels of English Language Listening were shown as medium (2) or high (3). All the other median ratings for

Bilingual Word List were found to be 2.0 regardless of the levels of Listening proficiency indicated in the ELL students' profiles. This same pattern was found for the panelists' median ratings for L1 Oral Administration: When the students' English Listening level was reported to be low the panelists' tended to rate the validity of the L1 Oral administration as high (3), but had median overall ratings of 2.0 for all the other categories, regardless of the level of English Listening proficiency indicated in the ELL students' profiles. Not surprisingly, the level of reported English Listening proficiency had a differential effect on how the panelists' rated the Oral English accommodation. When the students' English Listening proficiency was reported as low (1), the panelists tended to provide low ratings (median = 1.0) for Oral English administration for effectiveness, validity, and endorsement. These median ratings rose to moderate (2.0) for all three rating categories when the level of student English Listening proficiency was shown to be moderate (2). These median ratings rose again to 3.0 for effectiveness and validity when the students' English Listening skills were reported to be high (3), but remained at 2.0 for endorsement, even when the students' listening skills in English were shown to be high in their profiles.

L1 Reading. In most cases, the ratings of effectiveness, validity, and endorsement for the five accommodation choices were affected by the ELL students' reported level of reading proficiency in their native language (See Table 9). For the L1/Side by Side accommodation, median panelists' ratings showed that they uniformly rated this accommodation very low (1.0) when the students' L1 Reading level was shown as low (1) and uniformly rated this accommodation as high (3.0) when the students' L1 Reading proficiency was reported to be high (2). Panelists likewise provided high effectiveness,

validity, and endorsement ratings for use of the Bilingual Word List accommodation with ELL students who had high levels of L1 Reading. The panelists' median ratings for these categories for use of the Bilingual Word List were at a moderate level (2.0) for students with low levels of L1 Reading proficiency. For the Picture Dictionary accommodation, all of the median ratings for effectiveness and validity were 2.0 regardless of the students' L1 Reading proficiency level; however, they indicated a lower median rating for their endorsement of the Picture Dictionary accommodation when the ELL students' L1 Reading proficiency was indicated to be high. The Oral English accommodation also showed differential ratings by the panelist as a function of the reported level of the students' L1 Reading proficiency. As was found with the use of the Picture Dictionary accommodation, the place where the ratings diverged was in the panelists' median rating for endorsement when the L1 Reading proficiency was shown in the students' profiles to be high. All of the other median ratings for effectiveness, validity and endorsement were 2.0 regardless of the students' level of reading skill in their native languages. When considering the use of L1 Oral administration, the median panelists' ratings did not appear to vary as a function of the indicated level of the ELL students' reading level in their native languages. Across the board, for both low and high levels of L1 Reading, the median panelists' ratings were 2.0 (moderate) for effectiveness, validity, and endorsement for the use of the oral administration of the test in the students' native language (Oral L1).

Cultural Proximity. Results for Cultural Proximity can be found in Table 10. In the case of varying levels on the Cultural Proximity variable, none of the accommodation choices showed any differential ratings for effectiveness, validity, or endorsement.

Regardless of whether the student profiles showed Cultural Proximity values as low or high, the median ratings were systematically 2.0 across all five of the accommodation options.

Multi-Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT) Results

For each of the panelists, separate linear regression analyses were conducted for each of the five accommodations (L1/Side by Side, Bilingual Word List, Picture Dictionary, Oral English, and Oral L1 administrations). The dependent variables were the panelists' ratings for endorsement for each of these accommodations for the 58 profiles. The independent variables were the English Reading, English Writing, English Listening, L1 Reading, and Cultural Proximity levels. For the regression analyses, the method used forced all independent variables to be included in the regression formula, regardless of their respective individual contributions to the regression analyses. For each regression equation, those regression coefficients that were significant at the probability level of .05 or lower were identified. For each accommodation, the number of significant coefficients for each independent variable was totaled across the panelists. If more than 50% (17 or more) of the panelists' coefficients were significant for an independent variable in the prediction of the endorsement of that accommodation, it was considered to be a salient variable in the panelists' policies for endorsing that accommodation.

L1/Side by Side. The results for the regression analyses for the panelists' level of endorsement for the L1/Side by Side accommodation are shown in Table 11. Across the panelists' regression results, there were 21 significant coefficients for English Reading, 2 for English Writing, 3 for English Listening, 33 for L1 Reading, and 4 for Cultural

Proximity. Clearly, the panelists' underlying policies for endorsing L1/Side by Side were influenced by the student's reading level, both in English and in his or her native language.

Bilingual Word List. The variables that appear to be salient in the panelists' policies regarding their endorsement of the Bilingual Word List were also found to be English Reading and L1 Reading as the percent of significant coefficients across the panelists' regression analyses were 50% or higher for these variables (50% for English Reading and 88% for L1 Reading). None of the other variables had 17 or more significant coefficients: English Writing, 6; English Listening, 3; Cultural Proximity, 3. These results are shown in Table 12.

Picture Dictionary. Similar to the results for L1/Side by Side and Bilingual Word List accommodations, panelists' regression analyses for Picture Dictionary revealed that the salient variables in the endorsement of this accommodation were English Reading (with 24 significant coefficients) and L1 Reading (with 20 significant coefficients). All of the other variables had fewer than 10 significant coefficients across the panelists' regression results. These results are displayed in Table 13.

Oral English Administration. Three of the variables had more than 17 significant coefficients across the panelists' regression analyses for their endorsement of the Oral English administration. These variables, in order of the salience, were English Listening (32 significant coefficients across the 34 panelists' regression analyses), English Reading (23 significant coefficients), and L1 Listening (17 significant coefficients). Neither English Writing nor Cultural Proximity had more than 7 significant coefficients across the panelists' regression results (6 and 7, respectively), indicating that they were not

salient in the panelists' policies for endorsement of Oral English administration for the ELL students. Table 13 shows the results for the regression analyses for Oral English administration.

L1 Oral Administration. For this accommodation, three variables appeared to be salient for the panelists in their rating of level of endorsement. These variables were English Reading (21 significant coefficients), Cultural Proximity (18 significant coefficients) and L1 Reading (17 significant coefficients). The number of significant coefficients was relatively high for English Listening with 10; whereas only 2 panelists had regressions with significant coefficients for English Writing. These results are presented in Table 15.

Across all of the accommodation options, English Reading and L1 Reading showed prominence in the policies used by the panelists for endorsing the five accommodations used in this study. English Listening appeared salient for the Oral English administration for obvious reasons. Cultural Proximity only showed relevance for the endorsement of the L1 Oral Administration. English Writing was never a salient variable in the endorsement of any of these five accommodations. A synopsis of the significant variables across the five accommodations is shown in Table 16.

Intra-rater reliability Results.

In the set of profiles that were rated by the panelists, 6 were repeated to allow for an analysis of intra-rater reliability. One of these had to be discarded due to an error in presentation. Another of the profiles was inadvertently including three times; one of these repetitions was eliminated for the intra-rater reliability analysis, resulting in 5 pairs of 2 repeated profiles. For each of these five pairs, the percents of exact agreement in the

ratings for effectiveness, validity, and endorsement were computed for each of the five accommodations. These results are shown in Table 17. The percentages of exact agreements varied across the accommodations. For L1/Side by Side, the average exact agreement for effectiveness, validity, and endorsement was 70.00, 69.41, and 71.76, respectively. Exact agreement across the 5 pairs of repeated profiles for effectiveness, validity, and endorsement was, on average, 61.62, 61.92, and 58.09 for Bilingual Word List. Average exact agreement for Picture Dictionary was 75.15 for Effectiveness, 71.44 for Validity, and 77.50 for Endorsement. Exact agreements for Oral English values were, on average, 64.56 for Effectiveness, 65.74 for Validity, and 65.74 for Endorsement. Similarly, values for Oral L1 for Effectiveness, Validity, and Endorsement were 65.68, 67.15, and 69.12. These values are displayed in Table 17. This table also demonstrates that nearly equal levels of intra-rater reliability was found for the three rating categories; on average the exact agreement across the panelists for the five accommodations was 67.6 for Effectiveness, 66.8 for Validity, and 68.6 for Endorsement. There appeared to be some variation in the levels of intra-rater reliabilities across the rating categories for the five accommodation strategies: these values were 70.3 for L1/Side by Side, 60.7 for Bilingual Word List, 74.3 for Picture Dictionary, 65.7 for Oral English, and 67.3 for Oral L1. Overall, the panelists gave identical ratings across the three categories and for the five accommodation strategies about 2/3rds of the time (67.7 % overall average exact agreement).

Evaluation

An evaluation was conducted by Phoebe Winter, Project Evaluator. Panelists were asked to rate various aspects of the workshop and their level of confidence in the

ratings they provided on the accommodations for the student profiles. A copy of the evaluation is shown in the appendix.

The first question posed to the panelists asked them to rate on a five-point scale (1= very little, 5 = very much) to what extent the student characteristics and narrative information in the student profiles contributed to their evaluation of the potential accommodations. They provided separate ratings for each of the background variables (English language reading, writing, and listening; native language reading; and cultural proximity) and the narrative. The panelists' mean ratings were all over 3.5 on the 5-point scale. The lowest rating was 3.7 for Cultural Proximity and the highest ratings were 4.6 for English Listening and L1 Reading.

The second question asked whether they felt they had enough information about the students to evaluate the potential accommodations. Again, panelists were give a 5-point scale to record their ratings, where 1= never and 5 = always. The average rating for the panelists on this question was 3.4.

The third question on the evaluation offered the panelists an opportunity to A) indicate what additional information about the students would have helped them to evaluate the potential accommodations and B) how important that information would be in making these decisions. The majority of panelists responded to part A by indicating that they needed more information about the students' language skills in their native language (23 panelists asked for more information about L1 language skills). Nineteen wanted more information regarding L1 Listening; two requested more information about L1 Writing, Speaking, and Reading. In addition, some panelists (4 total) sought more detail about the instruction provided to the students and years of previous schooling in the

home country. They also, on average, felt that this information would be critical (average rating = 4.1 on a 5 –point scale where 1= useful and 5 = critical) to have in making the accommodation decisions.

The fourth evaluation question asked the panelists to answer either “yes” or “no” to whether they had enough information to provide an evaluation for each accommodation. Four of the five accommodations received a large number (greater than 30 of the 35 panelists saying “yes”) for having sufficient information. However, there was less endorsement for the information provided for the Picture Dictionary; only 22 of the panelists indicated they felt they had enough information on that accommodation to evaluate it.

The next two questions focused on the rating categories of effectiveness, validity, and endorsement. Question 5 asked the panelists to rate each of these categories on their appropriateness for the accommodations, using a 5 point scale where 1= not at all appropriate and 5 = very appropriate. The average ratings by the panelists were all over 4.0 for their appropriateness ratings. Question 6 asked the panelists to indicate, also using a 5-point scale, where 1= not at all confident and 5 = very confident, their level of confidence in their ratings of the accommodations they assigned based on the student characteristics for effectiveness, validity, and endorsement. Both effectiveness and endorsement had average ratings equal to or greater than 4.0 (4.1 and 4.0, respectively); however the average confidence for the validity rating category was 3.1, indicating an overall modest level of confidence for that rating category. The mean was also computed for each panelist across his or her three confidence ratings. All but two of the panelists had overall average ratings over 3.0; one of these had an average of 2.7 and the other had

an average of 1.0. As noted earlier, the ratings for the panelists with the overall confidence rating of 1.0 was removed from the data set.

The final two evaluation questions asked the panelists a) whether they participated in a previous WebEx training that was held September 10, 2007 and b) to provide addition comments they'd like to make about the MAUT process or STELLA. Very few panelists indicated they had participated in the previous WebEx training (only 5 of the 35 panelists). A full report from the workshop evaluation can be found in Winter, 2007.

Summary/Discussion

The purpose of this report is to summarize the procedures and results from the LEP SCASS workshop conducted on September 24 – 25, 2007. The goal of the workshop was to gather panelists' ratings of the effectiveness, validity, and endorsement of five accommodations (L1/Side by Side, Bilingual Word List, Picture Dictionary, Oral English, Oral L1) for ELL students who differed in their background and achievement levels as presented in profiles. The ELL student profiles systematically varied student performance levels in English Reading, English Writing, English Listening, L1 Reading, and Cultural Proximity.

Two analytic approaches were used with the ratings. The first approach looked at the average ratings for Effectiveness, Validity, and Endorsement for each of the student variables separately. Therefore, averages were determined for each level of the respective student variables for each of the accommodations. The second approach was based on a regression methodology. For each panelist, their ratings for endorsement were used as the dependent variable in five separate regression analyses, one for each of the

five accommodations. All five of the student background variables were used as the independent variables in these regression analyses. Using .05 as the significance level, significant regression coefficients were noted for each regression equation. The number of significant regression coefficients by student background variables was tallied across the panelists for each of the accommodation strategies. Using 50% as the criterion for saliency, for each accommodation strategy, those student background variables that appeared salient (had 50% or more of panelists' regressions indicating a significant coefficient) were identified. This provided a mechanism for isolating those student background variables that were salient in panelists' decision-making about their endorsement of the different accommodation strategies used in this study.

For student profiles that indicated high levels of English Reading, both Picture Dictionary and L1/Side by Side were rated low (either for endorsement: Picture Dictionary and L1/Side by Side; or for effectiveness: Picture Dictionary). When English Reading was shown to be medium in the student profiles, validity was rated high for use of the Bilingual Word List. For students with low levels of English reading, oral administration using the students' native language (Oral L1) was rated high for both effectiveness and validity; Picture Dictionary was also rated high in validity for students with low English reading skills.

Panelists rated Bilingual Word List high in validity when the English Writing skills of the students were shown as high. No other level of English Writing resulted in either high or low ratings of any for the other accommodations.

When student profiles showed high levels of English Listening, panelists rated the Oral English administration high in both effectiveness and validity. When the profiles

assigned low levels of English listening, the panelists showed low ratings for Oral English administrations in all three categories of effectiveness, validity, and endorsement. The panelists also rated the L1 Oral administration and the use of a Bilingual Word List high in validity.

Panelists gave many high ratings to L1/Side by Side and Bilingual Word List when the student profiles showed high levels of L1 Reading. When the profiles showed high levels of L1 Reading by the students, both Picture Dictionary and Oral English administration received low levels of endorsement. When the student profiles indicated low levels of L1 Reading, the L1/Side by Side accommodation received low ratings for effectiveness, validity, and endorsement.

No high or low ratings were given to any of the accommodations as a function of the level of Cultural Proximity shown in the student profiles.

When looking only at the effectiveness ratings by the panelists, L1/Side by Side was rated as high in effectiveness when the student profiles showed high levels of L1 Reading; Bilingual Word List was also rated as highly effective for these student profiles. Picture Dictionary did not receive any high effectiveness ratings for any of the student variables. Oral English was rated as a highly effective accommodation for students with high levels of English Listening and Oral L1 administration was rated as highly effective for students with low levels of English Reading.

From the regression analyses for the panelists' endorsement ratings, English and L1 Reading were the most dominant student variables in the panelists' decisions about accommodation assignment. English Listening was only prevalent in panelists' decisions

about the Oral English accommodation. Cultural Proximity appeared to make a difference in the panelists' decisions only for use of the L1 Oral administration.

Taken together, these analytic strategies provide information about what student variables are salient in making accommodation decisions for English Language Learners. Clearly the panelists felt that the students' levels of reading, either in English or in their native language, were important to consider when making accommodation decisions for ELLs. English Listening was important when considering an Oral English administration. L1/Side by Side and Bilingual Word List accommodations were considered highly effective for students with high levels of reading in their native language. Oral administrations in English was considered highly effective for students with high levels of English Listening and L1 Oral administration was rated highly effective for students with low levels of English Reading.

From these analyses, it appears that decisions about accommodations for ELL students involve a complex process that balances many features about the students. In this study, only 5 student variables were considered: level of proficiency in English Reading, Writing, and Listening; L1 Reading and Cultural Proximity. Further, only 5 possible accommodations were considered: L1/Side by Side, Bilingual Word List, Picture Dictionary, Oral English, and Oral L1. In the panelists' evaluations, several noted that they needed more information about the students in order to make accommodation assignment decisions for the students. Most frequently, these panelists indicated that information about the students' level of L1 listening was critically important in deciding about the effectiveness, validity, and endorsement of the accommodations (probably most needed for considering the Oral L1 accommodation

strategy). Some panelists also commented that they wanted to know more about the educational programs of the students and their length of time in US schools. The results of this study are limited to accommodation decisions when only these five student variables are provided and only for the set of 5 accommodations considered in the study.

References

Kopriva, Rebecca and Carr, Therese. "Two Decision-Making Models for Determining Testing Accommodations for English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities." With Courtney Foster, and Gerald Tindal. American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting. San Francisco, CA, April 7-11, 2006

Winter, P.C. (October, 2007). Adding value to accommodations decision making: Formative Evaluation Report.

mary statistics for panelists' ratings for L1 Side by Side Accommodation

rofile	ENG Reading	ENG Writing	ENG Listening	L1 Reading	Cultural Proximity	Age	Native Language	Language Program	L1/ Side-by-Side Effectiveness	L1/ Side-by-Side Validity	L1/ Side-by-Side Endorsement
1	2	1	3	2	2	9	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	2.63	2.77	2.69
1									0.55	0.49	0.58
1									3.00	3.00	3.00
2	2	1	1	1	2	8	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.37	1.71	1.29
2									0.55	0.79	0.62
2									1.00	2.00	1.00
3	1	1	1	1	1	5	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.11	1.20	1.09
3									0.40	0.53	0.37
3									1.00	1.00	1.00
4	1	1	3	1	2	8	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	1.29	1.60	1.34
4									0.52	0.77	0.59
4									1.00	1.00	1.00
5	2	1	2	1	2	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.40	1.66	1.37
5									0.55	0.73	0.60
5									1.00	2.00	1.00
6	1	1	1	2	2	8	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	2.69	2.71	2.69
6									0.68	0.67	0.68
6									3.00	3.00	3.00
7	2	1	2	2	2	17	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.71	2.77	2.74
7									0.52	0.43	0.51
7									3.00	3.00	3.00
8	2	1	3	1	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.40	1.71	1.37
8									0.50	0.75	0.55
8									1.00	2.00	1.00
9	2	1	3	1	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.74	2.74	2.69
9									0.51	0.51	0.53
9									3.00	3.00	3.00
10	1	1	2	2	2	12	4 (Swiss-German)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.63	2.71	2.57
10									0.77	0.62	0.78
10									3.00	3.00	3.00
11	2	2	2	1	2	10	2 (Cantonese)	3 (Cantonese Pull-out)	1.31	1.60	1.31
11									0.53	0.65	0.53
11									1.00	2.00	1.00
12	1	1	2	1	2	12	3 (Gujarati)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.37	1.63	1.26

12									0.55	0.69	0.51
12									1.00	2.00	1.00
13	2	2	3	1	2	8	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.49	1.71	1.46
13									0.56	0.79	0.61
13									1.00	2.00	1.00
14	3	2	3	1	2	9	2 (Chinese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.31	1.54	1.29
14									0.53	0.74	0.52
14									1.00	1.00	1.00
15	2	1	1	2	2	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.83	2.91	2.80
15									0.38	0.28	0.41
15									3.00	3.00	3.00
16	3	2	3	2	2	10	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.94	2.03	1.71
16									0.76	0.82	0.83
16									2.00	2.00	1.00
17	3	2	2	2	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.31	2.43	2.17
17									0.80	0.74	0.86
17									3.00	3.00	2.00
18	2	1	2	1	1	7	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.34	1.63	1.37
18									0.48	0.77	0.65
18									1.00	1.00	1.00
19	1	1	1	2	1	14	3 (Urdu)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.66	2.57	2.63
19									0.68	0.78	0.73
19									3.00	3.00	3.00
20	1	1	1	1	2	18	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.40	1.54	1.43
20									0.55	0.61	0.56
20									1.00	1.00	1.00
21	3	2	3	2	2	10	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.91	2.11	1.77
21									0.89	0.90	0.91
21									2.00	2.00	1.00
22	3	2	2	2	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.15	2.29	2.09
22									0.86	0.84	0.90
22									2.00	3.00	2.00
23	2	1	2	1	1	7	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.40	1.63	1.34
23									0.55	0.69	0.59
23									1.00	2.00	1.00
24	3	2	3	2	1	11	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.26	2.31	2.20
24									0.85	0.87	0.90
24									3.00	3.00	3.00
25	3	2	3	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	1.37	1.49	1.31
25									0.55	0.66	0.53
25									1.00	1.00	1.00
26	3	2	3	2	1	11	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.11	2.29	1.97
26									0.90	0.83	0.89

26									2.00	3.00	2.00
27	3	2	3	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	1.37	1.57	1.37
27									0.55	0.65	0.55
27									1.00	1.00	1.00
28	3	1	3	2	2	11	3 (Polish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.94	2.14	1.89
28									0.84	0.81	0.87
28									2.00	2.00	2.00
29	3	1	3	2	1	13	3 (Farsi)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.40	2.54	2.31
29									0.77	0.61	0.80
29									3.00	3.00	3.00
30	3	1	3	1	2	12	3 (Thai)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.31	1.57	1.26
30									0.58	0.74	0.61
30									1.00	1.00	1.00
31	3	1	3	1	1	8	2 (Moroccan Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.43	1.51	1.37
31									0.61	0.70	0.65
31									1.00	1.00	1.00
32	3	2	2	2	1	14	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.29	2.51	2.17
32									0.83	0.70	0.86
32									3.00	3.00	2.00
33	3	2	2	1	2	16	1 (Japanese)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.23	1.51	1.17
33									0.49	0.74	0.45
33									1.00	1.00	1.00
34	3	2	2	1	1	9	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.46	1.63	1.40
34									0.61	0.65	0.60
34									1.00	2.00	1.00
35	3	1	2	2	2	15	1 (Japanese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.34	2.46	2.11
35									0.80	0.74	0.90
35									3.00	3.00	2.00
36	3	1	2	2	1	13	3 (Russian)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.60	2.51	2.49
36									0.60	0.70	0.70
36									3.00	3.00	3.00
37	3	1	2	1	2	13	2 (Cantonese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.40	1.63	1.34
37									0.60	0.73	0.54
37									1.00	1.00	1.00
38	3	1	2	1	1	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.43	1.60	1.43
38									0.56	0.65	0.65
38									1.00	2.00	1.00
39	2	2	3	2	2	12	4 (German)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.71	2.65	2.53
39									0.52	0.54	0.61
39									3.00	3.00	3.00
40	2	2	3	2	1	10	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.69	2.77	2.60
40									0.58	0.49	0.65

40									3.00	3.00	3.00
41	2	2	3	1	1	8	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.40	1.51	1.31
41									0.55	0.70	0.53
41									1.00	1.00	1.00
42	2	1	3	2	1	7	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.63	2.63	2.49
42									0.55	0.60	0.70
42									3.00	3.00	3.00
43	2	1	3	1	1	9	3 (Armenian)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.34	1.69	1.26
43									0.54	0.68	0.44
43									1.00	2.00	1.00
44	2	2	2	2	1	9	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.86	2.89	2.86
44									0.43	0.40	0.43
44									3.00	3.00	3.00
45	2	1	2	2	1	12	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.77	2.77	2.69
45									0.49	0.49	0.63
45									3.00	3.00	3.00
46	2	2	1	2	2	14	2 (Cantonese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.65	2.68	2.62
46									0.60	0.64	0.65
46									3.00	3.00	3.00
47	2	2	1	2	1	9	2 (Chinese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.74	2.71	2.74
47									0.51	0.52	0.51
47									3.00	3.00	3.00
48	2	2	1	2	2	7	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.37	1.46	1.29
48									0.60	0.61	0.52
48									1.00	1.00	1.00
49	2	2	1	1	1	9	3 (Urdu)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.54	1.63	1.57
49									0.70	0.73	0.74
49									1.00	1.00	1.00
50	2	1	1	2	1	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.65	2.74	2.62
50									0.65	0.62	0.65
50									3.00	3.00	3.00
51	2	1	1	1	1	9	3 (Telegu)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.37	1.54	1.34
51									0.55	0.70	0.59
51									1.00	1.00	1.00
52	1	1	3	2	2	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.51	2.57	2.51
52									0.78	0.70	0.70
52									3.00	3.00	3.00
53	1	1	3	2	1	12	3 (Urdu)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.74	2.66	2.66
53									0.61	0.68	0.73
53									3.00	3.00	3.00
54	1	1	3	1	1	8	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.29	1.43	1.14
54									0.46	0.56	0.36
54									1.00	1.00	1.00

55	1	2	2	1	1	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.34	1.40	1.26
55									0.48	0.55	0.44
55									1.00	1.00	1.00
56	1	1	2	2	1	13	3 (Tagalog)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.74	2.71	2.69
56									0.61	0.57	0.68
56									3.00	3.00	3.00
57	1	1	2	1	1	11	3 (Thai)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.40	1.54	1.40
57									0.55	0.70	0.55
57									1.00	1.00	1.00
58	2	2	2	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.46	1.63	1.43
58									0.61	0.73	0.65
58									1.00	1.00	1.00

mary statistics for panelists' ratings for Bilingual World List accommodation

Profile	ENG Reading	ENG Writing	ENG Listening	L1 Reading	Cultural Proximity	Age	Native Language	Language Program	Bilingual Word List Effectiveness	Bilingual Word List Validity	Bilingual Word List Endorsement
1	2	1	3	2	2	9	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	2.74	2.80	2.71
1									0.44	0.41	0.52
1									3.00	3.00	3.00
2	2	1	1	1	2	8	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.80	2.06	1.83
2									0.72	0.73	0.79
2									2.00	2.00	2.00
3	1	1	1	1	1	5	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.17	1.29	1.15
3									0.45	0.57	0.44
3									1.00	1.00	1.00
4	1	1	3	1	2	8	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	1.63	1.91	1.66
4									0.60	0.78	0.68
4									2.00	2.00	2.00
5	2	1	2	1	2	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.86	2.06	1.89
5									0.69	0.73	0.80
5									2.00	2.00	2.00
6	1	1	1	2	2	8	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	2.43	2.60	2.43
6									0.61	0.60	0.65
6									2.00	3.00	3.00
7	2	1	2	2	2	17	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.77	2.77	2.74
7									0.43	0.43	0.44
7									3.00	3.00	3.00
8	2	1	3	1	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.83	2.09	1.89
8									0.71	0.74	0.76
8									2.00	2.00	2.00
9	2	1	3	1	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.74	2.74	2.71
9									0.51	0.51	0.52
9									3.00	3.00	3.00
10	1	1	2	2	2	12	4 (Swiss-German)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.60	2.57	2.57
10									0.69	0.74	0.74
10									3.00	3.00	3.00
11	2	2	2	1	2	10	2 (Cantonese)	3 (Cantonese Pull-out)	1.71	1.97	1.66
11									0.67	0.75	0.68
11									2.00	2.00	2.00
12	1	1	2	1	2	12	3 (Gujarati)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.71	1.94	1.71

12									0.67	0.68	0.67
12									2.00	2.00	2.00
13	2	2	3	1	2	8	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.77	2.03	1.71
13									0.69	0.71	0.71
13									2.00	2.00	2.00
14	3	2	3	1	2	9	2 (Chinese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.80	2.03	1.71
14									0.83	0.82	0.83
14									2.00	2.00	1.00
15	2	1	1	2	2	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.71	2.80	2.69
15									0.46	0.41	0.47
15									3.00	3.00	3.00
16	3	2	3	2	2	10	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.31	2.34	2.23
16									0.68	0.68	0.73
16									2.00	2.00	2.00
17	3	2	2	2	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.51	2.63	2.46
17									0.66	0.60	0.66
17									3.00	3.00	3.00
18	2	1	2	1	1	7	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.60	1.91	1.66
18									0.60	0.82	0.76
18									2.00	2.00	1.00
19	1	1	1	2	1	14	3 (Urdu)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.46	2.43	2.37
19									0.74	0.78	0.81
19									3.00	3.00	3.00
20	1	1	1	1	2	18	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.60	1.86	1.66
20									0.65	0.81	0.73
20									2.00	2.00	2.00
21	3	2	3	2	2	10	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.06	2.14	1.94
21									0.73	0.85	0.76
21									2.00	2.00	2.00
22	3	2	2	2	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.41	2.53	2.44
22									0.66	0.66	0.66
22									2.50	3.00	3.00
23	2	1	2	1	1	7	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.80	2.00	1.83
23									0.72	0.73	0.79
23									2.00	2.00	2.00
24	3	2	3	2	1	11	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.40	2.51	2.31
24									0.77	0.66	0.83
24									3.00	3.00	3.00
25	3	2	3	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	1.82	2.14	1.79
25									0.72	0.85	0.73
25									2.00	2.00	2.00
26	3	2	3	2	1	11	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.46	2.57	2.43
26									0.66	0.61	0.65

26									3.00	3.00	3.00
27	3	2	3	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	1.71	2.00	1.71
27									0.71	0.77	0.75
27									2.00	2.00	2.00
28	3	1	3	2	2	11	3 (Polish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.29	2.26	2.17
28									0.79	0.74	0.86
28									2.00	2.00	2.00
29	3	1	3	2	1	13	3 (Farsi)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.51	2.66	2.46
29									0.66	0.59	0.70
29									3.00	3.00	3.00
30	3	1	3	1	2	12	3 (Thai)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.57	1.86	1.57
30									0.65	0.77	0.70
30									1.00	2.00	1.00
31	3	1	3	1	1	8	2 (Moroccan Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.69	1.89	1.74
31									0.63	0.76	0.74
31									2.00	2.00	2.00
32	3	2	2	2	1	14	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.40	2.66	2.43
32									0.65	0.54	0.65
32									2.00	3.00	3.00
33	3	2	2	1	2	16	1 (Japanese)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.63	1.91	1.57
33									0.69	0.74	0.70
33									2.00	2.00	1.00
34	3	2	2	1	1	9	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.89	2.11	1.89
34									0.72	0.76	0.76
34									2.00	2.00	2.00
35	3	1	2	2	2	15	1 (Japanese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.43	2.66	2.34
35									0.74	0.64	0.84
35									3.00	3.00	3.00
36	3	1	2	2	1	13	3 (Russian)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.63	2.57	2.51
36									0.55	0.56	0.61
36									3.00	3.00	3.00
37	3	1	2	1	2	13	2 (Cantonese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.86	2.09	1.91
37									0.81	0.78	0.82
37									2.00	2.00	2.00
38	3	1	2	1	1	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.00	2.09	1.89
38									0.73	0.74	0.76
38									2.00	2.00	2.00
39	2	2	3	2	2	12	4 (German)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.74	2.79	2.68
39									0.51	0.48	0.64
39									3.00	3.00	3.00
40	2	2	3	2	1	10	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.82	2.80	2.68
40									0.39	0.41	0.47

40									3.00	3.00	3.00
41	2	2	3	1	1	8	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.80	1.97	1.77
41									0.58	0.71	0.69
41									2.00	2.00	2.00
42	2	1	3	2	1	7	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.60	2.77	2.57
42									0.55	0.49	0.61
42									3.00	3.00	3.00
43	2	1	3	1	1	9	3 (Armenian)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.77	2.06	1.60
43									0.69	0.73	0.69
43									2.00	2.00	1.00
44	2	2	2	2	1	9	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.71	2.83	2.66
44									0.52	0.45	0.54
44									3.00	3.00	3.00
45	2	1	2	2	1	12	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.80	2.83	2.63
45									0.41	0.38	0.55
45									3.00	3.00	3.00
46	2	2	1	2	2	14	2 (Cantonese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.76	2.76	2.74
46									0.43	0.43	0.51
46									3.00	3.00	3.00
47	2	2	1	2	1	9	2 (Chinese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.74	2.74	2.74
47									0.51	0.44	0.51
47									3.00	3.00	3.00
48	2	2	1	1	2	7	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.89	2.20	1.91
48									0.72	0.68	0.70
48									2.00	2.00	2.00
49	2	2	1	1	1	9	3 (Urdu)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.86	1.97	1.91
49									0.69	0.75	0.74
49									2.00	2.00	2.00
50	2	1	1	2	1	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.68	2.79	2.74
50									0.59	0.48	0.57
50									3.00	3.00	3.00
51	2	1	1	1	1	9	3 (Telegu)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.74	1.97	1.77
51									0.61	0.71	0.69
51									2.00	2.00	2.00
52	1	1	3	2	2	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.60	2.63	2.60
52									0.55	0.60	0.60
52									3.00	3.00	3.00
53	1	1	3	2	1	12	3 (Urdu)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.51	2.69	2.49
53									0.61	0.58	0.70
53									3.00	3.00	3.00
54	1	1	3	1	1	8	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.57	1.80	1.57
54									0.65	0.76	0.70
54									1.00	2.00	1.00

55	1	2	2	1	1	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.77	2.11	1.71
55									0.69	0.68	0.71
55									2.00	2.00	2.00
56	1	1	2	2	1	13	3 (Tagalog)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.51	2.71	2.43
56									0.66	0.46	0.70
56									3.00	3.00	3.00
57	1	1	2	1	1	11	3 (Thai)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.54	1.83	1.54
57									0.61	0.79	0.66
57									1.00	2.00	1.00
58	2	2	2	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.77	1.94	1.86
58									0.69	0.76	0.81
58									2.00	2.00	2.00

mary statistics for panelists' ratings for Picture Dictionary accommodation

rofile	ENG Reading	ENG Writing	ENG Listening	L1 Reading	Cultural Proximity	Age	Native Language	Language Program	Picture Dictionary Effectiveness	Picture Dictionary Validity	Picture Dictionary Endorsement
1	2	1	3	2	2	9	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	1.86	2.09	1.80
1									0.77	0.85	0.76
1									2.00	2.00	2.00
2	2	1	1	1	2	8	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.40	2.46	2.46
2									0.65	0.61	0.66
2									2.00	3.00	3.00
3	1	1	1	1	1	5	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.57	2.60	2.60
3									0.70	0.65	0.65
3									3.00	3.00	3.00
4	1	1	3	1	2	8	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	2.46	2.63	2.49
4									0.61	0.55	0.61

4									3.00	3.00	3.00
5	2	1	2	1	2	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.26	2.40	2.26
5									0.74	0.69	0.78
5									2.00	3.00	2.00
6	1	1	1	2	2	8	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	2.37	2.51	2.31
6									0.73	0.74	0.72
6									3.00	3.00	2.00
7	2	1	2	2	2	17	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.43	1.66	1.34
7									0.56	0.64	0.54
7									1.00	2.00	1.00
8	2	1	3	1	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.80	1.94	1.71
8									0.68	0.76	0.71
8									2.00	2.00	2.00
9	2	1	3	1	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual	1.83	2.06	1.83

								pull-out)			
9									0.66	0.80	0.71
9									2.00	2.00	2.00
10	1	1	2	2	2	12	4 (Swiss-German)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.91	2.17	1.80
10									0.70	0.86	0.76
10									2.00	2.00	2.00
11	2	2	2	1	2	10	2 (Cantonese)	3 (Cantonese Pull-out)	2.03	2.29	1.89
11									0.79	0.79	0.83
11									2.00	2.00	2.00
12	1	1	2	1	2	12	3 (Gujarati)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.37	2.49	2.37
12									0.69	0.70	0.73
12									2.00	3.00	3.00
13	2	2	3	1	2	8	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.06	2.17	1.94
13									0.73	0.79	0.68

13									2.00	2.00	2.00
14	3	2	3	1	2	9	2 (Chinese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.54	1.86	1.54
14									0.70	0.81	0.70
14									1.00	2.00	1.00
15	2	1	1	2	2	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.80	2.11	1.80
15									0.72	0.83	0.72
15									2.00	2.00	2.00
16	3	2	3	2	2	10	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.31	1.60	1.26
16									0.58	0.81	0.56
16									1.00	1.00	1.00
17	3	2	2	2	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.31	1.54	1.26
17									0.53	0.74	0.51
17									1.00	1.00	1.00

18	2	1	2	1	1	7	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.49	2.53	2.57
18									0.66	0.61	0.65
18									3.00	3.00	3.00
19	1	1	1	2	1	14	3 (Urdu)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.97	2.20	1.89
19									0.71	0.80	0.76
19									2.00	2.00	2.00
20	1	1	1	1	2	18	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.11	2.20	2.11
20									0.80	0.76	0.83
20									2.00	2.00	2.00
21	3	2	3	2	2	10	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.29	1.46	1.23
21									0.57	0.70	0.49
21									1.00	1.00	1.00
22	3	2	2	2	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.26	1.56	1.24
22									0.45	0.66	0.43

22									1.00	1.00	1.00
23	2	1	2	1	1	7	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.54	2.60	2.54
23									0.66	0.65	0.70
23									3.00	3.00	3.00
24	3	2	3	2	1	11	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.31	1.54	1.26
24									0.53	0.78	0.44
24									1.00	1.00	1.00
25	3	2	3	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	1.51	1.74	1.43
25									0.61	0.74	0.61
25									1.00	2.00	1.00
26	3	2	3	2	1	11	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.34	1.57	1.34
26									0.59	0.74	0.59
26									1.00	1.00	1.00
27	3	2	3	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	1.40	1.71	1.23

27									0.55	0.79	0.49
27									1.00	2.00	1.00
28	3	1	3	2	2	11	3 (Polish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.20	1.40	1.14
28									0.41	0.60	0.36
28									1.00	1.00	1.00
29	3	1	3	2	1	13	3 (Farsi)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.37	1.66	1.31
29									0.55	0.73	0.53
29									1.00	2.00	1.00
30	3	1	3	1	2	12	3 (Thai)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.26	1.54	1.23
30									0.44	0.70	0.49
30									1.00	1.00	1.00
31	3	1	3	1	1	8	2 (Moroccan Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.06	2.09	2.03
31									0.84	0.85	0.83
31									2.00	2.00	2.00

32	3	2	2	2	1	14	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.46	1.74	1.31
32									0.56	0.70	0.47
32									1.00	2.00	1.00
33	3	2	2	1	2	16	1 (Japanese)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.49	1.66	1.46
33									0.70	0.73	0.66
33									1.00	2.00	1.00
34	3	2	2	1	1	9	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.60	1.86	1.51
34									0.65	0.73	0.66
34									2.00	2.00	1.00
35	3	1	2	2	2	15	1 (Japanese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.20	1.43	1.14
35									0.41	0.61	0.36
35									1.00	1.00	1.00
36	3	1	2	2	1	13	3 (Russian)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.46	1.66	1.40
36									0.70	0.76	0.65

36									1.00	1.00	1.00
37	3	1	2	1	2	13	2 (Cantonese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.74	2.03	1.71
37									0.66	0.71	0.67
37									2.00	2.00	2.00
38	3	1	2	1	1	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.11	2.23	2.00
38									0.72	0.73	0.77
38									2.00	2.00	2.00
39	2	2	3	2	2	12	4 (German)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.50	1.71	1.41
39									0.62	0.72	0.56
39									1.00	2.00	1.00
40	2	2	3	2	1	10	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.74	2.00	1.69
40									0.66	0.77	0.68
40									2.00	2.00	2.00
41	2	2	3	1	1	8	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.23	2.31	2.23

41									0.65	0.58	0.65
41									2.00	2.00	2.00
42	2	1	3	2	1	7	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.91	2.20	1.83
42									0.78	0.80	0.75
42									2.00	2.00	2.00
43	2	1	3	1	1	9	3 (Armenian)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.46	2.46	2.34
43									0.66	0.74	0.68
43									3.00	3.00	2.00
44	2	2	2	2	1	9	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.86	2.23	1.71
44									0.69	0.69	0.75
44									2.00	2.00	2.00
45	2	1	2	2	1	12	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.71	2.00	1.63
45									0.57	0.69	0.60
45									2.00	2.00	2.00

46	2	2	1	2	2	14	2 (Cantonese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.62	1.76	1.50
46									0.60	0.70	0.56
46									2.00	2.00	1.00
47	2	2	1	2	1	9	2 (Chinese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.06	2.17	2.03
47									0.76	0.79	0.75
47									2.00	2.00	2.00
48	2	2	1	1	2	7	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.69	1.94	1.66
48									0.63	0.73	0.64
48									2.00	2.00	2.00
49	2	2	1	1	1	9	3 (Urdu)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.54	2.60	2.46
49									0.70	0.60	0.66
49									1.00	3.00	3.00
50	2	1	1	2	1	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.12	2.32	2.12
50									0.73	0.77	0.73

50									2.00	2.50	2.00
51	2	1	1	1	1	9	3 (Telegu)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.37	2.54	2.34
51									0.69	0.66	0.68
51									2.00	3.00	2.00
52	1	1	3	2	2	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.06	2.26	2.00
52									0.84	0.78	0.77
52									2.00	2.00	2.00
53	1	1	3	2	1	12	3 (Urdu)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.06	2.24	2.03
53									0.78	0.82	0.76
53									2.00	2.00	2.00
54	1	1	3	1	1	8	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.63	2.66	2.60
54									0.55	0.54	0.55
54									3.00	3.00	3.00
55	1	2	2	1	1	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.60	2.57	2.63

55									0.55	0.61	0.55
55									3.00	3.00	3.00
56	1	1	2	2	1	13	3 (Tagalog)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.91	2.14	1.80
56									0.74	0.73	0.68
56									2.00	2.00	2.00
57	1	1	2	1	1	11	3 (Thai)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.29	2.46	2.34
57									0.71	0.66	0.73
57									2.00	3.00	2.00
58	2	2	2	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.00	2.20	1.97
58									0.64	0.68	0.66
58									2.00	2.00	2.00

mary statistics for panelists' ratings for Oral English accommodation.

rofile	ENG Reading	ENG Writing	ENG Listening	L1 Reading	Cultural Proximity	Age	Native Language	Language Program	Oral English Effectiveness	Oral English Validity	Oral English Endorsement
1	2	1	3	2	2	9	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	2.49	2.49	2.40
1									0.70	0.66	0.69
1									3.00	3.00	3.00
2	2	1	1	1	2	8	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.26	1.49	1.20
2									0.44	0.70	0.41
2									1.00	1.00	1.00
3	1	1	1	1	1	5	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.51	1.69	1.54
3									0.74	0.76	0.74
3									1.00	2.00	1.00
4	1	1	3	1	2	8	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	2.91	2.85	2.85
4									0.29	0.36	0.36
4									3.00	3.00	3.00
5	2	1	2	1	2	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.03	2.23	2.00
5									0.62	0.60	0.64
5									2.00	2.00	2.00
6	1	1	1	2	2	8	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	1.20	1.43	1.26
6									0.47	0.74	0.56
6									1.00	1.00	1.00
7	2	1	2	2	2	17	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.69	1.83	1.57
7									0.53	0.57	0.61
7									2.00	2.00	2.00
8	2	1	3	1	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.86	2.83	2.77

8									0.36	0.38	0.49
8									3.00	3.00	3.00
9	2	1	3	1	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.69	1.91	1.57
9									0.63	0.61	0.65
9									2.00	2.00	1.00
10	1	1	2	2	2	12	4 (Swiss-German)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.97	2.17	1.91
10									0.62	0.62	0.74
10									2.00	2.00	2.00
11	2	2	2	1	2	10	2 (Cantonese)	3 (Cantonese Pull-out)	2.06	2.26	2.11
11									0.68	0.70	0.72
11									2.00	2.00	2.00
12	1	1	2	1	2	12	3 (Gujarati)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.17	2.29	2.17
12									0.71	0.67	0.79
12									2.00	2.00	2.00
13	2	2	3	1	2	8	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.77	2.80	2.71
13									0.43	0.41	0.52
13									3.00	3.00	3.00
14	3	2	3	1	2	9	2 (Chinese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.18	2.24	2.00
14									0.83	0.74	0.92
14									2.00	2.00	2.00
15	2	1	1	2	2	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.14	1.31	1.11
15									0.43	0.58	0.40
15									1.00	1.00	1.00
16	3	2	3	2	2	10	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.71	1.74	1.51
16									0.83	0.74	0.74
16									1.00	2.00	1.00
17	3	2	2	2	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese	1.43	1.57	1.37

								Bilingual pull-out)			
17									0.50	0.61	0.49
17									1.00	2.00	1.00
18	2	1	2	1	1	7	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.00	2.20	2.00
18									0.64	0.72	0.77
18									2.00	2.00	2.00
19	1	1	1	2	1	14	3 (Urdu)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.17	1.31	1.14
19									0.38	0.53	0.43
19									1.00	1.00	1.00
20	1	1	1	1	2	18	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.40	1.49	1.43
20									0.69	0.70	0.74
20									1.00	1.00	1.00
21	3	2	3	2	2	10	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.71	1.77	1.57
21									0.79	0.77	0.74
21									2.00	2.00	1.00
22	3	2	2	2	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.32	1.53	1.21
22									0.47	0.56	0.41
22									1.00	1.50	1.00
23	2	1	2	1	1	7	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.17	2.29	2.09
23									0.66	0.57	0.70
23									2.00	2.00	2.00
24	3	2	3	2	1	11	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.80	2.06	1.74
24									0.80	0.87	0.78
24									2.00	2.00	2.00
25	3	2	3	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	2.14	2.23	2.11
25									0.81	0.73	0.80
25									2.00	2.00	2.00
26	3	2	3	2	1	11	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.97	2.11	1.86
26									0.79	0.72	0.77
26									2.00	2.00	2.00
27	3	2	3	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	2	2.37	2.51	2.17

								(Transitional Bilingual)			
27									0.73	0.66	0.86
27									3.00	3.00	2.00
28	3	1	3	2	2	11	3 (Polish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.71	1.83	1.54
28									0.86	0.82	0.85
28									1.00	2.00	1.00
29	3	1	3	2	1	13	3 (Farsi)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.03	2.20	1.94
29									0.79	0.72	0.84
29									2.00	2.00	2.00
30	3	1	3	1	2	12	3 (Thai)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.11	2.31	2.00
30									0.72	0.63	0.80
30									2.00	2.00	2.00
31	3	1	3	1	1	8	2 (Moroccan Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.63	2.37	2.80
31									1.65	0.69	3.45
31									3.00	2.00	3.00
32	3	2	2	2	1	14	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.57	1.66	1.54
32									0.61	0.64	0.66
32									2.00	2.00	1.00
33	3	2	2	1	2	16	1 (Japanese)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.57	1.69	1.49
33									0.65	0.72	0.66
33									1.00	2.00	1.00
34	3	2	2	1	1	9	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.80	1.97	1.71
34									0.68	0.71	0.75
34									2.00	2.00	2.00
35	3	1	2	2	2	15	1 (Japanese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.51	1.57	1.31
35									0.56	0.56	0.53
35									1.00	2.00	1.00
36	3	1	2	2	1	13	3 (Russian)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.60	1.74	1.46
36									0.65	0.66	0.66
36									2.00	2.00	1.00
37	3	1	2	1	2	13	2 (Cantonese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.80	1.91	1.71
37									0.63	0.70	0.75
37									2.00	2.00	2.00

38	3	1	2	1	1	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.86	2.11	1.80
38									0.55	0.47	0.63
38									2.00	2.00	2.00
39	2	2	3	2	2	12	4 (German)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.41	2.38	2.29
39									0.70	0.65	0.80
39									3.00	2.00	2.50
40	2	2	3	2	1	10	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.57	2.71	2.51
40									0.56	0.52	0.61
40									3.00	3.00	3.00
41	2	2	3	1	1	8	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.66	2.66	2.63
41									0.59	0.54	0.60
41									3.00	3.00	3.00
42	2	1	3	2	1	7	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.43	2.63	2.41
42									0.70	0.60	0.74
42									3.00	3.00	3.00
43	2	1	3	1	1	9	3 (Armenian)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.69	2.66	2.66
43									0.53	0.59	0.59
43									3.00	3.00	3.00
44	2	2	2	2	1	9	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.63	1.89	1.60
44									0.60	0.68	0.60
44									2.00	2.00	2.00
45	2	1	2	2	1	12	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.76	1.91	1.68
45									0.61	0.62	0.68
45									2.00	2.00	2.00
46	2	2	1	2	2	14	2 (Cantonese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.06	1.29	1.06
46									0.24	0.52	0.24
46									1.00	1.00	1.00
47	2	2	1	2	1	9	2 (Chinese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.23	1.34	1.20
47									0.55	0.59	0.53
47									1.00	1.00	1.00
48	2	2	1	1	2	7	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.26	1.53	1.20

48									0.44	0.71	0.41
48									1.00	1.00	1.00
49	2	2	1	1	1	9	3 (Urdu)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.26	1.34	1.26
49									0.56	0.59	0.56
49									1.00	1.00	1.00
50	2	1	1	2	1	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.32	1.50	1.32
50									0.64	0.71	0.64
50									1.00	1.00	1.00
51	2	1	1	1	1	9	3 (Telegu)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.34	1.43	1.34
51									0.59	0.65	0.64
51									1.00	1.00	1.00
52	1	1	3	2	2	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.74	2.77	2.69
52									0.51	0.49	0.53
52									3.00	3.00	3.00
53	1	1	3	2	1	12	3 (Urdu)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.66	2.74	2.63
53									0.48	0.44	0.60
53									3.00	3.00	3.00
54	1	1	3	1	1	8	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.83	2.83	2.77
54									0.38	0.38	0.49
54									3.00	3.00	3.00
55	1	2	2	1	1	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.23	2.29	2.23
55									0.60	0.75	0.69
55									2.00	2.00	2.00
56	1	1	2	2	1	13	3 (Tagalog)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.83	1.97	1.74
56									0.51	0.66	0.61
56									2.00	2.00	2.00
57	1	1	2	1	1	11	3 (Thai)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.20	2.29	2.21
57									0.63	0.62	0.69
57									2.00	2.00	2.00
58	2	2	2	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.89	2.11	1.91
58									0.68	0.68	0.74
58									2.00	2.00	2.00

mary statistics for panelists' ratings for Oral L1

rofile	ENG Reading	ENG Writing	ENG Listening	L1 Reading	Cultural Proximity	Age	Native Language	Language Program	L1 Oral Administration Effectiveness	L1 Oral Administration Validity	L1 Oral Administration Endorsement
1	2	1	3	2	2	9	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	2.09	2.14	2.03
1									0.85	0.77	0.86
1									2.00	2.00	2.00
2	2	1	1	1	2	8	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.06	2.23	2.09
2									0.73	0.69	0.74
2									2.00	2.00	2.00
3	1	1	1	1	1	5	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.60	2.60	2.60
3									0.65	0.60	0.69
3									3.00	3.00	3.00
4	1	1	3	1	2	8	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	2.14	2.06	1.91
4									0.69	0.68	0.78
4									2.00	2.00	2.00
5	2	1	2	1	2	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.06	2.11	2.03
5									0.68	0.63	0.75
5									2.00	2.00	2.00
6	1	1	1	2	2	8	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	2.40	2.46	2.34
6									0.77	0.66	0.76
6									3.00	3.00	3.00
7	2	1	2	2	2	17	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.14	2.17	1.94
7									0.77	0.71	0.73
7									2.00	2.00	2.00
8	2	1	3	1	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.06	2.17	1.80
8									0.68	0.66	0.68
8									2.00	2.00	2.00
9	2	1	3	1	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.23	2.26	2.14
9									0.77	0.78	0.77
9									2.00	2.00	2.00
10	1	1	2	2	2	12	4 (Swiss-German)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.49	2.51	2.43
10									0.74	0.66	0.78
10									3.00	3.00	3.00
11	2	2	2	1	2	10	2 (Cantonese)	3 (Cantonese Pull-out)	1.74	1.80	1.66
11									0.74	0.76	0.80
11									2.00	2.00	1.00

12	1	1	2	1	2	12	3 (Gujarati)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.23	2.26	2.17
12									0.60	0.56	0.62
12									2.00	2.00	2.00
13	2	2	3	1	2	8	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.94	2.06	1.77
13									0.73	0.73	0.73
13									2.00	2.00	2.00
14	3	2	3	1	2	9	2 (Chinese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.62	1.74	1.53
14									0.65	0.71	0.66
14									2.00	2.00	1.00
15	2	1	1	2	2	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.29	2.29	2.06
15									0.71	0.71	0.80
15									2.00	2.00	2.00
16	3	2	3	2	2	10	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.43	1.51	1.29
16									0.70	0.70	0.62
16									1.00	1.00	1.00
17	3	2	2	2	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.74	1.83	1.66
17									0.74	0.75	0.76
17									2.00	2.00	1.00
18	2	1	2	1	1	7	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.49	2.51	2.49
18									0.61	0.56	0.66
18									3.00	3.00	3.00
19	1	1	1	2	1	14	3 (Urdu)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.43	2.49	2.37
19									0.74	0.70	0.73
19									3.00	3.00	3.00
20	1	1	1	1	2	18	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.40	2.43	2.46
20									0.60	0.65	0.70
20									2.00	3.00	3.00
21	3	2	3	2	2	10	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.50	1.64	1.35
21									0.71	0.70	0.65
21									1.00	2.00	1.00
22	3	2	2	2	2	11	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	1.71	1.85	1.62
22									0.72	0.74	0.70
22									2.00	2.00	1.50
23	2	1	2	1	1	7	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.46	2.37	2.31
23									0.66	0.60	0.72
23									3.00	2.00	2.00
24	3	2	3	2	1	11	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.83	1.86	1.63
24									0.82	0.81	0.81

24									2.00	2.00	1.00
25	3	2	3	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	1.83	2.11	1.74
25									0.79	0.83	0.78
25									2.00	2.00	2.00
26	3	2	3	2	1	11	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.94	2.03	1.89
26									0.80	0.75	0.83
26									2.00	2.00	2.00
27	3	2	3	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	2 (Transitional Bilingual)	1.97	2.06	1.91
27									0.89	0.80	0.85
27									2.00	2.00	2.00
28	3	1	3	2	2	11	3 (Polish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.60	1.69	1.41
28									0.77	0.68	0.70
28									1.00	2.00	1.00
29	3	1	3	2	1	13	3 (Farsi)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.11	2.26	2.00
29									0.80	0.70	0.80
29									2.00	2.00	2.00
30	3	1	3	1	2	12	3 (Thai)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.49	1.63	1.37
30									0.66	0.69	0.60
30									1.00	2.00	1.00
31	3	1	3	1	1	8	2 (Moroccan Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.03	2.00	1.77
31									0.86	0.77	0.81
31									2.00	2.00	2.00
32	3	2	2	2	1	14	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.09	2.17	1.94
32									0.78	0.82	0.84
32									2.00	2.00	2.00
33	3	2	2	1	2	16	1 (Japanese)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	1.49	1.54	1.43
33									0.66	0.61	0.61
33									1.00	1.00	1.00
34	3	2	2	1	1	9	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.06	2.17	1.91
34									0.76	0.75	0.82
34									2.00	2.00	2.00
35	3	1	2	2	2	15	1 (Japanese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.66	1.69	1.57
35									0.64	0.63	0.61
35									2.00	2.00	2.00
36	3	1	2	2	1	13	3 (Russian)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.26	2.20	2.17
36									0.78	0.72	0.79
36									2.00	2.00	2.00
37	3	1	2	1	2	13	2 (Cantonese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.77	1.89	1.57
37									0.65	0.72	0.61
37									2.00	2.00	2.00
38	3	1	2	1	1	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.11	2.17	1.91
38									0.72	0.66	0.70

38									2.00	2.00	2.00
39	2	2	3	2	2	12	4 (German)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.00	2.00	1.76
39									0.82	0.78	0.74
39									2.00	2.00	2.00
40	2	2	3	2	1	10	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.29	2.43	2.20
40									0.75	0.70	0.76
40									2.00	3.00	2.00
41	2	2	3	1	1	8	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.29	2.31	2.17
41									0.79	0.72	0.79
41									2.00	2.00	2.00
42	2	1	3	2	1	7	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.20	2.37	2.06
42									0.83	0.65	0.84
42									2.00	2.00	2.00
43	2	1	3	1	1	9	3 (Armenian)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.09	2.11	2.00
43									0.74	0.68	0.77
43									2.00	2.00	2.00
44	2	2	2	2	1	9	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.23	2.29	2.09
44									0.77	0.71	0.78
44									2.00	2.00	2.00
45	2	1	2	2	1	12	2 (Arabic)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.23	2.29	2.14
45									0.81	0.62	0.85
45									2.00	2.00	2.00
46	2	2	1	2	2	14	2 (Cantonese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.06	2.18	1.97
46									0.69	0.67	0.76
46									2.00	2.00	2.00
47	2	2	1	2	1	9	2 (Chinese)	3 (Vietnamese Bilingual pull-out)	2.51	2.60	2.51
47									0.70	0.55	0.70
47									3.00	3.00	3.00
48	2	2	1	1	2	7	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	1.86	2.00	1.83
48									0.73	0.73	0.75
48									2.00	2.00	2.00
49	2	2	1	1	1	9	3 (Urdu)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.40	2.51	2.43
49									0.65	0.61	0.70
49									2.00	3.00	3.00
50	2	1	1	2	1	9	2 (Vietnamese)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.41	2.53	2.38
50									0.78	0.75	0.78
50									3.00	3.00	3.00
51	2	1	1	1	1	9	3 (Telegu)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.46	2.51	2.43
51									0.66	0.61	0.70
51									3.00	3.00	3.00
52	1	1	3	2	2	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.34	2.31	2.20
52									0.73	0.76	0.76

52									2.00	2.00	2.00
53	1	1	3	2	1	12	3 (Urdu)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.32	2.35	2.18
53									0.77	0.65	0.76
53									2.50	2.00	2.00
54	1	1	3	1	1	8	1 (Korean)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.31	2.37	2.20
54									0.63	0.65	0.63
54									2.00	2.00	2.00
55	1	2	2	1	1	9	4 (Spanish)	3 (ESL/ESOL Pull-out)	2.51	2.49	2.49
55									0.61	0.66	0.66
55									3.00	3.00	3.00
56	1	1	2	2	1	13	3 (Tagalog)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.91	2.63	2.57
56									1.69	0.55	0.61
56									3.00	3.00	3.00
57	1	1	2	1	1	11	3 (Thai)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.49	2.51	2.37
57									0.56	0.56	0.65
57									3.00	3.00	2.00
58	2	2	2	1	1	14	4 (Spanish)	1 (ESL/ESOL Contained)	2.29	2.32	2.24
58									0.72	0.73	0.82
58									2.00	2.00	2.00

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for English Reading

Eng Reading

Summary Statistics	ENG Reading Level	L1/ Side-by-Side Effectiveness	L1/ Side-by-Side Validity	L1/ Side-by-Side Endorsement
Mean	1	1.94	2.02	1.90
St. Deviation	1	0.90	0.88	0.91
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	2.03	2.16	1.99
St. Deviation	2	0.85	0.84	0.88
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	3	1.83	1.98	1.74
St. Deviation	3	0.83	0.84	0.84
Median	3	2.00	2.00	1.00

Summary Statistics	ENG Reading Level	Bilingual Word List Effectiveness	Bilingual Word List Validity	Bilingual Word List Endorsement
Mean	1	2.01	2.18	1.99
St. Deviation	1	0.80	0.80	0.82
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	2.24	2.39	2.22
St. Deviation	2	0.76	0.72	0.79
Median	2	2.00	3.00	2.00
Mean	3	2.12	2.28	2.08
St. Deviation	3	0.77	0.76	0.80
Median	3	2.00	2.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	ENG Reading Level	Picture Dictionary Effectiveness	Picture Dictionary Validity	Picture Dictionary Endorsement
Mean	1	2.26	2.39	2.23
St. Deviation	1	0.74	0.73	0.75
Median	1	2.00	3.00	2.00
Mean	2	2.01	2.19	1.96
St. Deviation	2	0.74	0.76	0.76
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	3	1.46	1.69	1.40
St. Deviation	3	0.64	0.76	0.62
Median	3	1.00	2.00	1.00

Summary Statistics	ENG Reading Level	Oral English Effectiveness	Oral English Validity	Oral English Endorsement
Mean	1	2.06	2.16	2.04
St. Deviation	1	0.81	0.80	0.84
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.91	2.04	1.87
St. Deviation	2	0.80	0.79	0.82
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	3	1.84	1.96	1.74
St. Deviation	3	0.83	0.74	1.09
Median	3	2.00	2.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	ENG Reading Level	L1 Oral Administration Effectiveness	L1 Oral Administration Validity	L1 Oral Administration Endorsement
Mean	1	2.43	2.42	2.33
St. Deviation	1	0.81	0.65	0.72
Median	1	3.00	3.00	2.00
Mean	2	2.19	2.26	2.10
St. Deviation	2	0.75	0.70	0.78
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	3	1.81	1.90	1.69
St. Deviation	3	0.78	0.76	0.76
Median	3	2.00	2.00	2.00

Table 7. English Writing Results

ENG Writing

Summary Statistics	ENG Writing Level	L1/ Side-by-Side Effectiveness	L1/ Side-by-Side Validity	L1/ Side-by-Side Endorsement
Mean	1	1.94	2.08	1.90
St. Deviation	1	0.87	0.85	0.89
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.93	2.06	1.86
St. Deviation	2	0.85	0.85	0.86
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	ENG Writing Level	Bilingual Word List Effectiveness	Bilingual Word List Validity	Bilingual Word List Endorsement
Mean	1	2.11	2.27	2.10
St. Deviation	1	0.78	0.77	0.81
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	2.19	2.35	2.15
St. Deviation	2	0.76	0.73	0.79
Median	2	2.00	3.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	ENG Writing Level	Picture Dictionary Effectiveness	Picture Dictionary Validity	Picture Dictionary Endorsement
Mean	1	2.02	2.19	1.99
St. Deviation	1	0.78	0.79	0.80
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.67	1.89	1.61
St. Deviation	2	0.71	0.78	0.71
Median	2	2.00	2.00	1.00

Summary Statistics	ENG Writing Level	Oral English Effectiveness	Oral English Validity	Oral English Endorsement
Mean	1	1.95	2.06	1.90

St. Deviation	1	0.84	0.78	1.02
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.88	2.01	1.81
St. Deviation	2	0.79	0.78	0.81
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	**ENG Writing Level**	**L1 Oral Administration Effectiveness**	**L1 Oral Administration Validity**	**L1 Oral Administration Endorsement**
Mean	1	2.22	2.26	2.11
St. Deviation	1	0.81	0.70	0.78
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.97	2.05	1.86
St. Deviation	2	0.79	0.77	0.81
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00

Table 8. English Listening Results

ENG Listening

Summary Statistics	ENG Listening Level	L1/ Side-by-Side Effectiveness	L1/ Side-by-Side Validity	L1/ Side-by-Side Endorsement
Mean	1	2.07	2.16	2.04
St. Deviation	1	0.89	0.88	0.91
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.92	2.06	1.87
St. Deviation	2	0.86	0.84	0.87
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	3	1.89	2.04	1.82
St. Deviation	3	0.85	0.85	0.86
Median	3	2.00	2.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	ENG Listening Level	Bilingual Word List Effectiveness	Bilingual Word List Validity	Bilingual Word List Endorsement
Mean	1	2.18	2.32	2.18
St. Deviation	1	0.80	0.77	0.82
Median	1	2.00	3.00	2.00
Mean	2	2.15	2.31	2.12
St. Deviation	2	0.77	0.75	0.80
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	3	2.13	2.29	2.09
St. Deviation	3	0.77	0.76	0.81
Median	3	2.00	2.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	ENG Listening Level	Picture Dictionary Effectiveness	Picture Dictionary Validity	Picture Dictionary Endorsement
Mean	1	2.10	2.26	2.08
St. Deviation	1	0.76	0.76	0.77
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.89	2.09	1.84
St. Deviation	2	0.76	0.78	0.79
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	3	1.75	1.95	1.70
St.	3	0.77	0.82	0.76

Deviation				
Median	3	2.00	2.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	ENG Listening Level	Oral English Effectiveness	Oral English Validity	Oral English Endorsement
Mean	1	1.26	1.44	1.26
St. Deviation	1	0.54	0.66	0.55
Median	1	1.00	1.00	1.00
Mean	2	1.79	1.95	1.74
St. Deviation	2	0.66	0.69	0.72
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	3	2.36	2.42	2.29
St. Deviation	3	0.82	0.71	1.07
Median	3	3.00	3.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	ENG Listening Level	L1 Oral Administration Effectiveness	L1 Oral Administration Validity	L1 Oral Administration Endorsement
Mean	1	2.32	2.39	2.28
St. Deviation	1	0.73	0.69	0.77
Median	1	2.00	3.00	2.00
Mean	2	2.16	2.19	2.05
St. Deviation	2	0.83	0.72	0.79
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	3	1.98	2.05	1.83
St. Deviation	3	0.80	0.76	0.79
Median	3	2.00	2.00	2.00

Table 9. L1 Reading Results

L1 Reading

Summary Statistics	L1 Reading Level	L1/ Side-by-Side Effectiveness	L1/ Side-by-Side Validity	L1/ Side-by-Side Endorsement
Mean	1	1.37	1.57	1.33
St. Deviation	1	0.55	0.69	0.56
Median	1	1.00	1.00	1.00
Mean	2	2.51	2.57	2.44
St. Deviation	2	0.73	0.69	0.78
Median	2	3.00	3.00	3.00

Summary Statistics	L1 Reading Level	Bilingual Word List Effectiveness	Bilingual Word List Validity	Bilingual Word List Endorsement
Mean	1	1.73	1.97	1.73
St. Deviation	1	0.69	0.75	0.73
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	2.56	2.64	2.51
St. Deviation	2	0.62	0.59	0.67
Median	2	3.00	3.00	3.00

Summary Statistics	L1 Reading Level	Picture Dictionary Effectiveness	Picture Dictionary Validity	Picture Dictionary Endorsement
Mean	1	2.09	2.23	2.06
St. Deviation	1	0.77	0.76	0.80
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.66	1.90	1.60
St. Deviation	2	0.72	0.80	0.70
Median	2	2.00	2.00	1.00

Summary Statistics	L1 Reading Level	Oral English Effectiveness	Oral English Validity	Oral English Endorsement
Mean	1	2.07	2.17	2.03
St. Deviation	1	0.84	0.77	1.04
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.77	1.91	1.70
St. Deviation	2	0.77	0.77	0.79
Median	2	2.00	2.00	1.00

Summary Statistics	L1 Reading Level	L1 Oral Administration Effectiveness	L1 Oral Administration Validity	L1 Oral Administration Endorsement
Mean	1	2.11	2.17	2.02
St. Deviation	1	0.75	0.72	0.79
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	2.12	2.17	2.00
St. Deviation	2	0.87	0.76	0.82
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00

Table 10. Cultural Proximity Results

Cultural Proximity

Summary Statistics	Cultural Proximity Level	L1/ Side-by-Side Effectiveness	L1/ Side-by-Side Validity	L1/ Side-by-Side Endorsement
Mean	1	1.94	2.04	1.88
St. Deviation	1	0.86	0.85	0.88
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.94	2.10	1.88
St. Deviation	2	0.86	0.85	0.88
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	Cultural Proximity Level	Bilingual Word List Effectiveness	Bilingual Word List Validity	Bilingual Word List Endorsement
Mean	1	2.12	2.29	2.09
St. Deviation	1	0.78	0.76	0.81
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	2.17	2.32	2.15
St. Deviation	2	0.77	0.75	0.80
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	Cultural Proximity Level	Picture Dictionary Effectiveness	Picture Dictionary Validity	Picture Dictionary Endorsement
Mean	1	1.99	2.16	1.94
St. Deviation	1	0.77	0.78	0.79
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.76	1.96	1.71
St. Deviation	2	0.75	0.81	0.76
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	Cultural Proximity Level	Oral English Effectiveness	Oral English Validity	Oral English Endorsement
Mean	1	1.97	2.09	1.93
St. Deviation	1	0.83	0.77	1.02
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.86	1.98	1.79
St. Deviation	2	0.80	0.79	0.82
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00

Summary Statistics	Cultural Proximity Level	L1 Oral Administration Effectiveness	L1 Oral Administration Validity	L1 Oral Administration Endorsement
Mean	1	2.27	2.32	2.17
St. Deviation	1	0.82	0.71	0.79
Median	1	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mean	2	1.95	2.02	1.84
St. Deviation	2	0.77	0.74	0.78
Median	2	2.00	2.00	2.00

Table 11: Regression Analyses for L1/Side by Side

Panelist	ENG-R	Probability	ENG-W	Probability	ENG-L	Probability	L1-R	Probability	CP	Probability
1	0.27	0.01	0.00	0.66	0.16	0.07	1.49	0.00	0.00	0.90
2	0.00	0.91	0.36	0.05	0.00	0.48	0.99	0.00	0.48	0.01
3	0.00	0.54	0.28	0.16	-0.27	0.04	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.69
4	0.00	0.68	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.22	1.76	0.00	0.00	0.37
5	-0.34	0.01	-0.21	0.27	0.00	0.91	0.48	0.01	-0.37	0.03
6	-0.59	0.00	-0.15	0.40	0.00	0.55	1.04	0.00	0.00	0.97
7	-0.31	0.00	0.00	0.57	0.00	0.27	1.49	0.00	0.00	0.73
8	0.00	0.53	0.00	0.61	0.00	0.60	1.44	0.00	-0.21	0.13
9	0.00	0.72	0.11	0.60	0.00	0.47	0.73	0.00	-0.16	0.40
10	0.00	0.75	0.11	0.54	-0.19	0.09	0.53	0.00	-0.19	0.22
11	-0.22	0.03	0.12	0.40	0.00	0.72	1.67	0.00	-0.10	0.45
12	-0.37	0.00	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.98	1.22	0.00	0.00	0.64
13	0.00	0.56	0.13	0.14	0.00	0.79	1.87	0.00	0.00	0.37
14	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.71	0.00	0.38	1.46	0.00	0.00	0.79
15	-0.57	0.00	0.00	0.58	0.00	0.72	1.17	0.00	0.00	0.60
16	-0.59	0.00	0.00	0.93	-0.23	0.05	0.73	0.00	-0.14	0.43
17	-0.48	0.00	0.10	0.50	0.00	0.81	1.09	0.00	-0.15	0.26
18	-0.49	0.00	0.00	0.96	-0.10	0.34	1.23	0.00	0.00	0.53
19	0.00	0.59	-0.10	0.48	0.00	0.40	1.02	0.00	-0.11	0.44
20	0.37	0.00	-0.14	0.39	-0.20	0.06	1.09	0.00	0.31	0.05
21	-0.22	0.01	0.00	0.54	0.00	0.25	1.65	0.00	0.00	0.45
22	0.11	0.16	0.10	0.37	0.00	0.53	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.61
23	-0.35	0.02	0.13	0.53	-0.16	0.25	0.45	0.02	0.00	0.92
24	0.30	0.02	-0.38	0.05	-0.26	0.04	0.21	0.22	-0.26	0.13
25	0.13	0.34	0.21	0.30	0.00	0.60	0.61	0.00	-0.15	0.42
26	0.00	0.58	0.00	0.91	0.00	0.37	1.79	0.00	0.00	0.54
27	-0.33	0.00	0.21	0.17	0.00	0.37	1.08	0.00	-0.26	0.07
28	0.13	0.09	-0.14	0.20	0.00	0.67	1.16	0.00	0.00	0.42
29	-0.17	0.15	-0.28	0.10	-0.15	0.17	1.23	0.00	-0.31	0.05

30	-0.43	0.00	0.00	0.94	-0.17	0.14	1.05	0.00	0.00	0.84
31	0.15	0.15	0.00	0.52	-0.13	0.19	1.23	0.00	0.00	0.75
32	-0.44	0.00	0.00	0.70	-0.15	0.12	1.35	0.00	-0.26	0.07
33	0.30	0.01	-0.15	0.33	0.00	0.41	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.82
34	0.38	0.00	-0.11	0.44	0.00	0.31	0.59	0.00	0.00	0.91

Table 12. Regression Analyses for Bilingual Word List

Panelist	ENG-R	Probability	ENG-W	Probability	ENG-L	Probability	L1-R	Probability	CP	Probability
1	0.23	0.02	0.00	0.91	0.00	0.49	1.47	0.00	-0.16	0.19
2	0.26	0.01	0.30	0.05	0.00	0.78	0.99	0.00	0.32	0.02
3	0.00	0.85	0.35	0.06	-0.41	0.00	0.33	0.06	0.19	0.28
4	0.00	0.91	0.25	0.06	-0.19	0.02	1.19	0.00	-0.25	0.04
5	0.11	0.23	-0.12	0.35	0.00	0.55	0.26	0.03	0.00	0.39
6	-0.86	0.00	0.00	0.66	-0.24	0.05	0.00	0.98	0.00	0.94
7	-0.15	0.08	-0.13	0.31	0.00	0.97	1.53	0.00	0.00	0.95
8	0.12	0.15	0.00	0.72	0.00	0.99	1.47	0.00	-0.14	0.29
9	-0.26	0.01	0.32	0.02	0.00	0.97	0.26	0.04	0.00	0.65
10	0.00	1.00	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.84	0.85	0.00	0.23	0.21
11	0.00	0.85	0.14	0.56	-0.15	0.34	0.47	0.04	0.00	0.98
12	-0.18	0.13	0.11	0.52	-0.13	0.23	0.58	0.00	-0.10	0.51
13	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.75	1.70	0.00	0.00	0.98
14	0.19	0.03	0.14	0.27	0.13	0.10	0.76	0.00	0.20	0.09
15	-0.52	0.00	0.24	0.12	0.00	0.37	1.02	0.00	-0.13	0.38
16	0.00	0.44	0.18	0.27	0.00	0.34	0.28	0.07	0.10	0.50
17	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.33	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.91
18	-0.23	0.05	0.00	0.79	0.00	0.53	1.02	0.00	-0.49	0.00
19	0.20	0.03	-0.14	0.31	0.00	0.50	0.81	0.00	0.00	0.83
20	0.25	0.01	0.00	0.55	-0.18	0.06	0.83	0.00	0.21	0.12
21	-0.19	0.46	0.00	0.90	0.00	0.51	1.37	0.00	0.00	0.70
22	0.00	0.34	0.00	0.76	0.00	0.88	1.41	0.00	0.00	0.98
23	-0.16	0.22	-0.21	0.27	-0.18	0.13	0.46	0.01	-0.21	0.22
24	0.00	0.79	-0.23	0.28	0.00	0.78	0.19	0.35	-0.16	0.43
25	0.19	0.15	0.24	0.21	-0.12	0.33	0.81	0.00	0.00	0.70
26	-0.13	0.25	0.00	0.64	0.00	0.77	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.95
27	0.41	0.00	0.22	0.05	0.00	0.69	0.22	0.04	0.15	0.15
28	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.53	0.00	0.21	0.95	0.00	0.21	0.07
29	0.44	0.00	0.29	0.08	0.00	0.72	0.58	0.00	-0.15	0.33

30	-0.32	0.01	-0.36	0.03	0.00	0.47	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.78
31	0.14	0.05	-0.24	0.02	0.10	0.13	0.81	0.00	0.00	0.61
32	-0.49	0.00	0.00	0.65	0.00	0.93	0.65	0.00	-0.21	0.23
33	0.42	0.00	0.00	0.64	0.00	0.54	0.57	0.00	0.14	0.40
34	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.60	-0.13	0.18	0.48	0.00	0.24	0.09

Table 13. Regression Analyses for Picture Dictionary

Panelist	ENG-R	Probability	ENG-W	Probability	ENG-L	Probability	L1-R	Probability	CP	Probability
1	-0.13	0.14	0.16	0.19	-0.13	0.09	-0.26	0.02	0.00	0.76
2	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.79	0.00	0.90	-0.22	0.24	-0.14	0.45
3	-0.31	0.02	0.17	0.40	0.00	0.56	-0.25	0.17	-0.20	0.26
4	0.00	0.40	-0.27	0.10	0.10	0.32	-0.25	0.10	-0.21	0.15
5	-0.24	0.01	0.00	0.53	0.00	0.55	-0.11	0.33	-0.30	0.01
6	-0.72	0.00	-0.27	0.16	0.00	0.93	-0.33	-0.69	0.00	0.78
7	-0.53	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.63	-0.39	0.01	0.00	0.70
8	-0.38	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.36	-0.40	0.00	-0.16	0.21
9	-0.31	0.00	0.00	0.85	-0.20	0.21	-0.32	0.01	-0.31	0.01
10	-0.75	0.00	-0.17	0.25	0.00	0.46	-0.67	0.00	0.00	0.57
11	-0.27	0.07	-0.12	0.60	0.00	0.98	-0.61	0.00	0.21	0.30
12	-0.36	0.00	-0.16	0.34	-0.22	0.04	-0.75	0.00	-0.44	0.01
13	-0.18	0.08	0.00	0.68	-0.22	0.02	-1.00	0.00	0.00	0.51
14	0.00	0.53	-0.12	0.38	-0.19	0.03	-0.78	0.00	0.00	0.84
15	-0.56	0.00	-0.35	0.03	0.00	0.45	-0.50	0.00	-0.23	0.11
16	-0.28	0.01	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.43	-1.11	0.00	-0.56	0.00
17	-0.44	0.00	0.00	0.73	-0.25	0.01	-0.69	0.00	-0.24	0.09
18	-0.51	0.00	-0.21	0.14	-0.18	0.05	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.53
19	0.00	0.64	-0.44	0.00	0.00	0.72	-0.19	0.13	0.00	0.73
20	-0.60	0.00	0.00	0.93	-0.13	0.32	-0.58	0.00	0.00	0.63
21	-0.42	0.00	-0.48	0.00	-0.19	0.06	0.28	0.06	-0.59	0.00
22	-0.21	0.00	0.00	0.68	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.52	0.00	0.46
23	-0.44	0.00	-0.41	0.03	-0.11	0.37	-0.38	0.03	-0.60	0.00
24	-0.20	0.10	0.00	0.69	0.00	0.65	-0.26	0.11	-0.39	0.02
25	-0.48	0.00	-0.28	0.21	0.00	1.00	-0.37	0.03	-0.30	0.08
26	-0.56	0.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.46	-0.79	0.00	-0.13	0.40
27	-0.31	0.06	-0.23	0.32	0.00	0.98	-0.28	0.19	-0.31	0.15
28	-0.19	0.10	0.12	0.49	-0.20	0.07	-0.51	0.00	-0.10	0.51
29	-0.45	0.00	-0.19	0.24	-0.27	0.01	-0.73	0.00	0.00	0.72

30	-0.59	0.00	-0.14	0.41	-0.16	0.14	-0.24	0.11	0.00	0.68
31	-0.28	0.02	0.00	0.96	0.15	0.18	0.11	0.50	-0.23	0.15
32	-0.73	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.00	0.74	-0.33	0.01	-0.17	0.19
33	-0.23	0.01	0.00	0.98	0.00	0.86	-0.12	0.34	-0.44	0.00
34	-0.27	0.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.88	-0.57	0.01	-0.38	0.08

Table 14. Regression Analyses for Oral English

Panelist	ENG-R	Probability	ENG-W	Probability	ENG-L	Probability	L1-R	Probability	CP	Probability
1	-0.30	0.01	0.12	0.48	0.75	0.00	-0.75	0.00	0.00	0.67
2	0.11	0.31	0.26	0.11	0.80	0.00	-0.19	0.21	0.00	0.92
3	-0.13	0.36	-0.33	0.13	-0.17	0.21	0.00	0.61	-0.79	0.00
4	-0.20	0.04	0.00	0.70	0.70	0.00	-0.30	0.02	-0.16	0.22
5	-0.39	0.00	-0.40	0.02	0.00	0.78	-0.37	0.03	-0.79	0.00
6	-0.47	0.00	-0.56	0.01	0.38	0.01	-0.78	0.00	0.13	0.50
7	-0.12	0.16	-0.12	0.35	0.97	0.00	-0.19	0.11	0.00	0.98
8	0.00	0.73	-0.13	0.31	0.96	0.00	-0.24	0.04	0.00	0.74
9	-0.45	0.00	0.23	0.07	0.83	0.00	-0.19	0.11	-0.17	0.15
10	-0.40	0.00	-0.25	0.08	0.55	0.00	-0.45	0.00	0.00	0.81
11	-0.73	0.00	0.20	0.31	0.49	0.00	-0.24	0.19	0.00	0.91
12	-0.67	0.00	0.27	0.03	0.75	0.00	-0.48	0.00	0.00	0.75
13	-0.43	0.00	0.00	0.61	0.57	0.00	-0.55	0.00	0.11	0.46
14	-0.42	0.00	-0.14	0.31	0.84	0.00	-0.57	0.00	-0.40	0.00
15	-0.22	0.01	0.00	0.09	0.34	0.00	-0.20	0.05	0.00	0.84
16	-0.48	0.00	0.00	0.71	0.33	0.00	-0.89	0.00	-0.14	0.32
17	-0.60	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.00	0.54
18	-0.42	0.00	-0.30	0.04	0.63	0.00	-0.23	0.08	-0.20	0.13
19	-0.29	0.00	0.11	0.39	0.58	0.00	-0.20	0.08	0.00	0.80
20	0.00	0.89	0.00	0.70	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.79
21	-0.55	0.00	-0.19	0.22	0.59	0.00	-0.19	0.18	-0.57	0.00
22	0.00	0.84	0.00	0.15	0.96	0.00	0.00	0.97	0.00	0.20
23	-0.14	0.19	0.32	0.04	0.46	0.00	-0.10	0.45	0.32	0.02
24	-0.37	0.00	-0.12	0.42	0.21	0.03	0.00	0.92	-0.29	0.04
25	-0.45	0.00	0.10	0.56	0.80	0.00	-0.47	0.01	0.00	0.96
26	-0.36	0.00	0.13	0.36	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.46	-0.32	0.02
27	-0.23	0.05	0.00	0.83	0.25	0.02	-0.35	0.03	-0.23	0.15
28	-0.14	0.13	0.00	0.58	0.54	0.00	-0.11	0.36	0.00	0.88
29	0.00	0.50	-0.12	0.35	0.79	0.00	-0.37	0.00	0.12	0.30

30	-0.69	0.00	0.16	0.40	0.36	0.00	-0.40	0.02	0.00	0.64
31	-0.31	0.00	0.18	0.20	0.56	0.00	-0.37	0.01	0.00	0.57
32	-0.47	0.00	-0.14	0.35	0.65	0.00	-0.40	0.01	0.17	0.23
33	0.00	0.95	0.00	0.84	0.82	0.00	-0.18	0.07	0.12	0.23
34	0.00	0.56	-0.28	0.01	0.97	0.00	-0.16	0.11	0.00	0.63

Table 15. Regression Analyses for Oral L1

Panelist	ENG-R	Probability	ENG-W	Probability	ENG-L	Probability	L1-R	Probability	CP	Probability
1	-0.11	0.41	0.00	0.90	0.25	0.04	0.50	0.01	-0.48	0.01
2	0.00	0.60	0.22	0.13	0.16	0.08	0.00	0.78	-0.26	0.05
3	-0.28	0.04	0.00	0.97	-0.18	0.14	-0.20	0.26	-0.70	0.00
4	-0.20	0.05	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.70	-0.19	0.18	-0.53	0.00
5	-0.22	0.06	-0.23	0.17	-0.20	0.07	0.00	0.73	-0.69	0.00
6	-0.62	0.00	-0.26	0.25	-0.10	0.46	-0.65	0.00	0.00	0.82
7	-0.14	0.16	-0.10	0.46	-0.16	0.08	0.52	0.00	-0.13	0.31
8	-0.28	0.06	0.00	0.97	-0.19	0.15	-0.25	0.19	-0.36	0.06
9	-0.26	0.01	0.00	0.97	-0.17	0.04	0.50	0.00	-0.30	0.01
10	-0.45	0.00	0.00	0.79	-0.68	0.00	-0.12	0.43	-0.34	0.02
11	-0.43	0.00	0.00	0.68	0.00	0.63	0.11	0.54	0.22	0.24
12	-0.46	0.00	0.20	0.25	-0.16	0.14	-0.11	0.51	-0.32	0.05
13	-0.22	0.05	-0.11	0.51	0.00	0.78	-0.33	0.03	0.29	0.06
14	-0.46	0.00	-0.22	0.20	-0.11	0.30	0.78	0.00	-0.38	0.02
15	-0.41	0.00	-0.28	0.04	-0.24	0.01	0.52	0.00	-0.22	0.08
16	-0.55	0.00	0.18	0.24	-0.32	0.00	-0.46	0.00	-0.48	0.00
17	-0.27	0.01	0.00	0.59	0.00	0.59	-1.04	0.00	0.00	0.87
18	-0.10	0.32	-0.30	0.05	-0.59	0.00	-0.30	0.03	-0.53	0.00
19	0.00	0.69	0.00	0.99	-0.15	0.10	0.00	0.86	-0.20	0.11
20	-0.22	0.01	0.00	0.41	0.00	0.58	-0.12	0.25	-0.44	0.00
21	-0.37	0.00	0.00	0.97	-0.26	0.01	0.15	0.27	-1.05	0.00
22	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.49	-0.20	0.15
23	-0.31	0.03	-0.30	0.13	0.00	0.44	0.00	0.79	-0.18	0.33
24	-0.51	0.00	0.00	0.84	0.15	0.24	0.00	0.66	-0.64	0.00
25	-0.27	0.04	-0.26	0.16	-0.45	0.00	-0.17	0.33	-0.32	0.06
26	-0.33	0.01	0.22	0.18	-0.20	0.06	0.28	0.07	-50.00	0.00
27	-0.39	0.00	0.12	0.49	0.00	0.90	0.61	0.00	-0.17	0.30
28	-0.16	0.10	-0.20	0.16	0.00	0.42	-0.53	0.00	-0.44	0.00
29	-0.23	0.08	0.00	0.78	-0.28	0.02	1.13	0.00	0.13	0.44

30	-0.11	0.21	-0.24	0.06	0.00	0.69	-0.51	0.00	0.00	0.42
31	-0.46	0.00	-0.13	0.37	-0.11	0.22	0.00	0.59	-0.68	0.00
32	-0.21	0.02	0.00	0.74	-0.10	0.20	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.80
33	-0.12	0.16	0.00	0.75	-0.25	0.00	0.32	0.01	-0.40	0.00
34	-0.14	0.23	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.80	1.09	0.00	0.00	0.55

Table 16. Number of Significant Coefficients (out of 34) from MAUT Analyses

Accommodation	Eng Read	Eng Writing	Eng Listen	L1 Read	CP
L1/Side X Side	21	2	3	33	4
Bilingual Word List	17	6	3	30	3
Picture Dictionary	24	4	6	20	9
Oral English	23	6	32	17	7
Oral L1	21	2	10	17	18

Table 17. Intra-rater Reliability: Exact Agreement on Repeated Profiles

Accommodation	Effectiveness	Validity	Endorsement	Average
L1/Side by Side	70	69	72	70.3
Bilingual Word List	62	62	58	60.7
Picture Dictionary	75	70	78	74.3
Oral English	65	66	66	65.7
Oral L1	66	67	69	67.3
Average	67.6	66.8	68.6	67.7

Overall average 67.7

Figure 1. Student background variables varied in the student profiles

Student Description Variables
(Independent Variables)

English Language Proficiency Scale

1. Beginner/low-intermediate ELL indicates that the student either has little or no proficiency in English or that the student can communicate with limited proficiency in English.

2. High-Intermediate ELL indicates that the student may communicate in English with a high level of proficiency relative to ESL/ESOL students, but may need help to function effectively in a mainstream setting. A student at this level may sometimes function well in English in the classroom and may even have exited an ESL/ESOL program. However, his or her ability to effectively use English in an academic setting may be somewhat inconsistent, and this student may still experience language-related difficulties on standardized content tests.

3. Grade-Level-Competitive ELL describes an ELL who has the English skills necessary to thrive in a mainstream classroom without extra support. This student is able to consistently use English to function effectively in the school environment. Although the student may have an accent and make some grammatical errors, these generally do not impede communication.

L1 Reading Proficiency Scale

1. Well below/below grade level indicates that the student's L1 proficiency is below what one would expect of grade-level peers enrolled in a full-time academic program in the native country.

2. At/above grade level indicates that the student can communicate in L1 at an advanced level that is competitive in meeting grade-level expectations in the native country.

Cultural Proximity Scale

The student's cultural profile is expressed through a single graph, which is a combination of three variables: Time in U.S., Experience with Testing Procedures, and Proximity of Previous Schooling. The meaning of each of these variables is explained below.

Time in U.S.

"Time in U.S." is a composite variable that reflects how much opportunity the student has had to adapt to U.S. culture. It takes into account how long the child has been in the United States, as well as his/her time spent in U.S. school systems. The higher this variable, the more likely the student is to be familiar with U.S. schools and assessment practices. Students who are relatively new to the country may not understand procedures associated with standardized tests in the U.S. and/or the purpose of these tests.

Experience with Testing Procedures

This is a measure of the exposure that the student has had to testing protocol in the United States. Assessment may differ in procedures from country to country, and depending on the circumstances the student has encountered thus far in his or her

schooling experience, the student may be quite familiar with the types of assessment procedures used in the U.S. or he or she may have little experience with them.

Proximity of Previous Schooling

If the student has attended school in the native country, this variable is a measure of how similar this schooling system, including academic assessment, was to the U.S. school system.

Figure 2. Descriptions of the accommodations used in the profiles

Accommodations
(Dependent Variables)

Native Language Forms

L1 form/ Side-by-side form

The L1 form is a translation of one or more standard testing forms used in a particular testing system or a transliteration or other native language form developed to be parallel to the standard test form in English. The grade-level reading load should be the same for the L1 version as for the English form.

In a side-by-side form, questions from the standard test form are printed on one side of the page and the same questions in L1 are printed on the other side of the page.

Tools

Bilingual word list/Electronic translator

A test-specific word list includes selected test words in English with the L1 word equivalent. This list does not include any content-area words that are being measured on the exam, or any examples or definitions. Alternately, a general bilingual word list, such as a bilingual dictionary or electronic translator, may be used.

Picture dictionary

This word list, specific to each content test, includes selected words in English with a pictorial representation of the term. This accommodation may be used to meet the needs of students who are not literate in L1 or for whom bilingual word lists are not available.

Administration

Oral English

In addition to the traditional means of having an adult administrator read test questions aloud in English, this accommodation can be administered by tape/CD or by video to a group of students, or by computer with voice capability. It is generally not considered a valid accommodation for tests of reading ability.

Oral L1

In addition to the traditional means of having an adult administrator read test questions aloud in the student's language, this accommodation can be administered by tape/CD or by video to a group of students, or by computer with voice capability.

Appendix

A. Student Profiles

B. Workshop Agenda

C. Panelists' Information Form

D. Evaluation Form

Adding Value to Accommodations Decision-Making (AVAD)
ELL SCASS Workshop
September 24-25, 2007
Nashua, NH

Agenda
September 24, 2007

9:00-9:30	Welcome and Introductions (Elizabeth Jones) {slides 1-2}
9:30-9:45	STELLA Background Information (Rebecca Kopriva)
9:45-10:00	AVAD Goals and Objectives (Lariza Miranda) {slides 3-14}
10:00-10:45	Orientation to the Multi-Attribute Utility Theory Methodology (MAUT) (Barbara Plake) {slides 15-21} o Component Descriptions (Nikki Mattson) {slides 22-24} o Rating Process (Barbara Plake) {slides 25-27}
10:45-11:00	Morning Break
11:00-12:00	Introduction to Using MAUT to Rate ELL Profiles: Modeling the Process Workshop (Barbara Plake) {slides 28-34}
12:00-1:00	Lunch
1:00-2:30	Continuation of Modeling the Rating Process Workshop (Barbara Plake) {slides 35-39}
2:30-3:00	Afternoon Break
3:00-4:30	Present Results from Practice Profiles (Barbara Plake)

AVAD/STELLA Expert Panel Meeting #1
September 24-25, 2007
Nashua, NH

Agenda
September 25, 2007

9:00-9:15	Synopsis of MAUT Analyses (Barbara Plake)
9:15-12:00	Rating Profiles (Barbara Plake) (Break as needed)
12:00-1:00	Lunch
1:00-2:45	Continue Rating Profiles (Barbara Plake)
2:45-3:00	Web Survey Demonstration (Nikki Mattson)
3:00-3:15	Preview of Future STELLA Activities (Rebecca Kopriva)
3:15-4:00	Evaluation (Phoebe Winter)
4:00-4:30	Questions and Discussion

Participant Information Form
ELL SCASS Workshop

September 24-25, 2007

Name:_____
Address:_____
_____
_____
Phone:_____
Fax:_____
Email:_____

Education:
Highest degree:_____
When received:_____
Additional credits:_____

Are you currently working with English Language Learners?

Yes / No (please circle)

Current position:_____

Number of years in education:_____

Specialization (if any):_____

Awards and Honors: Please list any teaching or education awards and honors you have received, giving date if possible.

_____
_____
_____
_____

Adding Value to Accommodations Decision-Making
Evaluation of MAUT Review Process
ELL SCASS Meeting
September 24 – 25, 2007

ID: _____

1. In general, to what extent did the student characteristics and narrative information contribute to your evaluation of the potential accommodations?

	Very little				Very much
English Language Proficiency – Reading	1	2	3	4	5
English Language Proficiency – Writing	1	2	3	4	5
English Language Proficiency – Listening	1	2	3	4	5
L1 Proficiency – Reading	1	2	3	4	5
Cultural Proximity	1	2	3	4	5
Narrative	1	2	3	4	5

	Never				Always
2. Did you have enough information about student characteristics to evaluate the potential accommodations?	1	2	3	4	5

3. What additional information about **students** would help you evaluate the potential accommodations?

	Useful				Critical
3a How important is it to have this information?	1	2	3	4	5

4. Did you have enough information about each potential accommodation to evaluate it?

L1/Side-by-Side Form	Yes	No
Bilingual Word List	Yes	No
Picture Dictionary	Yes	No
Oral L1	Yes	No
Oral English	Yes	No

4a. If you answered “no” to any accommodation, what additional information did you need?

5. How appropriate is each rating variable in terms of evaluating accommodations?

	Not at all appropriate				Very appropriate
Effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
Validity	1	2	3	4	5
Endorsement	1	2	3	4	5

6. How confident do you feel about each type of rating you assigned to accommodations based on student characteristics?

	Not at all confident				Very confident
Effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
Validity	1	2	3	4	5
Endorsement	1	2	3	4	5

7. Did you participate in the September 10 WebEx training?	Yes	No

8. Please write any other comments you'd like to make about the MAUT process or STELLA here.