City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research

Brooklyn College

2016

An Exploration of Elementary Teachers' Views of Informal Reading Inventories in Dual Language Bilingual Programs

Laura Ascenzi-Moreno
CUNY Brooklyn College

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/bc_pubs/101

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

An Exploration of Elementary Teachers' Views of Informal Reading Inventories in Dual Language Bilingual Programs

Laura Ascenzi-Moreno

Brooklyn College School of Education, City University of New York (CUNY), New York, New York

ABSTRACT

This study examines how elementary teachers (grades three through five) in dual-language, bilingual programs (Spanish/English) view informal reading inventories (IRIs) to support their students' reading growth. The research, conducted in an urban district in the Northeastern United States, draws on interviews with 20 teachers in these programs. One significant finding is that although teachers in the sample collected IRIs in the two languages of instruction, they did not examine English and Spanish reading assessment data side by side in order to construct a unified portrait of their students as bilingual readers. This study highlights the finding that IRIs are currently viewed as monolingual assessments rather than as a lens into students' biliteracy, thus bypassing a powerful way to assist teachers in making instructional decisions in support of students' bilingual reading development.

KEYWORDS

Assessment; biliteracy;
emergent bilingual students;
Informal Reading Inventories

Reading is at the heart of all schooling (Bialystok, Luk, & Kwan, 2005; Proctor, Carlo, August, & Snow, 2005). Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that teachers know how students become readers, can assess their reading, and can draw on assessment data to craft instructional practices in support of reading development. This is a complex task, in particular, when children are developing to be readers in two or more languages, as is the case of students in bilingual settings such as dual-language, bilingual (DLB) programs. Considered a strong form of bilingual education, the goal of DLB programs is to develop students' bilingualism and biliteracy in two languages (García, 2009). Due to their popularity and effectiveness (Escamilla, Hopewell, & Butvilofsky, 2013), these programs have rapidly expanded across the United States. To illustrate, there are currently about 1,500 to 2,000 such programs across the country (J. Sugarman, personal communication, June 23, 2015). The prevailing effort to assess reading and use data to inform instruction cuts across all programs, including DLB programs. Yet, how teachers in DLB settings use reading assessments to adapt instruction to support biliteracy has received little attention in the fields of bilingual education and literacy studies (Gandy, 2013; Spinelli, 2008). This article examines elementary teachers' views of informal reading inventories (IRIs), a commonly used reading assessment (Paris, 2002), in favor of biliteracy.

Because this article is at the intersection of bilingual education and literacy, I have delineated terms that are employed in this work (see Table 1). The selection of these terms reflects important conceptual shifts in bilingual education. For example, I utilize

Table 1. Key terms in bilingual education.

Term	Definition
Bilingual education	A mode of educating students in two (or more) languages with the additional goals of bilingualism and of the ability to “function across cultures” (García, 2009, p. 5). Language is used as a medium of instruction rather than a subject (García, 2009).
Bilingualism and bilinguals	The ability to operate in two or more languages. “Bilinguals are those who use two or more languages (or dialects) in their everyday lives” (Grosjean as cited by Baker, 2011, p. 4).
Biliteracy	A multilayered and interactive process in which bilinguals acquire reading and writing skills across languages (Pacheco, 2010).
Dynamic bilingualism	A framework for describing holistic practices of bilingual people. Under this framework, language is conceived of as “practice” and therefore is malleable and shaped by language users (García, 2009).
Emergent bilingual	Students who are in the process of learning two or more languages. The word, “emergent,” emphasizes that students are in continual process of learning language (García et al., 2008).
Parallel bilingualism	A framework in which bilinguals are viewed as two monolinguals in one (Baker, 2011). Therefore, competencies in each language are not used to “mutually reinforce” areas of instruction such as literacy (Soltero-González et al., 2012).
Dual-Language Bilingual (DLB)	A form of bilingual education of which the central goal is for students to acquire language and content in two languages (Baker, 2011). Fundamental to this model is that language is viewed as a resource (Reyes, 2006).

the term, emergent bilingual, developed by García, Kleifgen, and Falchi (2008) over English Language Learner (ELL) and Limited English Proficient (LEP). Although these terms refer to similar populations of students, they point to fundamental differences in how the acquisition of language and bilingualism is valued and conceived. In particular, the language embedded in ELL and LEP highlights students’ lack of English and therefore stems from a deficit perspective (Gutiérrez & Faulstich Orellana, 2006). In contrast, the term emergent bilingual places the word bilingual at the center of the definition and therefore showcases students’ linguistic resources as a source of strength. Additionally, the term emergent bilingual describes students who are in the process of learning two or more languages.

Bilingualism, the acquisition of two or more languages, and biliteracy, the development of literacy practices in two or more languages, are abilities that are valued worldwide (Baker, 2011; García, 2009). Despite the strong backlash against bilingual education in some areas of the United States (Reyes, 2006), many communities “are looking beyond our borders and seeing the world through new eyes and languages” (García, 2009, p. 194). The increased focus on bilingual programs stems from a heightened awareness of their effectiveness in maintaining and developing skills and abilities in two languages within an environment that values and recognizes students’ diverse cultures (Baker, 2011). Moreover, there is evidence that bilingual schooling provides students with greater chances at academic success. In a study by Umansky and Reardon (2014), students in bilingual programs both achieved at grade-level literacy expectations and outperformed their monolingual English counterparts on English proficiency measures. Bialystok (2007) has also documented potential benefits that extend beyond bilingualism such as the acquisition of metalinguistic awareness, loosely defined as the ability to consciously reflect on the structures and design of language and the ability to apply what is known in one language to another, often referred to as cross-linguistic transfer.

The beneficial effects of bilingual programming have strengthened the resolve of bilingual advocates for these types of programs for emergent bilingual students and thus have triggered the creation of DLB programs across the country. Within these programs,

how bilingualism is understood has profound impacts on the language and literacy practices in place.

Because it is central to the framing of the study, an explanation of dynamic bilingualism is necessary here. In contrast to a parallel monolingual framework, where languages are thought of as separate entities, under dynamic bilingualism language practices exist in relationship to each other (García, 2009; García & Li Wei, 2014). For example, instead of thinking of emergent bilinguals as acquiring reading in English and in Spanish separately, as through a parallel monolingual lens, through dynamic bilingualism, students' reading development is nurtured by their abilities across languages. In other words, a dynamic bilingual perspective posits that students' diverse literacy practices are in fact unified and develop as such. In this way, teachers in DLB programs should view emergent bilingual students' reading assessments in both English and Spanish (as in this study) as comprising a holistic portrait of the child as a bilingual reader.

Since the focus of this study is on reading assessment in a DLB context, the intended promise of assessment to inform instruction for emergent bilinguals must be examined. As Datnow and Park (2015) contend, "data use provides a lever for school improvement, but if the process isn't implemented effectively, it won't deliver" (p. 49). For teachers in DLB programs, meaningful use of data would be one that is rooted in dynamic bilingual practices thus bringing forth students' entire repertoire of skills and abilities in all languages to the learning process. The purpose of this research was to explore from elementary teachers' perspectives how they view IRIs in support of bilingual reading development. As such, the following questions framed the work:

- (1) How do elementary teachers in DLB programs view the purpose of IRIs for their emergent bilingual students?
- (2) What do elementary teachers in DLB programs learn about their students' bilingual reading development from IRIs?

In the following section, I present a literature review that joins scholarship from the fields of reading and bilingual education. In the first section of the literature review, I discuss the complexity of assessing bilingual reading development alongside the concept of dynamic bilingualism. In this section, I further elaborate how dynamic bilingualism can be used as a conceptual framework that informs and impacts the assessment of bilingual reading development. Also as part of the literature review, I provide an overview of IRIs as an assessment tool, discussing their components and how they are currently used in DLB classrooms.

Literature review and conceptual framework

Reading and dynamic bilingualism

Students' bilingualism indelibly shapes reading development in multiple ways (Baker, 2011; Bernhardt, 2003; Proctor, August, Snow, & Barr, 2010). Bialystok et al. (2005) identify oral language development, phonological awareness, and metalinguistic awareness as three fundamental areas in which bilinguals and monolinguals differ as they acquire literacy skills. For example, they note that a bilingual advantage may exist in terms of

phonological awareness for emergent bilingual students who are learning to read and write in languages that are related (Bialystok et al., 2005). However, they also note that these differences are not presented uniformly across all emergent bilingual students. As Reyes (2012) points out, “because children’s language experiences are a by-product of their language choices, patterns, and individual differences, biliteracy development is a dynamic, fluid, and at times seemingly messy process” (p. 323). As such, the diversity among emergent bilingual students, who vary widely in home languages, educational histories, and learning temperaments, also influence the reading process (Pacheco, 2010).

One dimension in which emergent bilingual students’ reading development is distinguished from the monolingual reading process is the importance of metalinguistic awareness (Proctor et al., 2010). Metalinguistic awareness refers to the ability to think about how language is structured. It is critical to literacy development for all students (Bialystok, 2007). However, for many emergent bilingual students, although not for all, metalinguistic awareness is enhanced when educated in bilingual settings (Bialystok, 2007). One possible explanation is that emergent bilinguals need to have knowledge of and move between their languages (Baker, 2011). In addition, researchers have noted that the skills and understandings that students acquire in one language may greatly influence reading development in another (Cummins, 1979; Montecillo Leider, Proctor, Silverman, & Harring, 2013; Proctor et al., 2005). Often referred to as cross-linguistic transfer, this term makes reference to the process of using skills and knowledge in one language to support the development of skills in another language (Bialystok, 2007; Proctor et al., 2010).

Despite the abundance of research on the importance of transfer in the acquisition of language and literacy skills for emergent bilinguals, recent scholarship has reframed this discussion through a focus on dynamic bilingual practices (Flores & Schissel, 2014; García, 2009; Hopewell & Escamilla, 2014). Under the framework of dynamic bilingualism, language is considered “action and practice” (García & Li Wei, 2014, p. 1). As such, emergent bilingual students’ varied language practices are not separate, but rather fluid and unified.

Dynamic bilingualism repositions the notion of cross-linguistic transfer by placing the focus for educators on developing students’ literacy practices as a whole rather than on the separate and parallel development of these abilities. Within the context for reading, this means that teachers in DLB programs must consider the skills and habits that emergent bilingual students possess across languages in order to construct an integrated portrait of each student as a “reader” regardless of the language the students perform in.

Assessment of bilingual reading and IRIs

To properly assess bilingual reading development, teachers in DLB programs need specialized knowledge about (1) how emergent bilingual students develop as readers and how this process differs from monolingual reading development; (2) how to assess emergent bilingual students’ reading development bilingually; (3) how to analyze data about emergent bilingual students’ reading and translate it into effective practice to foster bilingualism (McCutchen, Green, Abbott, & Sanders, 2009).

However, the proper assessment of bilingual reading is hampered by multiple challenges. First, many bilingual teachers have been schooled under a parallel monolingual framework and undervalue the importance of home language in the development of vital literacy skills (Escamilla, 2006; Puzio, Keyes, Cole, & Jiménez, 2013). Another challenge is

that the complexity of reading development for emergent bilinguals is not matched by the assessment tools available to teachers. With respect to this point, the most critical issue is that emergent bilingual students are often assessed through monolingual assessment tools (García, 2009; Shohamy, 2011). Otherwise stated, although emergent bilinguals possess a unified, yet multilingual body of knowledge, these students are assessed through instruments designed to evaluate reading monolingually. This assessment structure places emergent bilingual students at a disadvantage as their reading abilities across languages are not assessed.

Within this assessment context, DLB programs look to formative assessments to build a pool of information about their students. Formative assessments are defined as, “a process used by teachers and students during instruction that provides feedback to adjust ongoing teaching and learning to improve students’ achievement of instructional outcomes” (FAST SCASS, 2008, p.3). These types of assessments are considered one of the primary “engines” of instruction; teachers use formative assessment to adapt or redirect instructional practices (Black, Harrison, & Lee, 2003; Heritage & Niemi, 2006; Popham, 2008). In fact, teachers of emergent bilingual students are increasingly expected to rely on data from formative assessments (Davison & Leung, 2009; Gandy, 2013; Spinelli, 2008). The importance given to this kind of assessment for this population of students is, in part, due to the numerous problems stemming from standardized, high stakes assessments that are considered summative assessments used for evaluation. These types of assessments are problematic in that they do not accurately evaluate the knowledge and skills of emergent bilingual students (Abedi, 2009; García, 2009).

IRIs have long been considered a valuable means of comprehensively assessing student reading (Walpole & McKenna, 2006). These assessments are comprised of a variety of components which collect information about student reading through word lists, fluency tasks, graded reading passages, and comprehension rubrics (Walpole & McKenna, 2006). These components provide teachers with a wealth of data about student reading including information about their behaviors, miscues, and comprehension.

One intended goal of IRI data is to provide teachers with an understanding of their students’ reading and to forge instructional moves to support reading development. The power of IRIs as a formative assessment for emergent bilingual students in particular is that they are contextual and are focused on the individual (Gandy, 2013). However, with respect to the assessment process, Leung and Rea-Dickens (2007) note that teachers of emergent bilinguals should be able apply their understanding of the “nature of language” to formative assessments in order for these tools to truly impact instruction for these students. Correspondingly, instruction for emergent bilinguals must take into account students’ knowledge of their home language in order to support new learning (Helman, Bear, Invernizzi, Templeton, & Johnston, 2013). Thus, teachers must have or must be supported to have a strong vision of how IRIs can be used within DLB programs to design instruction in favor of bilingual reading development and to contribute toward each student’s path toward biliteracy.

Within the DLB context, IRIs are used in both English and the language other than English, which in this study is Spanish. Teachers in this sample conducted IRIs in English and Spanish. Although there are a wide range of IRIs in English, IRIs in Spanish are less common. One example is John’s Spanish Reading Inventory (Johns & Daniel, 2010). This formative instrument includes a graded word list as well as leveled passages with

Table 2. Differences between Informal Reading Inventories (IRIs) and running records.

	IRI	Running records
Purpose	"To assess multiple aspects of children's reading skills in authentic situations" (Paris & Carpenter, 2003).	"To provide an assessment of <i>text reading</i> , and [they] are designed to be taken as a child reads orally from any text" (Clay, 2000).
Components	IRIs are comprised of graded word lists, leveled passages, comprehension questions for leveled passages, and comprehension rubrics (Nilsson, 2008).	"Any text can be used for Running Records—books, stories, information texts, children's published writing" (Clay, 2000).
Administration	Teachers select an appropriate leveled text based on knowledge of student. Based on the IRI, different aspects of student reading, such as fluency, miscues, comprehension are noted by the teacher (Paris & Carpenter, 2003).	Teachers select any text (in any language) depending on what the goal of the running record is for a given student. Teachers document reading behaviors and miscues using standard notation (Clay, 2000).
Examples	Qualitative Reading Inventory-3 (QRI3) (Leslie & Caldwell, 2001) Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) (Beaver, 1997) Evaluación Del Desarrollo de la Lectura 2 (EDL2) (Ruiz & Machado-Cuesta, 2006)	Running records can be done with any text, and are not commercially prepared.

companion comprehension questions. John's Spanish Reading Inventory (Johns & Daniel, 2010) is similar to the IRIs selected by schools in this study. The IRIs selected by schools in the sample included the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) (Beaver, 1997) in English and the Evaluación de Lectura 2 (EDL2), the Spanish version of the same assessment (Ruiz & Machado-Cuesta, 2006). Other teachers in this sample used the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project Running Records (TCRWP, 2014) as well as created a Spanish IRI by selecting leveled books in Spanish, as the Teachers College product is not available in a language other than English.

The reasons for using assessments in two languages for these programs are multiple. First and foremost, teachers in DLB programs are teaching with the goal of biliteracy. Therefore, they must be able to both monitor and understand how to support the students' reading development in two languages of instruction. In addition, the assessment of students in the two languages of instruction places equal value in the acquisition of reading skills in each. When biliteracy is the goal, the hope is that teachers can use information from IRI data from each language to compose a complete portrait of students as readers.

This study is focused on the running record portion of the IRIs. Teachers in DLB programs who participated in the study referred to these assessments colloquially as "running records," even though they are officially considered a portion of the IRI. This section of the assessment consists of a leveled passage, a checklist for reading behaviors, and a comprehension rubric. There are notable differences between IRIs and running records as assessment tools (see Table 2). Despite differences, the leveled passages of the IRI and running records are founded on the same principle that the documentation of students' contextual and authentic reading practices can provide teachers with important information about student reading to base their instruction (Clay, 2000; Datnow & Hubbard, 2015; Fountas & Pinnell, 2000; Gandy, 2013; Shea, 2012; Taberski, 2000).

With respect to running records, Clay (2000) writes, "this kind of information [the data from listening to and documenting student reading] allows teachers to prompt, support, and challenge individual learners" (p. 4). These statements ring true for IRIs, which have

evolved from early informal reading inventories such as Clay's Observation Survey (Paris, 2002). The documentation of students' miscues, their fluency and phrasing, and their comprehension comprise a comprehensive picture of students as readers and provide key understandings for teachers to base their teaching (Clay, 2000; Fountas & Pinnell, 2000; Taberski, 2000). Once this information is collected, teachers can engage in complementary analyses in order to understand students' reading processes. Two aspects of these analytical processes will be mentioned in this review in order to provide context for the findings.

Miscue analysis is the process of examining students' errors in order to gain insight into the reading process (Goodman, 1969; Wilde, 2000). The richness of miscue analysis lies in the information it provides to teachers about what syntactic, semantic, and grapho-phonetic information students use as they read. Based on an analysis of students' miscues, teachers can adjust their teaching to best support them as they learn to read (Fountas & Pinnell, 2000; Wilde, 2000). For bilingual readers, miscue analysis can provide an additional layer of information to teachers in illuminating the role of language in reading.

The examination of students' reading accuracy and comprehension is a counterpart to miscue analysis. This analysis allows teachers to peg students' reading with a text level and is a key feature of IRIs (Fountas & Pinnell, 2000; Nilsson, 2008). Based on a given student's percent accuracy of reading words from a leveled text combined with their ability to fully comprehend that text, teachers can establish a student's reading level. Although often teachers will use one text in order to ascertain a given student's reading level, many researchers have cautioned against the practice (Fawson, Ludlow, Reutzel, Sudweeks, & Smith, 2006; Gandy, 2013; Paris, 2002). They note that it is preferred that teachers have students read multiple texts to gain an accurate sense of their reading levels.

However, despite their important role as formative assessments in instruction, Perie, Scott, and Gong (2009) note that IRIs can also serve summative purposes. When IRIs are used to collect benchmark data about student reading levels and to identify patterns of student achievement across the school, they are considered an interim assessment with an underlying summative purpose (Perie et al., 2009). In the sample, IRIs were also used in this way as all teachers in DLB programs reported student reading levels to administration. I now turn to the design of the research and the methods used to document teachers' views on IRIs.

Methods

Because the focus of this study is on capturing elementary teachers' perspectives of their use of IRIs, this study employs phenomenology, the study of an experience or an issue as it is in lived life (Van Mannen, 1997). Interviews were used to collect data on teachers' perspectives on the use of IRIs with emergent bilinguals. Through the combination of structured and informal questions, I sought to capture teachers' thinking about IRIs across a variety of issues, as well as document their own perceptions about the assessment.

Setting and participants

More than 40 DLB schools in Allegra City (pseudonyms used throughout the article) were contacted in order to gain access to teachers for interviews. Only DLB programs in Spanish and English were invited to participate in the study. Five schools granted

Table 3. Demographics and socioeconomic characteristics of schools.

School	Population	Grade levels	% Free lunch	% ELL	% Hispanic	% Black	% White	% Asian
#1^	689	K–5	67	14	51	26	14	5
#2	436	PreK–8	96.1	44	97.5	2.5	N/A	N/A
#3	420	K–8	74.6	26.9	85	1.8	8.5	3
# 4^	1161	K–4	87.5	50.2	83.6	1.6	4.6	9.7

^ Denotes schools which are entirely comprised of DLB programs.

permission to conduct research at their site. After receiving the principal’s permission to conduct research in the building, flyers describing the research were provided to either the assistant principal or schools’ instructional coaches. These recruitment flyers were physically given to teachers and emailed to them. In one school, the principal provided one period of non-instructional time to teachers so that they could hear a presentation of the research goals before being recruited. Although five school principals gave permission to conduct the research, interviews were conducted at only four schools. At one of the schools, there were no teacher volunteers.

Of the schools where teachers were interviewed, two were entirely DLB schools, while the other two were schools that housed these programs within them. Table 3 provides demographic and socioeconomic information about the schools. This sample of four DLB schools represents the landscape of these types of programs in the Northeast. As such, although this was a convenience sample, it was purposeful as it represents a cross-section of DLB programs found within this geographic region of the United States (Creswell, 1998). As noted in the table, the four schools demonstrate differences in size and population. The sample is similar in terms of the socioeconomic status of students, as indicated by the percent of the student population receiving free school lunch, an indicator in the United States of poverty.

Interviews of 20 teachers from 4 schools were conducted from November 2010 through May 2011 with an interview protocol designed exclusively for this study (see Appendix). The sample of teachers represented a wide range of experience. Teachers’ professional experience ranged from 1 year to 13 with an average of 7 years of experience (see Table 4). Furthermore, 87.5% of the teachers sampled were fully certified in the state in which this research was conducted to teach in bilingual classrooms. Bilingual certification in this state requires teachers to demonstrate high literacy skills in both English and the language other than English (Spanish), as well as complete course work in multilingual education, linguistics, bilingualism, and use of the home and new language in instruction. The entire sample of teachers received their education training in the United States. Furthermore, the sample was comprised entirely of teachers who themselves are bilingual in Spanish and English and had grown up in the United States.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for sample of teachers interviewed.

Sample Size	20
Total Years Teaching (Mean)	6.6 years
Total Years Teaching (Standard Deviation)	3.7 years
Total Years Teaching Bilingual Students (Mean)	6.3 years
Total Years Teaching Bilingual Students (Standard Deviation)	3.1 years
Fully Certified to Teach Bilingual Education	87.5%
Highest Level of Education (BA)	25%
Highest Level of Education (MA)	75%

Data collection

The interview protocol was designed to collect information about a range of reading assessments, as the qualitative data used in this article were part of a larger mixed-methods study which also investigated the role of large-scale standardized reading data. However, only qualitative data from the interviews about IRIs are presented in this article (see Appendix); therefore, only the qualitative methods will be discussed. Questions in the interview protocol were developed with the help of Margaret Heritage, an expert in formative assessment (personal communication, March 17, 2010).

Furthermore, the interview protocol was validated through peer review sessions (Creswell, 1998). The participants in the peer review session were selected for both their expertise in teaching reading in DLB settings as well as the length of time that they worked within these programs (more than 7 years each). Peer reviews sessions involved an analysis of interview questions first, to ensure that would be understood by teachers in similar ways, and second, to confirm that they were aligned to the research questions. One significant result from the peer review sessions is that in the interview protocol the term, “English Language Learner” (ELL) was used over “emergent bilingual,” the term preferred in this article. The reason for using “ELL” during the interviews was that the peer reviewers thought that the teachers would be more familiar with this term and the introduction of the term “emergent bilingual” could possibly interrupt the flow of the interview. Likewise, although teachers in the study used leveled passages of IRIs, these were referred to as “running records” by the teachers in practice; therefore, this term was preferred over IRI in the interview protocol.

The instrument used for the interviews was comprised of two types of questions: structured and informal. Structured questions were posed to all participants. The purpose of these questions was to ensure that all teachers responded to the same inquiries about reading assessments. These questions primarily sought to document the processes by which teachers view and use running records for their emergent bilingual students.

The second type of question was “informal” or unstructured. These emerged from the particulars of the interview. Data-wise, unstructured interviews are considered to gather nuanced data that is “more varied and numerous” than data from structured interviews (Codó, 2008, p. 165). The objective of these questions was to dig deeper, to clarify points made by teachers during the interviews, and to ultimately gather the underlying story of teachers’ developing knowledge and engagement in the use of IRIs to improve reading instruction for emergent bilingual students. The use of both types of questions in the interview was to ensure that interviews were in-depth and able to capture both commonalities and variation in teachers’ views and understandings of their use of running records (Marshall & Rossman, 1998).

Data analysis

Each interview was conducted by the author. Participants were interviewed individually and each interview lasted approximately an hour. Interviews were digitally recorded, pseudonyms assigned, and subsequently transcribed verbatim. The transcripts thereby went through a process of multiple re-readings. The purpose of multiple readings was twofold. First, the body of transcripts was analyzed and checked according to preexisting

codes. Essentially, these were a priori codes that were developed based on the literature review. This process involved checking that these codes were “internally consistent” (Marshall & Rossman, 1998). Some examples of these codes are: “bilingual knowledge acquired through running records” and “knowledge of student reading.” These preexisting codes were re-analyzed to ensure that they captured patterns in respondents’ interviews.

The second purpose of the multiple re-readings was to generate and categorize new codes by identifying thematic patterns from the data set through axial coding (Creswell, 1998). Using grounded theory as a framework for analysis (Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2000; Charmaz, 2010), the interview data was examined for categories that reflected the practices across the sample of teachers. For example, a code for “language transfer” and “inequities between assessment materials” emerged from the body of interviews. Once the data were analyzed and coded, these were examined alongside the research questions in order to collapse categories into general themes. For example, two codes, “professional development regarding IRIs” and “time dedicated to administering IRIs,” were grouped together to form one of the main themes of the study, “school assessment policy.” Four themes emerged from the data analysis: teachers’ views of IRIs, assessing emergent bilinguals as monolinguals, school assessment policy, and inequities in assessment materials. These themes will be elaborated on in the Findings section.

Finally, interview transcripts were scanned to identify examples and descriptions of how teachers viewed the use IRI leveled passages with their students. These key quotes are highlighted and used in the Findings.

Findings

In this section, I describe four interconnected themes that emerged from the data. The first theme is “teachers’ views of IRIs.” This theme details the contradictory relationship between teachers’ positive regard for the IRIs and their monolingual use of these assessments. The second theme identified in the study, “assessing emergent bilinguals as monolinguals,” grows out of the first. This theme focuses on how teachers’ assessment practices isolate students’ reading development by collecting and analyzing student reading data in each separate language.

The last two themes provide a backdrop for the first two. Although these are not directly related to the research questions, they are significant as they provide an important context for understanding the first two findings. The first of these two themes, “school assessment policy,” describe how assessment policies at the building level influence teachers’ use of IRIs. Specifically, this theme highlights how assessment policies are focused on collecting reading levels resulting from IRI leveled passages rather than the analysis of data, such as miscue analysis, from this portion of the assessment. The fourth theme, “inequities in assessment materials,” describes differences between English and Spanish IRI materials that affect teachers’ perceptions of the value of data culled from Spanish versions of the IRIs.

These four themes together construct an integrated description of how teacher knowledge of assessment and bilingualism interact with school assessment policies and practices that result in IRIs being used under a parallel monolingual framework. In what follows, each of these themes will be explained further.

Theme 1: Teachers' views of IRIs

Teachers overwhelmingly stated that they learned about their students through IRIs. Above all, teachers highlighted that the process of administering IRI leveled passages was useful to them because their knowledge of their students as readers grew. All teachers spoke about the knowledge they acquired about the strengths and weaknesses of students' reading abilities within an authentic context of reading.

For instance, Judy, a fifth grade teacher at School 4, explained that IRI data afforded her with the ability to focus on the habits, skills, and thinking processes that her students possess. Judy's quote is characteristic of how teachers in the sample spoke about what they learned about their students from this type of assessment. She states: "They [IRI leveled passages] sort of give us a very good indication of what type of reader the child is. You can tell their habits as a reader. You can tell their fluency, their vocabulary, their comprehension. You also get a picture of how they process the information." (Judy, School 4, grade 5)

Another teacher, Kai, described the benefits of administering the IRIs from a different angle. Her response reveals that teachers also gain information about students' reading behaviors. The following quote is also illustrative of the majority of teachers' responses about what they learn about their emergent bilingual students from these assessments.

The purpose of the running records [IRI leveled passages] is to assess fluency and reading strategies. So are student using syllabification to figure out a word? Are they breaking the word down and sounding it out phonetically? Are students using the picture in order to help them decode a word? So we code all of the errors and the coding of those errors helps me know whether or not they are using those strategies. (Kai, School 2, grade 4)

Both Judy's and Kai's descriptions of the power IRIs to provide a snapshot of student learning match the intended and general purpose of this assessment. However as Escamilla, Andrade, Basurto, Ruiz, and Clay (1996) and Gandy (2013) suggest, IRIs for emergent bilinguals need to be selected carefully and take into account these students' language needs. For example, Escamilla et al. (1996) advocate that when documenting the reading of Spanish speaking students, the process must account for their "languaging" behaviors, such as the use of all languages resources, in both the home and the new language, as a natural part of these students' repertoire.

Throughout the data, there was a glaring absence of teachers' perception of the IRIs as a tool to support students' bilingual reading, though all students were in DLB programs and clearly developing reading abilities in two languages. Only 2 of the 20 of the teachers spoke about how they learn about their students as bilinguals through these assessments. In essence, the teachers in the study describe their use of IRIs monolingually; that is, without attending to the fact that students are learning to read in English and Spanish and without acknowledging that these two language systems nurture each other. Therefore, although teachers perceive IRIs to be a useful assessment tool, they do not view them as a means in which to understand students' bilingual reading development. The absence of teachers reporting that they use IRIs to learn about student bilingualism, suggests that bilingual teachers use these assessments monolingually, even in DLB settings. In the following section, the ways in which IRIs operate under a parallel monolingual framework will be examined.

Theme 2: Assessing emergent bilinguals as monolinguals

In order for IRIs to operate as a formative assessment and as such, to impact instruction, teachers must learn about their students from these (Heritage, 2007). In addition to learning about their students, teachers must possess the knowledge to connect what they learn about students to effective practice (Heritage, 2007; Heritage, Kim, Vendlinski, & Herman, 2009). However, the findings describe widespread practices that support both what Davison and Leung (2009) and Soltero-González, Escamilla, and Hopewell (2012) discuss in their work. That is, many teachers in DLB programs do not possess or are not supported to develop an underlying vision of how formative assessment supports biliteracy.

The following quote is representative of how 18 out of 20 of the teachers in DLB programs responded when asked if they analyze their students' IRIs bilingually:

- Researcher: Do you ever look at your student data or assessments bilingually?
 Jaime: What do you mean?
 Researcher: You will take one student's data and look at the running record [IRI leveled passage] in English and then in Spanish and then think about how they use strategies in both languages.
 Jaime: Not in terms of the errors they've made or what skills they do have, just in terms of that letter, that level. That's pretty much it. (Jaime, School 1, grade 3)

Time and again, teachers responded that they did not modify the implementation or their analysis of IRIs in order to examine students' bilingual reading practices. Rather, all teachers reported that they were focused on ascertaining two, separate reading levels for each student, one in English and one in Spanish, which resulted from administering the IRI leveled passages. One reason why teachers are focused on collecting and reporting reading levels may be that there are few institutional supports to do otherwise. For instance, Suzie's quote below reveals that teachers are open to analyzing students' reading bilingually but are not supported systematically at the school level to do so:

For the most part it's their English development and their Spanish development, although I think it's a great idea to look at them side by side, but I wouldn't know on demand that X student has the same issue in both languages, although the information could be there in the running record [IRI leveled passages]. But I do have a general idea of how students are in their language development in both languages. I know who the ELLs are. I know who the SSLs [Spanish language learners] are. I also have a chart that has their level in English and Spanish next to each other, so I can see really easily how their levels compare, but that doesn't have the specific data of what issues they are having in reading in Spanish or what strategies are they using in Spanish versus in English. (Suzie, School 2, grade 5)

The above quote points to the institutional importance given to data collection and how this focus frames the use of the IRIs as a monolingual assessment. Data from the IRIs in English and in Spanish were treated as separate entities for each student, although under a dynamic bilingual framework, these two assessments necessarily should be positioned alongside each other and influence teachers' overall understandings of their students as readers.

A defining characteristic of formative assessments is to inform teachers' knowledge of students to design instruction (Popham, 2008); however, the bulk of teachers described IRIs as a way to designate a reading level for a given student in English and in Spanish. For most of the teachers in this sample, IRIs were implemented for the purpose of collecting data. Although teachers collected students' reading data in both languages, the focus of teachers' work on the reporting of student levels is representative of how emergent bilingual students exist as parallel monolinguals within DLB classrooms in this sample.

However, an alternative vision, in which are not viewed as either "readers in English" or "readers in Spanish" but instead as *bilingual* readers is possible. After some further questioning, 2 out of 20 teachers in the sample reported that they did use IRIs bilingually. For both of these teachers, each of which had more than 10 years of experience each, examining IRI data from a bilingual perspective helped them gain a greater sense of their students' biliteracy and supported their ability to provide cohesive instruction in both languages. Although not representative of the entire sample, these two teachers' narratives are instructive in that they provide a glimpse of the potential of examining how reading skills develop in both languages.

The ideal situation in which teachers examine data from IRI leveled passages bilingually is illustrated in the following quote. Zoila speaks about how she does not compartmentalize each student into a "reader in English" and a "reader in Spanish." Rather she considers the unified reading development of a given student and responds accordingly. She states:

Actually I look at the whole child. I have a couple who are really fluent in Spanish more than English so I make sure they are getting the same "praises." If I see that they are doing something great in their native language, I am not going to dismiss that just because it's English week. I am going to make sure they know, "you are doing it well in Spanish, awesome, I like the way that you use adjectives. That's a nice adjective to use." (Zoila, School 2, grade 3)

She goes on to note that a focus on language helps her to identify areas of instructional need by relating the following example:

One thing that I notice is, there are certain things: if they are able to transfer certain practices and habits between languages. I can also figure out when they are using Spanish pronunciation when they are reading books in English, so it helps me understand their reading processes. You can tell when they are using the skills they have in one language and try to apply it to another one ... (Zoila, School 2, grade 3)

Zoila's consolidated vision of a student who is developing in reading regardless of language demonstrates that the support of language development during reading can be in either language of instruction. In this way, Zoila supports students' holistic biliteracy development and not exclusively the reading development in one language.

If there is such great potential and positive regard for IRIs exists to undergird bilingual reading instructional practices, why is this road not taken more often by the teachers interviewed? Answers to this question, can be partially found in the critiques of how these assessments are framed in schools.

Theme 3: School assessment policy

Teachers overwhelmingly reported that the implementation and data collection of IRIs was framed by compliance. They emphasized the collecting and reporting reading levels to administrators within distinct time frames. For example, Constanza, a fifth grade teacher at school 2, contributes the following perspective on how teachers in DLB programs view IRIs as an aspect of compliance under schools' assessment policies:

It takes a long time to gather ... so we are kind of overwhelmed by all the data and we are like: the deadline and we got to do this and we got to do that and report cards and by the time we gather all the data, it's already time to assess again. There is more testing than teaching. It takes so much away from your teaching and we are battling that a lot. (Constanza, School 2, grade 5)

The viewpoint that IRIs are eroding important instructional time was common among teachers in the sample. Teachers stated that these assessments cut the time they have to teach. This creates an antagonistic relationship between assessment and instruction for teachers. This is contrary to the intention of educators that formative assessment can powerfully impact instruction. In fact, many of the teachers expressed resentment that the administration of IRIs "interrupted" instruction. Teachers in the sample noted that only after IRIs were carried out for each student could this teaching resume. This issue is compounded for teachers in DLB programs as they must collect two sets of IRI data for each student.

The time crunch that teachers felt was the result of school assessment policies of which IRIs were an integral part. School principals of the DLB programs required teachers to report students' reading levels in both languages several times a year through the implementation of IRI leveled passages. Therefore, teachers were motivated, in part, to conduct these assessments because of these school-level mandates, rather than for the purpose gathering data to inform instruction. The demands on teachers to collect and report the assessment transform the potential parameters of the assessment, as noted by the fifth grade teacher in the above quote. IRIs are viewed as a summative test, rather than as a formative assessment from which next instructional steps are crafted.

In addition to the demands on time that come with administering IRIs, teachers also stated that they were not provided with ongoing resources, guidance, and support in developing the professional knowledge to make use of IRIs as the catalyst for instructional improvements, a finding that is reflected in the literature that describes the use of IRIs across educational programs (L'Allier, 2013). To this effect, Kai (school 2, grade 4) notes that "a great deal of the stress I have is I'm going to have that piece of paper [with assessment results]; whether I look at it, whether I analyze it, is another story." Kai's quote underscores that these teachers received the institutional message that what is valued is the collection of data above the quality of the data or the process of understanding how to analyze these results for their emergent bilingual students. In the following quote, Suzie, a fifth grade teacher, notes the urgent need for more guidance about how to make the link between assessment data and instruction. She says:

I guess I would like a little bit more training. What does a really strong reading conference look like? Have that modeled or, "how do you sit down with your running records [IRI leveled passages] and break down the data in a meaningful way?" It's rare that I'll sit down with running records and make a list of recommendations for students and somehow use that

data in a reading lesson. I don't feel like the running records [IRI leveled passages] have a particularly strong connection to the mini-lessons that I choose to do. (Suzie, School 2, grade 4).

As noted above, many teachers are aware that IRIs are not being used formatively and therefore are not contributing to teachers' knowledge of students. Few teachers learn how to analyze data from the IRI leveled passage in general (L'Allier, 2013), and consequently fewer, if any, have the knowledge and skills to adapt their use of these assessments for the benefit of emergent bilingual students' learning needs. The focus on accountability, the time crunch to assess and report student reading levels, and the lack of practical knowledge about how to put these data into use all weaken the potential of the IRI to be truly seen as a means to support students' biliteracy development. In addition to these school-level factors, teachers from across all schools in the sample noted that differences in quality between English and Spanish IRIs. For this reason, teachers also did not actively use results from these assessments to consider bilingual reading development. This issue will be discussed in the following section.

Theme 4: Inequities in assessment materials

Across schools in the sample, teachers reported problems with Spanish IRIs that were used. These issues ranged from perceiving that products in Spanish were inferior to those in English to having to create and translate IRIs in Spanish. Since the school did not have a commercial Spanish IRI, teacher-created Spanish IRIs were created from a compilation of leveled books to assess student reading growth. This theme is inextricably intertwined with teachers' monolingual use of IRIs as it lessens the validity of Spanish reading assessments and thus their comparability with students' English running record data, often collecting from commercially prepared and validated IRIs.

The following quote illustrates the types of issues faced when Spanish IRI materials are of differing qualities than those in English. In this particular case, as noted above, the school used leveled texts in Spanish that were chosen by one of the teachers at the school. Because the school did not have IRI kits in Spanish, a teacher, who did not have training in creation of formative assessment materials, selected one Spanish book for each reading level (Fountas & Pinnell levels) to assess students.

In Spanish, I use the books that were carefully selected by Ms. Torres, the third grade teacher. She put a lot of effort into doing all the running records [IRI leveled texts]. She did a great job, you know. The only problem is that we only had one book per each level so if the student doesn't master it, and sometimes it's the same book for two levels, so sometimes if the student doesn't master that level, he gets to read the same book the next time, he already knows the story. (Marisol, School 4, grade 4)

In this quote, Marisol suggests that assessing students with the IRI leveled passages in Spanish may not truly reflect students' competencies. This issue cut across all schools in the samples, because at all four schools teachers used different IRIs to assess students in English and Spanish and the majority of the teachers viewed the Spanish materials of a lesser quality.

The issue of equity between IRIs in English and Spanish does not end in the selection of quality assessment materials in both languages. In addition, it is critical that Spanish

reading materials do not favor one Spanish speaking population over the other. For example, in the following quote, one teacher noted that the leveled texts from one IRI contained Spanish vocabulary from one particular region, thus giving advantage to one Spanish speaking population over another. This teacher remarks:

It's so hard because with Spanish there are so many different types of Spanish that are spoken. And so testing a number of students who come more or less at a level K and the story that they have to read is *Hielos de fresa* [Strawberry Ices] and these kids are like *charola* [tray]? They don't know what that means. They don't know what *rabito de fresa* [strawberry slice] is and they call it something different. If a kid comes from the DR [Dominican Republic] and he calls something one thing and a kid comes from Mexico and calls it another thing, they are both correct, but how do you assess that? Like the kid from Mexico is lucky because the assessment happens to have words that he knows. (Emeline, School 1)

As the teacher above comments, because the IRI leveled texts in Spanish may contain solely vocabulary from one regional variety of Spanish, the assessment may not accurately capture students' reading ability even for students whose home language is Spanish.

Limitations

One of the limitations with the study's research design was respondent selection. Due to the difficulty of gaining access into schools, schools in the sample were led by principals who were open to having research conducted on assessments in their building. Within the current accountability climate, when assessments determine the quality of a school, the leadership, and teachers, this can be a sensitive topic. Therefore, it was difficult to gain access as a researcher to teachers.

Interviews, comprised of structured and informal questions, afforded researchers with the ability to gather both responses across a body of similar inquiries as well as probe into nuances of the topic with each respondent. However, this study is limited by the fact that only one interview was conducted with each respondent.

Discussion

Although all teachers interviewed taught at DLB programs and taught solely emergent bilingual students, teachers viewed data from IRIs through a monolingual lens. The importance of a dynamic bilingual perspective for the education of emergent bilinguals is critical to teachers' total understanding of emergent bilinguals (Flores & Schissel, 2014; García, 2009; Hopewell, 2011; Soltero-González, Escamilla, & Hopewell, 2012). The move away from parallel monolingualism where students are taught literacy and language skills in each of their languages separately to dynamic bilingualism is an important one for instruction. When educational choices for emergent bilinguals are filtered through the lens of dynamic bilingualism, teachers are able to leverage students' entire repertoire of skills and abilities across languages in the learning process.

In this sample, teachers made certain to administer both IRIs to their students and assess their reading contextually. However, although they assessed students in English and in Spanish, teachers in DLB programs did not engage in practices to use IRIs as a way to understand students' bilingualism. These practices run counter to current thinking on bilingualism, which views bilinguals' use of language as unified rather than

compartmentalized (García, 2009; García & Kleifgen, 2010; Hopewell, 2011; Hornberger & Link, 2012). In using IRIs monolingually, teachers bypassed students' enormous and rich resources that they possess as bilingual students. When viewed as parallel monolinguals even within DLB setting, these students are placed in a "disadvantaged" position as they are not asked to make use of their entire repertoire of bilingual resources (Shohamy, 2011).

Despite the potential of IRIs to be used as a formative assessment, the ways teachers spoke about the administration and analysis of these evaluations was as an interim assessment serving a summative purpose. As such, IRIs functioned as an evaluation of student reading rather than as data-rich resource on which to base instructional decisions. Teachers viewed these assessments as yet another mandate they were expected to complete, rather than to meaningfully analyze and consider to guide instruction. Instead, teachers ensured that they were in compliance with school mandates about the collection of these formative data in English and Spanish. In other words, teachers completed their assessment responsibilities without accessing the potential of these formative assessments for bilingual students. Because of the emphasis on compliance at the school level, teachers in DLB programs did not view IRIs as a source to learn about their emergent bilingual students and were not supported to understand how to do so.

Adding to the challenge of viewing and using IRIs bilingually, teachers reported that the English and Spanish materials used were of differing quality. Due to the questionable quality and fit of Spanish materials, teachers did not view emergent bilinguals' results from IRI leveled passages in English and Spanish as comparable, thus compounding the use of this assessment as a monolingual assessment.

Conclusion and implications

This research points to the critical need for both a conceptual vision and practical application of how IRIs can operate within a framework of dynamic bilingualism. Hornberger and Link (2012) refer to challenges such as these, which require both shifts in thinking as well as in practice, as "implementational and ideological spaces" (p. 274). First and foremost, teachers must be supported to use IRIs as a tool to support bilingual reading development. This can be done in a number of ways.

A common vision for reading assessment in which the emergent bilingual student is viewed as possessing a unified linguistic repertoire is essential. Teachers of emergent bilinguals must have a solid understanding that they are teaching reading as a generalized ability across languages rather than reading in either English or Spanish. Based on this shared understanding, as Gandy (2013) and Nilsson (2008) advocate in their earlier work, reading assessment tools should be selected intentionally. These researchers advocate that the components of a variety of IRIs be examined and selected according to the needs of the student population. For DLB programs, this means both looking at the how the individual components of the IRIs suit the emergent bilingual population at the school as well as considering the comparability of the English and Spanish versions of the IRI assessment.

In addition, as the value of the IRI resides in its potential to inform instruction, teachers must be trained to use observations and patterns of student reading in order to forge instruction (L'Allier, 2013; Paris & Carpenter, 2003). For this to happen, on the

research front, scholars in bilingualism and literacy must continue to inquire how to document and analyze the miscues that are particular to bilingual students as well as define how teachers can use an analysis of these miscues to develop a complete portrait of the bilingual reader. This essential assessment knowledge is vital for teachers of emergent bilinguals at all stages of expertise, from preservice teachers to practicing teachers, so that assessment practices match a conceptual vision for bilingual reading assessment. Within a dynamic bilingual framework, the need to see students as readers holistically (across languages) is paramount. Therefore, it is crucial that teachers are able to observe and make insights about their emergent bilinguals, taking into account their performance in reading in English and Spanish side by side. Furthermore, it is essential researchers investigate how to support teachers in making instructional recommendations from a combined synthesis of students' reading assessments in two languages. In this way, teachers would have guidance on how to effectively support their students as readers bilingually rather than in a piecemeal fashion through separate languages.

In addition, the formative character of IRIs must be valued and prioritized by school administration over compliance. Only when teachers in DLB programs are supported to use IRIs as formative assessments and are recognized for doing so, can they work toward realizing their students' bilingual reading development. In order for this to happen, school administrators must dedicate time for ongoing teacher professional development and construction of knowledge that emerges from the practice of analyzing data bilingually, rather than imposing top-down assessment policy that results in an emphasis on primarily collecting and reporting of results. This issue is not only relevant to DLB programs, as evidenced by reports that educators are faced with a plethora of untapped data (Datnow & Hubbard, 2015; Datnow & Park, 2015)

Further research which is focused these issues: how to document the reading of emergent bilingual students and how to forge instructional moves from the dynamic analysis of student reading in two languages has the potential to reform the impact of these assessments on reading instruction in DLB settings. Reshaping these assessment practices for emergent bilinguals will aid teachers in developing knowledge of these students as readers and, most importantly, ensure that these students receive reading instruction that leads to strong, thoughtful bilingual readers.

Acknowledgments

I thank Cecilia Espinosa, Kate Menken, and Ofelia García for their feedback on earlier versions of this paper. I also am grateful to the editors and anonymous reviewers for their comments and guidance.

References

- Abedi, J. (April 14, 2009). *Examining the impact of language factors as a construct irrelevant source across ELL/non-ELL subgroups*. Unpublished manuscript. AERA Annual Conference, San Diego, CA.
- Alvesson, M., & Skoldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodologies: New vistas for qualitative research*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Beaver, J. (1997). *Developmental reading assessment*. Glenview, IL: Celebration Press.

- Bernhardt, E. (2003). Challenges to reading research from a multilingual world. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38(1), 1122–117.
- Bialystok, E. (2007). Acquisition of literacy in bilingual children: A framework for research. *Language Learning*, 57(1), 45–47. doi:[10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00412.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00412.x)
- Bialystok, E., Luk, G., & Kwan, E. (2005). Bilingualism, biliteracy, and learning to read: Interactions among languages and writing systems. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 9(1), 43–61. doi:[10.1207/s1532799xssr0901_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532799xssr0901_4)
- Black, P., Harrison, C., & Lee, C. (2003). *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Charmaz, K. (2010). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In W. Luttrell (Ed.), *Qualitative educational research: Readings in reflexive methodology and transformative practice* (pp. 183–207). London, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Clay, M. (2000). *Running records for classroom teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Codó, E. (2008). Interviews and questionnaires. In L. Wei & M. G. Moyer (Eds.), *The Blackwell guide to research methods in bilingualism and multilingualism* (pp. 158–176). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing. doi:[10.1002/9781444301120.ch9](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444301120.ch9)
- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cummins, J. (1979, Spring). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, 49(2), 222–251. [10.3102/00346543049002222](https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543049002222)
- Datnow, A., & Hubbard, L. (2015). Teachers' use of assessment data to inform instruction: Lessons from the past and prospects for the future. *Teachers College Record*, 117(4), 1–26. ID Number: 17848, Date Accessed: 10/28/2015 11:06:52 AM <http://www.tcrecord.org/library>
- Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2015). Data use for equity. *Educational Leadership*, 72(5), 49–54.
- Davison, C., & Leung, C. (2009). Current issues in English language teacher-based assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(3), 393–415. doi:[10.1002/tesq.2009.43.issue-3](https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.2009.43.issue-3)
- Escamilla, K. (2006). Semilingualism applied to the literacy behaviors of Spanish-speaking emerging bilinguals: Bi-illiteracy or emerging biliteracy? *Teachers College Record*, 108(11), 2329–2353. ID Number: 12807, <http://www.tcrecord.org/library>
- Escamilla, K., Andrade, A., Basurto, A., Ruiz, O., & Clay, M. (1996). *Instrumento de observación de los logros de la lecto-escritura inicial*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., & Butvilofsky, S. (2013). *Biliteracy from the start: Literacy squared in action*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.
- FAST SCASS (Formative Assessment for Teachers and Students) (State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards) of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), Coordinated by Sarah McManus. (2008). Attributes of effective formative assessment. http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2008/Attributes_of_Effective_2008.pdf
- Fawson, P., Ludlow, B., Reutzel, R., Sudweeks, R., & Smith, J. (2006). Examining the reliability of running records: Attaining generalizable results. *Journal of Educational Research*, 100(2), 113–126. doi:[10.3200/JOER.100.2.113-126](https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.100.2.113-126)
- Flores, N., & Schissel, J. (2014). Dynamic bilingualism as the norm: Envisioning a heteroglossic approach to standards-based reform. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 454–479. doi:[10.1002/tesq.182](https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.182)
- Fountas, I., & Pinnell, G. S. (2000). *Guiding readers and writers: Teaching comprehension, genre, and content literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Gandy, S. (2013). Informal reading inventories and ELL students. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 29, 271–287. doi:[10.1080/10573569.2013.789782](https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2013.789782)
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English language learners*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, O., Kleifgen, J. A., & Falchi, L. (2008, January). *From English language learners to emergent bilinguals*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED524002.pdf>
- García, O., & Li Wei (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Goodman, K. (1969). Analysis of oral reading miscues: Applied psycholinguistics. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 5(1), 9–30. doi:[10.2307/747158](https://doi.org/10.2307/747158)
- Gutiérrez, K., & Faulstich Orellana, M. (2006). The “problem” of English learners: Constructing genres of difference. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 40(4), 502–507.
- Helman, L., Bear, D., Invernizzi, J., Templeton, S., & Johnston, F. (2013). *Words their way: Within word pattern sorts for Spanish-speaking English learners*. New York, NY: Pearson Education.
- Heritage, M. (2007, October). Formative assessment: What do teachers need to know and do? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89, 140–145. doi:[10.1177/003172170708900210](https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170708900210)
- Heritage, M., Kim, J., Vendilinski, T., & Herman, J. (Fall 2009). From evidence to action: A seamless process in formative assessment? *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 28(3), 24–31. doi:[10.1111/j.1745-3992.2009.00151.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.2009.00151.x)
- Heritage, M., & Niemi, D. (2006). Toward a framework for using student mathematical representations as formative assessments. *Educational Assessment*, 11(3–4), 265–282. doi:[10.1080/10627197.2006.9652992](https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2006.9652992)
- Hopewell, S. (2011). Leveraging bilingualism to accelerate English reading comprehension. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(5), 603–620. doi:[10.1080/13670050.2011.564274](https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.564274)
- Hopewell, S., & Escamilla, K. (2014). Struggling reader or emerging biliterate student? Reevaluating the criteria for labeling emerging bilingual students as low achieving. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 46(1), 68–89. doi:[10.1177/1086296X13504869](https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X13504869)
- Hornberger, N., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 261–278. doi:[10.1080/00405841.2012.726051](https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2012.726051)
- Johns, J., & Daniel, M. (2010). *Spanish reading inventory*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing.
- L’Allier, S. (2013). Lessons learned from research about informal reading inventories: Keys to data-driven instructional recommendations. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 29, 288–307. doi:[10.1080/105733569.2013.789780](https://doi.org/10.1080/105733569.2013.789780)
- Leslie, L., & Caldwell, J. (2001). *Qualitative reading inventory–3*. New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Leung, C., & Rea-Dickens, P. (2007). Teacher assessment as policy instrument: Contradictions and capacities. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 4(1), 6–36. doi:[10.1080/15434300701348318](https://doi.org/10.1080/15434300701348318)
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1998). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McCutchen, D., Green, L., Abbott, R., & Sanders, E. (2009). Further evidence for teacher knowledge: Supporting struggling readers in grades three through five. *Reading and Writing*, 22, 401–423. doi:[10.1007/s11145-009-9163-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-009-9163-0)
- Montecillo Leider, C., Proctor, C., Silverman, R., & Haring, J. (2013). Examining the role of vocabulary depth, cross-linguistic transfer, and the types of reading measures on the reading comprehension of Latino bilinguals in elementary school. *Reading and Writing*, 26, 1459–1485. doi:[10.1007/s11145-013-9427-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-013-9427-6)
- Nilsson, N. (2008). A critical analysis of eight informal reading inventories. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(7), 526–536. doi:[10.1598/RT.61.7.2](https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.61.7.2)
- Pacheco, M. (2010). English-language learners’ reading achievement: Dialectical relationships between policy and practices in meaning-making opportunities. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 45(3), 292–317. doi:[10.1598/RRQ.45.3.2](https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.45.3.2)
- Paris, S. (2002). Measuring children’s reading development using leveled texts. *The Reading Teacher*, 56(2), 168–170.
- Paris, S., & Carpenter, R. (2003). FAQs about IRIs. *The Reading Teacher*, 56(6), 578–580.
- Perie, M., Scott, M., & Gong, B. (2009). Moving towards a comprehensive assessment system: A framework for considering interim assessments. *Educational Measurement*, 28(3), 5–13. doi:[10.1111/j.1745-3992.2009.00149.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.2009.00149.x)
- Popham, J. (2008). *Transformative assessment*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

- Proctor, C. P., August, D., Snow, C., & Barr, C. (2010). The interdependence continuum: A perspective on the nature of Spanish-English bilingual reading comprehension. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 33(1), 5–20. doi:[10.1080/15235881003733209](https://doi.org/10.1080/15235881003733209)
- Proctor, C. P., Carlo, M., August, D., & Snow, C. (2005). Native Spanish-speaking children reading in English: Toward a model of comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 246–256. doi:[10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.246](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.246)
- Puzio, K., Keyes, C., Cole, M., & Jiménez, R. (2013). Language differentiation: Collaborative translation to support bilingual reading. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36(3), 329–349. doi:[10.1080/15235882.2013.845118](https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2013.845118)
- Reyes, I. (2012). Bilitracy among children and youths. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(3), 307–327. doi:[10.1002/RRQ.022](https://doi.org/10.1002/RRQ.022)
- Reyes, L. (2006). The Aspira Consent Decree: A thirtieth-anniversary retrospective of bilingual education in New York City. *Harvard Education Review*, 76(3), 369–400. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.76.3.m1501351j6024767>
- Ruiz, O., & Machado-Cuesta, V. (2006). *Evaluación del desarrollo de la lectura 2*. Lebanon, IN: Pearson.
- Shea, M. (2012). *Running records: Authentic instruction in early childhood education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Shohamy, E. (2011). Assessing multilingual competencies: Adopting construct valid assessment policies. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 418–442. doi:[10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01210.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01210.x)
- Soltero-González, L., Escamilla, K., & Hopewell, S. (2012). Changing teachers' perceptions about the writing abilities of emerging bilingual students: Towards a holistic bilingual perspective on writing assessment. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(1), 71–94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.604712>
- Spinelli, C. (2008). Addressing the issue of cultural and linguistic diversity and assessment: Informal evaluation measures for English language learners. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 24(1), 101–118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10573560701753195>
- Taberski, S. (2000). *On solid ground: Strategies for teaching reading K–3*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- TCRWP (Teachers College Reading and Writing Project). (2014). *Running records*. New York, NY: Author.
- Umansky, I., & Reardon, S. (2014). Reclassification patterns among Latino English learner students in bilingual, dual immersion, and English immersion classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(5), 879–912. doi:[10.3102/0002831214545110](https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831214545110)
- Van Mannen, M. (1997). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action-sensitive pedagogy*. Ontario, Canada: Althouse.
- Walpole, S., & McKenna, M. (2006). The role of Informal Reading Inventories in assessing word recognition. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(6), 592–594. doi:[10.1598/RT59.610](https://doi.org/10.1598/RT59.610)
- Wilde, S. (2000). *Miscue analysis made easy: Building on student strengths*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Appendix

Qualitative interview questions

This study is about reading assessments and English Language Learners.

I am going to ask you some questions about how you learn about the English Language Learners in your class from the different kinds of reading assessments you use. I will also ask you how you use the information from these assessments to help you teach.

Interview Protocol		
The first questions are intended to gather background information about your reading program, your students, and your beliefs about assessments.		
Question	Rationale	Response
Please describe how you teach reading at your school.	Gather descriptive information about pedagogical techniques school-wide.	
Please describe your English Language Learners (what languages they speak, how many years in your program, their background, their learning needs).	Gather descriptive information about student population.	
How do you assess your readers at the school (both large-scale and classroom-based)?	Gather descriptive information about reading assessments in general at school.	
What do you like about how you assess readers? Why?	Gather teacher perspectives on the effectiveness of reading assessments?	
What would you change about how you assess readers? Why?	Gather teacher perspectives on what would make assessment process stronger.	
Do you assess your English Language Learners in reading differently or the same as above? Why?	Inquire about teachers' methods for learning about emergent bilingual's reading abilities.	
What are your beliefs about the reading assessment of English Language Learners?	Gather descriptive information about beliefs.	
How do you decide which reading assessments to use? What choices do you have in implementing these assessments?	To tie use assessments to either mandates or teacher preference.	

Now I will ask you a series of questions about the classroom based assessments you use. I would like to know what you learn from each of these and how you the results from either to teach English Language Learners. (Structured Questions)		
Question	Rationale	Response
What is the purpose of running records? Why are they important?	To uncover teacher knowledge of assessment and how it is tied to pedagogical goals.	
What is assessed through running records? Why are you assessing these skills?	To uncover teacher knowledge of assessment.	
Do you find running records give you useful information about your English Language Learners?	To inquire about if teacher uses this assessment for instructional practices.	
What do you learn about the bilingual reading development of your students from running records?	To inquire about bilingual reading development.	
If yes, Can you give me an example of what this assessment has told you about the <i>reading abilities</i> of a student or a group of students?	To uncover teacher knowledge of assessment and knowledge of students' abilities.	
If yes, Can you give me an example of what this assessment has told you about the <i>language development</i> of a student or a group of students?	To uncover teacher knowledge of assessment and knowledge of bilingualism.	
Given the results of the assessment, what were your next instructional steps for the student or group of students you mentioned?	To examine the relationship between assessment and practice.	
Did you provide the student/group of students with feedback based on the results of this assessment? What was it?	To examine the relationship between assessment and practice.	
These questions are about your personal experiences with assessment and your opinion for how they should be used to improve teaching for English Language Learners. (Conversational)		
What experiences have influenced your use of assessment?	To develop a personal history of assessment use.	
Which experiences with assessment have impacted your practice most?	To examine how teacher experience has impacted practice.	
Can you give me an example of an assessment that has supported your work with English Language Learners and what you did with those results?	To gather examples of when the assessment-instructional cycle works.	
Can you give me an example of an assessment that has not supported your work with English Language Learners?	To gather examples of when the assessment-instructional cycle is not realized.	
Is there anything else you would like to share with me about what you learn from assessments of your English Language Learners?	To gather personal opinion.	
Is there anything else you would like to share with me about how you use the assessments to shape instructional practices?	To gather personal opinion.	

Finally, I will ask teachers the following questions about demographics.

1. What grade level do you teach?

☐

3rd Grade

☐

4th Grade

☐

5th Grade

☐

Other (please specify): _____

2. How many years have you worked as a teacher? Record whole years, not fractions or months. Round up to the nearest whole number and include the current school year.

Number of years

3. How many years have you worked with bilingual students? Record whole year, not fractions or months. Round up to the nearest whole number and include the current school year.

Number of years

4. What type of teaching certification do you hold? Mark (X) ALL that apply.

☐

Permanent

☐

Alternative certification (Transitional B)

☐

Initial or Provisional certification

☐

No certification

5. Do you hold Bilingual Extension?

☐

Yes

☐

No

6. What is your highest level of education?

☐

BA

☐

Masters