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ABSTRACT

Oral Language Proficiency Testing with Navajo Students:
Issues and Problems

by

Carolyn Martin, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1985

Major Professor: Dr. Damian McShane
Department: Psychology

The purpose of this paper is to review and analyze the available literature focusing upon exit criteria for bilingual programs, especially in relation to student achievement thresholds, and the appropriateness of oral language tests used in establishing a student's readiness to terminate participation in a bilingual program and enter monolingual educational environments.

(34 pages)
PROBLEM STATEMENT

Bilingual education programs for children whose first language is a language other than English have created testing requirements beyond the current capabilities of professionals responsible for regular education programs. These requirements involve establishing appropriate criteria for selecting students to enter such programs and criteria for students to exit such programs. In effect testing provides a determination of which students can best benefit from native language instruction and which students can function in a mainstream English language program.

In the process of attempting to define appropriate criteria, several difficult questions present themselves. Are tests purported to be valid measures of monolingual children’s language production also valid measures of the language production of Navajo children with such widely varied backgrounds as monolingual Navajo, bilingual Navajo/English, or monolingual English (who lack a common background with the monolingual Anglo or Hispanic children and also other bilingual children from different cultural groups)? Are there sufficient data to determine what level of language skill is needed to function effectively in an English medium classroom? How complex should the gradations be in scoring the test? Should gradations exist or is a simple yes-no score sufficient?

Major decisions regarding individual students and funding for schools are being made today on the basis of tests that are of doubtful
validity for establishing entry-exit proficiency of the students.
Section 15-799.02.B of Title 15, chapter 7, Article 8 of Arizona Revised Statutes reads:

By December 1 of each year, the school district shall determine the language proficiency in both English and the primary home language of all new pupils identified as having a primary home language other than English. The school district shall use language assessment instruments approved by the State Board of Education to determine language proficiency.

The tests approved by the Arizona State Department of Education for oral assessment of English language are:

Bilingual Syntax Measure I (BSM I) K-2
Bilingual Syntax Measure II (BSM II) 3-12
IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test I (IPT I) K-6
IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test II (IPT II) 7-12
Language Assessment Scales I (LAS I) Forms A and B K-5
Language Assessment Scales II (LAS II) Forms A and B 6-12
Language Assessment Scales I (LAS I) Short Form K-12
Language Assessment Scales II (LAS II) Short Form 6-12

Section R7-2-306-B-2 Arizona State Department of Education Regulations provides that: "...students who score below the publisher's designated score for fluent English proficient shall be classified as English limited proficient."

The above standards apply to entry into the program, and the Arizona standards are more strict for reclassification out of the program.
Thus, students are being accepted into bilingual education programs and directed into monolingual education programs on the basis of scores on tests which are of questionable value. Oller (1976), for example, argued: "Unfortunately, the empirical evidence for the reliability of the Bilingual Syntax Measurement is not particularly impressive. The highest estimates range from .41 to .77" (p. 118).

No reliability figures could be found for the IDEA Oral Language Proficient Test or the Language Assessment Scales in the Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook or other available sources.

One concern of the author has been what should be tested by a language proficiency test. Wald (1981) lists the core linguistic components most widely used by language proficiency instruments as:

1. Phonology: The pronunciation and perception of linguistic sounds.

2. Morphology: The process of word formation; particularly, for English, the most frequently used inflectional suffixes.

3. Syntax: The process of sentence formation; the organization of words into sentences and intermediate units, i.e., clauses and phrases (p. 53).

Wald (1981) compared the Bilingual Syntax Measure and the Language Assessment Scale and found that the Bilingual Syntax Measure assessed only morphology; the Language Assessment Scale measured mainly phonology and lexicon. He quoted a 1980 California State Department of Education comparability study of the BINL, BSM, and the LAS. (See Appendix A.)
1. Different tests identified different percentages of the same population as LES, etc. (LEP).

2. BSM was the hardest at each grade level, but BINL shifted from easiest to second place at grade 3.

3. BINL/LAS had the highest agreement, from 45% at grade 3, progressing to 65% at grade 5. (p. 118)

Cummins (1980) argued that two levels of language proficiency exist. One is Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS), the other, Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). He stated:

The data suggest that "equality" of academic potential performance is not attained until the later grades of elementary school.

Many minority students will be fluent in English prior to that time and may qualify to exit a bilingual program on the basis of a "natural communication" task such as on the Bilingual Syntax Measure or the Basic Inventory of Natural Language. However,...

fluency in English BICS does not necessarily imply commensurate proficiency in English CALP. (p. 53)

Rudolph Troike in 1982 wrote:

Since the demands for language assessment are there, mandated by law and court decisions, what can we do? We can, as many already do, try to take other factors such as achievement scores into account, and avoid, if possible, using a language score as the sole criterion for program exit. Meanwhile, we need additional research, of course, but more importantly, we need to work to convince legislators, administrators, and others
that academic achievement, rather than English proficiency, should be the basis for exiting from a bilingual program. Better than that, we should seek to remove the compensatory label from bilingual education and work to institutionalize it as a permanent program option which is available to all students and in which requirements for program exit would not exist. (p. 5)
OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this paper is to review the available research which focus on exit criteria for bilingual programs in relation to actual student achievement and the appropriateness of tests of oral language in the establishment of a student's readiness for exit from a bilingual program. The establishment of appropriate criteria is vital to the continued operation of bilingual programs in Contract Schools on the Navajo reservation in light of the January 3, 1985, letter from Dr. Kenneth Ross, Acting Director, Office of Indian Education Programs, setting forth guidelines for intense Bilingual Education Program funding. The revised guidelines set forth in Dr. Ross's letter rescind those guidelines that are presently in the Indian School Equalization Program. The proposed guidelines provide in part:

Bilingual education programs shall be designed to meet the needs of identified limited English proficient children in kindergarten through third grade. However, if participation of children beyond the third grade is necessary, the school will:

1. Conduct a complete formal need assessment....

Another part of the proposed guidelines states:

An assessment shall be administered individually to each child and must differentiate between children with language problems related to learning disabilities and children who are of limited English proficiency.
Under the subject of evaluation, these proposed guidelines provide:

An evaluation shall be conducted annually for each participant in a bilingual education program. The objective of the evaluation will be to measure the child's progress in improving their English language skills. The evaluation instrument(s) shall be appropriate for the skills and grade level of the child and is to be used to determine the progress in improving their English language skills. A student can no longer be counted for ISEP funding or participate in a ISEP (sic) funded program when:

1. A child is proficient in the English language skills as determined by a formal evaluative instrument, or
2. Instruction is in the English language.

Contract schools have been a part of the education of the Navajo people for over fifteen years. The programs have been located throughout the reservation and surrounding withdrawn land and share many characteristics such as:

1. They are community controlled.
2. They serve a Navajo language speaking population.
3. The initial years of the program are devoted to one-half to a full day of the use of Navajo as a medium of instruction. The use of Navajo as a medium of instruction is continued throughout the student's schooling.
4. The curriculum of the Navajo program is similar in content to that of the English program.
William J. Kniseley, the curriculum coordinator of Borrego Pass School, in a memorandum to the school director, stated:

The proposed guidelines would effectively destroy the successful bilingual program we have developed over the past five years. In grades four through eight the Navajo language arts program, which concentrates on developing cognitive/academic language proficiency in Navajo that transfers into English, is taught by teacher-trainees funded under the Intense Bilingual Funding and would have to be discontinued. Our Navajo language reading series for grades four through eight (14 out of 25 textbooks) would no longer be of use and the need for the Navajo language test materials developed for these grades would disappear.

It is apparent in these days of diminished funding that such programs cannot be carried on without increased funding for personnel and materials. Mr. Kniseley accurately describes the results of such action on the part of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
PROCEDURE

In conducting the review of previous research for this paper two questions formed the basis for research.

1. Is there a need for entry/exit criteria in bilingual education for Indian students?

2. Are there appropriate standardized instruments available to measure cognitive/academic language proficiency of Navajo Indian students?

The author has reviewed over fifty research studies representing every region of the country, Canada, and Mexico, of which twenty dealt with the problem directly rather than quoting other sources. These studies, which were identified by means of an ERIC search, a review of TESOL journals, and the facilities of the University of New Mexico library, appeared to be the definitive works on oral language proficiency assessment published to date. It is the author's belief that this review is the most comprehensive possible given the facilities available. Those studies judged to apply to the questions stated above are referred to in the review of literature and are listed in the references.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

An examination of the many tests of language proficiency and language dominance available for assessing students in bilingual programs reveals a wide variation in what they purport to measure. Of the 46 tests examined by DeAvila and Duncan (1978), four included a measure of pronunciation, 43 claimed to measure the use and meaning of words, 34 contained items on phrase, clause, and sentence construction, and nine attempted to measure conversational aspects of the language.

This wide variation between what language proficiency tests purport to measure probably arises from the organization of bilingual education programs. The demand for measures of language proficiency and dominance arose from the belief that the mismatch between home language and school language was the major cause of minority children's failure in school. Therefore, it was assumed that children should be educated in their home language and in English until the children were proficient enough in English to benefit from an English only program. Thus, it became necessary to devise a means of determining when a child was proficient enough in English to exit the bilingual program and the era of language proficiency test development began.

Test developers sought measures that were easily quantifiable, and they focused upon communicative aspects of the language. The content validity of the test became the critical factor and the predictive validity of the test was disregarded. For example, Burt and Dulay (authors of the Bilingual Syntax Measure) in 1978 argued:
It is not at all clear how the results of a linguistic manipulation task is related to a student's overall communicative proficiency leaving the validity of linguistic manipulation tasks in some doubt, if their results are to be used as an indicator of general level of communicative ability or proficiency. (p. 178)

Oller (1976) argues:
The authors [Burt and Dulay] defend the relatively low levels of reliability by saying that a very high level of reliability for this test would suggest that it was not sensitive to changes in a child's speech, and, hence, not adequately reflective of the acquisition process. This, however, is a just defense only if the low reliabilities, in fact, indicate real changes in the child's speech. This has certainly not been demonstrated. Clearly it would be absurd to argue that low reliability necessarily indicated "sensitivity to change." A more likely reason for low reliability is insensitivity to precisely what the test purports to measure. (p. 399)

The emphasis on communicative skills is appropriate if the purpose of the assessment is to diagnose weaknesses in the students' interpersonal communicative skills. However, such tasks are inappropriate to measure the students' thinking and learning skills, especially in a second language. The ability to communicate in social context in no way relates to his ability to adequately perform in an English only classroom.
The relevance of tests based upon the assumption that communication skill predicts academic readiness, and the placement of children in classrooms considered linguistically appropriate on the basis of such tests is questionable. Furthermore, consideration of the nature of language proficiency and its crosslingual dimensions, as reviewed above, suggests that many widely used tests of language dominance and proficiency may be of doubtful validity for educational placement programs.

In his article "Zeno's paradox and language assessment," Troike (1982) stated:

I have argued on somewhat different grounds that English language proficiency, as ordinarily conceived, is, beyond a minimum level, only a small and perhaps largely irrelevant factor in school achievement of NEB [non-English background] students. To take a simple example; various American Indian tribes have given up their native language and have adopted English instead, but they have not improved their school achievement as might have been expected if language proficiency were the main factor inhibiting achievement. (p. 4)

Most of the literature reviewed has been based upon Indo-European languages which are only remotely related to Indian languages, and to Navajo in particular. An analysis of the Language Assessment Scales, The Basic Inventory of Natural Language, the Language Assessment Battery, and the Bilingual Syntax Measure conducted by Merino and Spencer reported at the National Association for Bilingual Education Conference in Washington, D.C., attended by the author, in 1983 found
that there is substantial reason to doubt the comparability of these oral language proficiency instruments across languages.

The studies reviewed have revealed the possibility of a language continuum rather than discrete-point polarities and the extreme importance of ethnographic observation and analysis rather than statistical or quantitative analysis. On one side of the midpoint of such a continuum would lie the mainly English speaking child, on the other, the mainly native language speaker. The midpoint would be the true bilingual. It is unfortunate that at some point, in either direction from the midpoint, would be the semilingual child who is not proficient in any language. At Borrego Pass School, this child constitutes about 15% of the school population.

Communication, for the purpose of this paper, is defined as the process which joins speech, language, and interaction within a particular situation. Competence is the ability to select, deliver, and evaluate communication messages according to individual goals. Cognitive competence aims at understanding the underlying skill or structure for the purpose of detailing relevant behavior aspects. Communicative performance has been emphasized rather than communicative competence. It is felt by the author that tests measuring communicative competence are better predictors of communicative skills than tests which measure formal language skills. But a discrepancy exists between the constructs used to measure language proficiency and the repertoire of a bilingual child in a natural setting. There is a need for new test constructs for measuring language proficiency that are more
holistic in nature and which show a knowledge of or are based on what children do with language.

Kniseley, the curriculum coordinator at Borrego Pass School, reported:

We teach the child in his native language (hopefully CALP is taught) in order to provide transference of the cognitive skills learned. If the child has been taught properly, and the transference has, in fact, taken place when English was taught, we can test that transference. If the transference has taken place, then the child can survive in an English classroom. If there has been no transference, the child will flounder until he learns the cognitive skills in English or drops out.

He continued:

When context embedded approaches which focus on that which is necessary, relevant, and useful for the student are used, transference will take place and that transference can be tested. Probably the hardest thing is to focus the student's attention on what is necessary, relevant, and useful. Interpersonal communications skills are more attractive because they enable the student to communicate with others about superficial matters and require little, if any, mental effort.

He concluded:

What we are seeking are the conceptual aspects of his ability to use English (or his native language), and I believe a test basically encompassing the skills listed could accomplish just that. (1985)
The skills referred to by Kniseley are listed in Appendix B.

The literature reviewed suggests that the performance of bilingual children on a test of English language facility is affected by at least four factors: the child's previous test taking experience, his/her motivation to perform well, the rapport between the child and the examiner, and the child's socioeconomic status. This is especially true of Navajo children, and may, to some extent, influence the scores of Navajo children on oral language proficiency tests.

When a monolingual child enters the first grade, he can understand much of the spoken native language he hears. Saville-Troike (1973) stated:

Much of a child's language development is completed before he ever comes to school. In addition, he can pronounce with correct meaning many of the words in his native language. It is also true that a child can understand and use simple, compound, and complex sentences at this early age. He demonstrates an awareness of the structure of language. (p. 165)

Language structures (patterns) are only one feature of any language. Menyuk (1971) stated: "All languages are composed of speech sounds, syllables, morphemes and sentences, and meaning is largely conveyed by the properties and particular use of these units" (p. 3).

Other features are the sound system, which include stress, intonation, and juncture; vocabulary (lexicon); and content words, which divide the English language into things, actions, and quantities.
However, tests of oral language proficiency have elected only to evaluate structure since this feature more readily lends itself to some degree of quantitative measure. Bejar (1978) reviewing the Bilingual Syntax Measure for the Eighth Mental Measurement Yearbook stated:

...one is inclined to question the wisdom of using syntax as the only criterion for measuring language proficiency. One is further inclined to wonder whether the authors considered carefully enough alternative procedures and strategies for the evaluation of the test reliability. (p. 233)

Oller (1978) argued that: "There exists a global language proficiency factor which accounts for the bulk of the reliable variance in a wide variety of language proficiency measures" (p. 413).

This "global language proficiency factor" mentioned by Oller and repeated in Oller and Perkins (1978) refers to thinking and learning skills. Shuy (1976) diagrammatically illustrated the difference between communication skills, thinking, and learning skills through the use of the "iceberg metaphor" (see Appendix C). This representation is used in an attempt to demonstrate that the visible features of language, assessed by oral language proficiency tests, are not necessarily those meaningful for functioning in a classroom environment. He suggested that the less visible dimensions of semantic and functionals meaning are critical for functioning in a language but are not the dimensions assessed by oral language proficiency tests since they do not easily lend themselves to quantitative measurement.
Hernandez-Chavez, Burt, and Dulay (1978) reported that natural communication tasks and linguistic manipulation tasks "give quite different results in terms of the quality of language produced" (p. 52).

Burt and Dulay, the authors of the Bilingual Syntax Measure, (1978) defined the distinction as follows:

A natural communication task is one where the focus of the student is on communicating something to someone else--an idea, some information or an opinion in a natural manner...on the other hand, a linguistic manipulation task is one where the focus of the student is on performing the conscious linguistic manipulation required by the task. (p. 184)

Oller (1976) held,

It is surprising and, in my view, unfortunate that the authors (of the Bilingual Syntax Measure) recommend a kind of discrete point syntactic scoring.... It seems remarkable that the long-standing controversy concerning pragmatic (or discrete point) testing has apparently been unnoticed by the authors of the Bilingual Syntax Measure. (p. 236)

Wells (1979) pointed out that "The oral language production skills of preschoolers are only weakly related to the later acquisition of reading skills in school"(p. 77).

This is not to say that the development of communication skills is completely independent of thinking and learning skills. Cummins (1980) diagrammatically presented the relationship of the various determinants of educational progress. In the diagram, shown as
Appendix I, he uses the acronym CALP to designate thinking and learning skills.

Gensee (1979) suggested that:

One might expect the language specific skills (those which are not easily transferable from language to language) to include the more technical aspects of language, such as spelling patterns or syntactic rules, whereas the transferable skills may be more in the nature of cognitive processes, such as the use of one's knowledge of the syntactic transitional probabilities of a language in reading. (pp. 74-75)

The exit fallacy, consisting of the assumption that mainstreaming Indian children out of a bilingual program into an English-only program will promote the development of English literacy skills more effectively than if children were maintained in a bilingual program, is deeply engrained in the thinking of policy makers. However, among the hundreds of evaluations of bilingual programs carried out over the world over the past 20 years, no research has conclusively shown that transition programs are superior to maintenance programs. On the contrary, the pattern of results in a vast majority of the research findings has revealed that there is a significant direct relationship between the amount of instructional time through the minority language and student achievement.

Paulson (1975) stated:

Rhetoric about cultural pluralism accounts for little if the objectives are not implemented. The community run Navajo school,
as measured by the achievement test batteries from the California Test Bureau, was markedly inferior to the government-run school academically. I was investigating the learning of English-language skills, but that standard—and the evaluation itself—shows our tendency to use conservative standards (with technique as a priority) to evaluate schooling of groups undergoing a revitalization movement (with moral learning as the priority). (p. 42)

Paulson was referring to Rough Rock Demonstration School.

The findings of the author's research are best summed up in a statement by Silverman and Russell (1977):

"Language dominance" is a relatively new concept in linguistics and education. In fact, it may not be unreasonable to say that "language dominance" is a legal and political rather than a linguistic, educational or psychological construct. That is, the concept originated as the results of the Lau v. Nichols court decision and the subsequent "Remedies." As mentioned, districts have been mandated to determine the "language dominance" of their students and as a result they have turned to the linguistic, educational and psychological professions for measures. As a result of this need, within the past few years, there has been a phenomenal increase in the numbers of instruments which purport to measure "language dominance." Each looks at the question in a somewhat different way. Some look at syntax, others vocabulary, others general communicative competence, and still others look at combinations of these aspects of language.
What there hasn't been is a concerted effort to first carefully define the phenomenon before instruments are devised to measure it. Throughout this paper "language dominance" has been written in quotation marks to reflect the ambiguity of the concept. These statements should not be interpreted as an attack against either school districts or professionals who are responding to a very real need. Rather, it is a plea for more work that needs to be done. (pp. 24-25)
DISCUSSION

It is the opinion of the author that the eventual outcome of language assessment testing will depend upon the extent to which sociolinguistic knowledge is used in the design of instruments for such assessment. Functional language studies of both the native language and the host language will be necessary for the development of effective evaluation instruments, since a child's ability to use language efficiently is vastly more critical than lexicon, pronunciation, or grammar, the items usually emphasized on language tests.

The total context of the bilingual program at Borrego Pass School is the emphasis on the development of cognitive-academic language skills in both English and Navajo from grades three through eight. This emphasis is not totally apparent from results of the federally required evaluations which tend to place emphasis on short-term outcomes, such as student achievement on measures such as the CTBS, and the emphasis on measurement of the effectiveness of policy-makers' goals. What should be examined are the sociocultural dimensions that consider the total context of the school environment, including its relationship to the community.

The Borrego Pass School program for grades four through eight utilizes the Navajo language as a means of instruction for approximately 12.5% of the school day. During this period, the Navajo instruction (delivered by a non-certified teacher-trainee) focuses on the development of problem solving skills. The remaining
87.5% of the school instruction utilizes the English language. There are 14 locally developed Navajo language textbooks for use during this five year period. Restraints on "code-switching" during the Navajo language instruction help preserve the integrity of the language.

It is easy to confuse teaching and testing which are two separate processes even though easy to misidentify. At Borrego Pass School, we teach the child in his native language in order to provide transference of the cognitive skills learned. If the child has been taught properly, and the transference has, in fact, taken place when English was taught, we can test that transference. If the transference has taken place, then the child can survive in an English classroom. If there has been no transference, the child will flounder until he learns the cognitive skills in English or drops out.

The problem, as the author perceives it, lies in the fact that comparability of oral language proficiency instruments across languages varies greatly. As previously mentioned, most oral language proficiency instruments were designed for Indo-European languages which have little, if any, comparability to Navajo (or any other Indian language).

Some may question as to why the school can't just go ahead and teach the objective in English first. If this is a valid question, then it goes to the roots of bilingual education and questions the validity of the educational processes we have so patiently designed over the years. This would bring us full circle back to the English immersion programs which everyone fought so hard to replace.
When context embedded approaches which focus on that which is necessary, relevant, and useful for the student are used, transference will take place and that transference can be tested. Probably the hardest thing is to focus the student's attention on what is necessary, relevant, and useful. Interpersonal communications skills are more attractive because they enable the student to communicate with others about superficial matters and require little, if any, mental effort.

The language continuum rather than discrete-points of measurement of a child's ability to use language efficiently mentioned previously, and, by efficiently the author means items other than lexicon, pronunciation, or grammar, must be considered. What we are seeking are the conceptual aspects of his ability to use English (or his native language), and the author believes a test basically encompassing the skills listed in Appendix B could accomplish just that. The domain being assessed (home, school, job market, culture, etc.) would have to be taken into consideration but that is incidental to the pre-planning stage.
RESEARCH DESIGN

The author proposes the utilization of the CALP skills listed in Appendix B for the development of a Navajo/English language proficiency test. The population of Borrego Pass School (approximately 200 students) could be used for norming purposes. The wide variation from monolingual Navajo to monolingual English (including the semilingual children) should give a wide base for establishing norms. The data base should include the oral language use within the community, the extent of use of the native language for official and community purposes, the Tribal language policy, samples of language usage on all age groups, survey of homes for primary language, and teacher/teacher aide observations. The cooperation of other schools serving Navajo students would be sought.

If the test items were kept relevant to the children, the items were timed to reduce mental translation by the children, and the scoring was continuum based rather than discrete point based, it might be possible to develop a CALP measurement rather than a BICS measurement of language proficiency. The items and administration instructions should be submitted to persons knowledgeable in the native language and culture, by teachers at the grade levels for which the measurement instrument is designed, and a student committee for relevance. That is the research design proposed by the author to be used by the Curriculum Center at Borrego Pass School.

The draft form of the instrument should be pilot tested on the school population across grade levels so that norms above and below
the target grade may be established. These data should be carefully analyzed and inappropriate items deleted. From this analysis, the number of items that should constitute the test may be determined, the time frame for administration of the test may be set, and the user manual, test directions and directions to the students may be modified to conform to the pilot testing. Continual revision of the instrument and the field test cycle will be necessary.
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APPENDIXES
Appendix A

Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BICS</td>
<td>Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BINL</td>
<td>Basic Inventory of Natural Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSM</td>
<td>Bilingual Syntax Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALP</td>
<td>Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT</td>
<td>Idea Oral Language Proficiency Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEP</td>
<td>Indian School Equalization Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>Language Assessment Scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>Limited English Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LES</td>
<td>Limited English Speaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B

**CALP Proficiency Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify Money</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze Symmetry</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent Figures</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Main Idea</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify True and False Sentences</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Basic Measurements</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe Feelings</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw Conclusions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Abstract Shapes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence of Events</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorize Pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Picture Synonyms and Antonyms</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe Motives</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose Shapes In Sequence</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimeaning Words</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Traits</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare Characters</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause and Effect</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predict Future Events</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality and Fantasy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Solid Figures</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret Graphs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine Author's Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact and Opinion</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive Techniques</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic and Roman Numerals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Fractional Parts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent Figures</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

"Iceberg"

The "ICEBERG" Representation of Language Proficiency
Appendix D

Relationship of CALP to Language Proficiency

Relationship of CALP to Language Proficiency, Cognitive and Memory Skills and Educational Progress.