Appendix 1. Technical information on the studies

Recommendation 1. Screen for reading problems and monitor progress

The Panel rated the level of evidence as **Strong.** It considered 21 studies that addressed the criterion-related validity of assessment measures to screen English learners in reading and to monitor their reading progress over time. The body of research on early screening measures meets the standards of the American Psychological Association for valid screening instruments (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education, 1999).

Eighteen reviewed studies conducted screening and criterion assessments with English learners at different points in time on measures of phonological awareness, letter knowledge, and word and text reading. Although the number of studies in this category was large, we noted that in many of these studies the samples of English learners were not adequately representative of the population of English learners in the United States. So, we have some concern about the generalizability.

However, the fact that so many studies have replicated these findings supports this recommendation. In addition, the set of screening measures demonstrates moderate predictive validity for English learners from homes speaking a variety of languages: Spanish, Punjabi, Tamil, Mandarin, Cantonese, Farsi, Hmong, and Portuguese, among others.

Example of a criterion-related validity study

In a recent study by Geva and Yaghoub-Zadeh (2006), second-grade English learners (Cantonese, Punjabi, Tamil, and Portuguese) and native English speakers were assessed in English on cognitive and linguistic measures (nonverbal intelligence, rapid letter naming, phonological awareness, vocabulary, and syntactic knowledge) and reading measures (pseudoword reading, word recognition, and word and text reading fluency).

Phonological awareness, rapid letter naming, and word recognition accounted for the bulk of the variance on word and text reading fluency. These measures accounted for 60 percent and 58 percent of the variance on measures of fluency of word and text reading, respectively, after oral language measures (vocabulary and syntactic knowledge) were entered into the hierarchical regression models. The pattern of relationships among the measures was similar for the English learners and native English speakers. Oral language measures, although entered first into the regression models, accounted for just 11 percent and 12 percent of the variance on measures of word and text reading fluency, respectively. In other studies the predictive validity for oral language measures is even smaller for kindergarten and the first grade. We thus assert that oral language proficiency is a poor predictor of subsequent reading performance.

Studies that systematically monitored student progress over time in grades 1 to 5

Four studies also investigated the regular monitoring of student progress over time (Baker & Good, 1995; Dominguez de Ramirez & Shapiro, 2006; Leafstedt,

Richards, & Gerber, 2004; Wiley & Deno, 2005), with three of four investigating the use of oral reading fluency. Two of these focused specifically on the technical issues of monitoring progress regularly. They indicated that oral reading fluency was sensitive to growth over periods as short as two weeks when used in the early grades (Baker & Good, 1995) and when used with students up to grade 5 (Dominguez de Ramirez & Shapiro, 2006). In two of the studies (Baker & Good, 2005; Wiley & Deno, 2005) oral reading fluency predicted the performance of English learners on comprehensive reading tests such as the SAT-10 and state-developed reading assessments.

Comparable expectations for English learners

An interesting and important sidelight of the validity studies is the corresponding set of descriptive statistics. Many of the studies demonstrate that English learners can perform at comparable levels of proficiency to native English speakers on measures assessing phonological awareness, word reading, and reading connected text fluently. These studies have been conducted with English learners in the primary grades who receive their instruction exclusively in the general education classroom alongside their native-English-speaking peers. It is in these contexts that they develop comparable word reading, word attack, and spelling skills in kindergarten through the second grade (Chiappe & Siegel, 1999; Chiappe, Siegel, & Wade-Woolley, 2002; Lesaux & Siegel, 2003; Limbos & Geva, 2001; Verhoeven, 1990, 2000).

The comparable development of early reading skills for English learners appears to extend beyond accuracy in word recognition and spelling. There is evidence that English learners can develop equivalent degrees of fluency in reading both word lists and connected text by the second grade (Geva & Yaghoub-Zadeh, 2006; Lesaux & Siegel, 2003). There is also some limited evidence that English learners can develop equivalency with native English speakers in reading comprehension (Chiappe, Glaeser, & Ferko, 2007; Lesaux, Lipka, & Siegel, 2006; Lesaux & Siegel, 2003). We conclude that it is reasonable to expect that English learners can learn to read at rates similar to those of native speakers if they are provided with high-quality reading instruction.

Recommendation 2. Provide intensive small-group reading interventions

The Panel rated the level of evidence as **Strong.** We located four high-quality, randomized controlled trials demonstrating support for the practice of explicit, systematic small-group instruction. Each of the studies met the standards of the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). Conducted at various sites by different research groups, they targeted different interventions that share core characteristics in design and content.

For sample sizes, there were 91 first graders in one of the studies of *Enhanced Proactive Reading,* 41 first graders in the other, 33 students in grades 2–5 for *Read Well,* and 17 students in kindergarten through third grade for *SRA Reading Mastery.* All the students were English learners. In three of the studies, all were students reading at or below the first-grade level.

Effect sizes were consistently positive for reading but inconsistent for English

language development. Only the study of *Enhanced Proactive Reading* (Vaughn, Mathes, et al., 2006) demonstrated a statistically significant effect in reading. Yet all the studies demonstrated substantially important effect sizes for reading: 0.89 and 0.25 for *Enhanced Proactive Reading,* 0.76 for *SRA Reading Mastery,* and 0.25 for *Read Well.*

Despite the different names and some differences in lesson content and sequencing, all three interventions have many features in common: fast-paced, intensive, highly interactive small-group instruction; frequent review; frequent opportunities for students to respond; heavy emphasis on systematic teaching of phonological awareness and phonics principles; use of decodable text; and emphasis on fluency as well as comprehension.

Example of a study of intensive small-group reading intervention

In one *Enhanced Proactive Reading* study (Vaughn, Cirino, et al., 2006), 91 English learners below the 25th percentile in English reading from four schools were randomly assigned (at the student level) to the intervention or comparison condition. The intervention involved daily small-group reading instruction focusing on five areas: phonological awareness, letter knowledge, word recognition, fluency, and comprehension. There were 120 50-minute lessons. Teachers modeled new content, and the lessons were fast paced. Students' responses were primarily choral, with some individual responses. Students in the comparison group received the same core reading instruction as students in the intervention condition, and many students also received supplemental instruction, although it was different from the supplemental instruction provided to English learners in the intervention condition.

The What Works Clearinghouse concluded that the effects for reading achievement were not statistically significant (largely because of analysis at the classroom level, which decreased power), but five of the seven effect sizes, as well as the average effect size, were large enough to be substantively important. These effects were average for overall reading achievement (effect size = 0.27) and for specific measures of letter-sound knowledge (0.26), decoding (word attack, 0.42), reading fluency (DIBELS passage 1, 0.32; DIBELS passage 2, 0.27), and word reading efficiency (0.41). Impacts on letter-word identification and passage comprehension were not considered important (0.13 and 0.06, respectively).

In the second *Enhanced Proactive Reading* study (Vaughn, Mathes, et al., 2006), which met the WWC standards with reservations (because of randomization problems), there was a statistically significant and substantively important impact on reading overall (0.89), on decoding (word attack, 1.53), and on comprehension (1.32).

Together, these two studies, plus the other studies in this set, showed potentially positive effects in reading achievement and no discernible effects in English language development.

Recommendation 3. Provide extensive and varied vocabulary instruction

The Panel rated the level of evidence as **Strong.** We reviewed three studies that directly investigated the impact of vocabulary instruction with English learners. A randomized controlled trial (Carlo et al., 2004) reviewed by the What Works Clearinghouse and was found to meet the WWC evidentiary standards with

reservations (because of differential attrition). Perez (1981) also conducted a randomized controlled trial, and Rousseau, Tam, and Ramnarain (1993) conducted a single-subject study. All three studies showed improvements in reading comprehension, and in the one study that assessed vocabulary specifically (Carlo et al., 2004), the effect was positive.

The Panel also considered that many studies of vocabulary instruction for native English speakers have found that explicit word meaning instruction improves reading achievement (see Beck & McKeown, 1991; Blachowicz & Fisher, 2000; Blachowicz, Fisher, Ogle, & Watts-Taffe, 2006; Mezynski, 1983; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000; Stahl & Fairbanks, 1986). We also reviewed intervention research conducted with English learners.

Example of a vocabulary intervention study

In the study of the *Vocabulary Improvement Program* (Carlo et al., 2004), 16 classrooms were randomly assigned to treatment ($n = 10$) and control ($n = 6$) conditions. These classrooms included 142 fifth-grade English learners and 112 English-only students. The intervention lasted 15 weeks. At the beginning of each week, 10 to 12 target words were introduced, and instruction was provided four days per week for 30 to 45 minutes. Each fifth week was a review of the previous four weeks.

On Mondays English learners previewed a reading assignment in their native language. On Tuesdays intervention activities began, with English learners reading the assignment in English and defining the target vocabulary words in large-group discussion with the teacher. On Wednesdays the English learners completed cloze activities (fill in the blanks) in small groups (heterogeneous groups based on language). On Thursdays students completed word association, synonym/antonym, and semantic feature analysis activities. On Fridays specific intervention activities varied, but the central objective was to promote general word analysis skills, rather than to focus specifically on learning the target words.

In the control classrooms, English learners received instruction normally included in the school curriculum.

In the WWC analysis the intervention was found to have a potentially positive impact on both reading achievement and English language development. But because of the small sample size (with the classroom as the unit of analysis), the gains in these domains were not statistically significant. The effect size in reading comprehension was 0.50, and the average effect size across five specific measures of English language development was 0.43. Both effect sizes were considered substantively important.

Perez (1981) also found that a vocabulary intervention had a positive impact on reading achievement with third-grade English learners. In a multiple baseline study, Rousseau et al. (1993) found that discussion of key words prior to text reading in combination with teacher reading of the text prior to students' reading of the text on their own resulted in a positive impact on both oral reading and reading comprehension.

Reading interventions and vocabulary development

These three studies are the only direct tests of the impact of vocabulary instruction on the reading development of English learners. But it is important that many complex interventions that have improved

the reading achievement of English learners also include explicit teaching of vocabulary. Various studies reviewed positively by the What Works Clearinghouse make it clear that these more complex interventions have been successful in increasing English learners' reading and language achievement, but these studies were not designed to allow the specific effects of vocabulary teaching to be calculated. These successful programs include *Read Well* (Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck, 2004); *Instructional Conversations* (Saunders, 1999; Saunders & Goldenberg, 1999); *Enhanced Proactive Reading* (Vaughn, Cirino, et al., 2006); and *SRA Reading Mastery* (Gunn, Biglan, Smolkowski, & Ary, 2000; Gunn, Smolkowski, Biglan, & Black, 2002). In all these programs, potentially confusing or difficult words for English learners were drawn from reading texts and given additional instructional attention, often using procedures similar to those noted in the explicit vocabulary studies reviewed above.

Recommendation 4. Develop academic English

The Panel rated the level of evidence as **Low.** Two studies (Scientific Learning Corporation, 2004; Uchikoshi, 2005) demonstrate that focused interventions in two relatively narrow areas of academic English (quality of oral narrative and syntax) are potentially effective. But because the studies address very selected aspects of academic English and only indirectly address classroom instruction, we cannot conclude at this time that the studies affirm the effectiveness of instruction in academic English. Additional support is provided by a recent classroom observational study that correlates devotion of specific blocks of time to English language development with enhanced outcomes.

The two randomized controlled studies pertaining to academic English (Scientific Learning Corporation, 2004; Uchikoshi, 2005) are described in greater depth on the What Works Clearinghouse website (www.whatworks.ed.gov). Both were assessed as possessing high control for internal validity; they were rated as *meets evidence standards* without reservations.

In one randomized controlled trial (Uchikoshi, 2005), 108 Spanish-speaking English learners were assigned to watch either 54 half-hour episodes of *Arthur* (*Arthur* emphasizes stories with a plot, conflict, and resolution) or the same number of episodes of *Reading Between the Lions* (a book-based program emphasizing phonics and reading). *Arthur* had an overall positive impact on measures of English language development (effect size = 0.29) and specifically on overall quality of the students' retelling a story (0.44); these effects were not statistically significant. See Dickinson and Tabors (2001) and Snow, Tabors, Nicholson, and Kurland (1995) for discussions of the role of narratives in emerging literacy and the link of narratives to the subsequent academic success of monolingual children.

The study of *FastForWord* (Scientific Learning Corporation, 2004), a computer-based program conducted with 81 English learners in kindergarten through the fifth grade, assessed three aspects of comprehension of oral language that encompass three domains: word classes and relations, grammatical morphemes, and elaborated sentences. The effect size across these three areas was 0.88 (statistically significant).

Example of a study of academic English

The correlational study by Saunders, Foorman, and Carlson (2006) supports the recommendation that student growth in

oral language is stronger in classes that designate specific blocks of time for English language development. This observational study was conducted in 85 kindergarten classrooms in 11 school districts in two states with large populations of English learners. In 26 classrooms the entire school day was in English. In the remaining 59 classrooms teachers used Spanish for most of the day but spent some time on English language development instruction (also known as ESL or ESOL). The *Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery—Revised: English and Spanish Forms* (WLPB-R; Woodcock, 1991; Woodcock & Muñoz-Sandoval, 1993) was used to measure oral language development; word reading skills were assessed with the word identification (Identificación de letras y palabras) subtest from the WLPB-R. Students were assessed at the beginning and the end of the school year.

Two findings are worth noting. First, whether academic instruction was in English or Spanish, classrooms with a fixed block of time devoted to English language development had greater proportions of time during the school day devoted to oral language development. Students in these classes made significantly greater growth in both language and literacy outcomes than students in classes where English language development was infused throughout the day. So, it seems important for teachers to have a block of time each day during which English language development is the primary focus.

Second, very little time was devoted to building academic English in any of the various programs. On average, only 4.5 percent of the time was devoted to vocabulary development and less than 2 percent of the time was spent on work on language structures, such as grammar and syntax. In other words, less than 10 percent of the time was devoted to developing academic English (see also Arreaga-Mayer & Perdomo-Rivera, 1996).

Recommendation 5. Schedule regular peer-assisted learning opportunities

The Panel rated the level of evidence as **Strong.** Three studies of English learners addressed peer-assisted learning (Calhoon, Al Otaiba, Cihak, King, & Avalos, 2006; McMaster, Kung, Han, & Cao, in press; Saenz, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2005) and two investigated the use of cooperative groups (Calderón, Hertz-Lazarowitz, & Slavin, 1998; Klingner & Vaughn, 1996).

Two studies were randomized controlled trials, and two were high-quality quasi experiments. The Saenz et al. study (randomized controlled trial) met the WWC evidence standards without reservations. Calhoon et al. was also a randomized controlled trial. The Calderón et al. quasi experiment met the WWC criteria with reservations. McMaster et al. was a methodologically acceptable quasi experiment. Because a set of four studies across multiple sites conducted by multiple research teams reached consistent conclusions about the positive academic impacts of structured work in heterogeneous teams of two or four, we consider the evidential basis strong.

The study by Klingner and Vaughn (1996) used a weaker design (with threats to internal validity). This study compared peer-assisted learning (using groups of two) with reciprocal teaching (using groups of four). Both interventions seemed promising, and impacts were roughly equivalent for the two. But because the design did not include a control group, the study cannot make strong claims. It does, however,

provide additional evidence of the potential effectiveness of structured peer-assisted learning.

Nature of the impacts on student learning

In the kindergarten (Saenz et al., 2005) and first-grade (Calhoon et al., 2006) studies, positive effects were found for peer-assisted learning on letter-sound and word attack measures, phoneme awareness, and oral reading fluency. The effect sizes were substantively important. In grades 3–6 the impact on reading comprehension was significant.

Example of a study on peer-assisted learning

The Saenz et al. (2005) study provides a good example of how peer-assisted learning works and how this research is frequently conducted. Twelve classroom teachers were randomly assigned to peer tutoring and control conditions. Within each classroom four groups of English learners were identified: two English learners with learning disabilities, and three students per group in low, average, and high achieving groups, for a total of 11 students per classroom. Peer-assisted instruction was conducted three times per week in 35-minute sessions for 15 weeks. Relatively strong readers were paired with relatively weak readers for the tutoring sessions, and pairs were rotated every three to four weeks. Each student assumed the role of tutor and tutee and engaged in three reading activities: partner reading with story retelling, summarizing text (paragraph shrinking), and making predictions (prediction relay). In these activities the stronger reader was the tutee first, and tutors were trained to respond with structured prompts when tutees were having difficulty. Treatment fidelity was very high, above 90 percent in all areas.

In this study, there was a positive impact on reading comprehension, as measured by questions answered correctly. There was no interaction with learner type, and the effect sizes were 1.03 for English learners with learning disabilities, and 0.86, 0.60, and 1.02, respectively for the low, average, and high achieving groups. These effect sizes were substantively important.

Appendix 2. Levels of evidence for the recommendations in the practice guide

We rely on the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Evidence Standards to assess the *quality* of evidence supporting educational programs and practices. The What Works Clearinghouse addresses evidence for the causal validity of instructional programs and practices according to WWC Standards. Information about these standards is available at www.whatworks.ed.gov/reviewprocess/standards.html.

The technical quality of each study is rated and placed in one of three categories:

- *Meets evidence standards*—for randomized controlled trials and regression discontinuity studies that provide the strongest evidence of causal validity;
- *Meets evidence standards with reservations*—for all quasi-experimental studies with no design flaws and randomized controlled trials that have problems with randomization, attrition, or disruption; and
- *Does not meet evidence standards*—for studies that do not provide strong evidence of causal validity.

Criteria for assessing problems of attrition and randomization are described in detail in a set of *Technical Working Papers.* The following are the main reasons for excluding studies:

1. There is only one teacher per condition or one school per condition. This creates a major problem in interpretation because it is uncertain whether one particular teacher or one particular school produces the effect, or whether the effect is due to the practice.
2. Failure to provide pretest information on a salient pretest variable—for quasi experiments only. In this case we don't know whether the effect is due to the practice or to important initial differences between the experimental and control groups.
3. Differential attrition between intervention and control groups or extremely high attrition (without an adequate attempt to account for this factor in data analysis procedures).

Strong level of evidence

In general, characterization of the evidence for a recommendation as *strong* requires both studies with high internal validity (studies whose designs can support causal conclusions) and studies with high external validity (studies that in total include enough of the range of participants and settings on which the recommendation is focused to support the conclusion that the results can be generalized to those participants and settings). Evidence for this Practice Guide is strong if:

- A systematic review of research generally meets the standards of the What Works Clearinghouse and supports the effectiveness of a program, practice, or approach—and there is no contradictory evidence of similar quality.

OR

- Several well designed, randomized, controlled trials or well designed quasi experiments generally meet the standards of the What Works Clearinghouse and support the effectiveness of a program, practice, or approach—and there is no contradictory evidence of similar quality.

OR

- One large, well designed, randomized, controlled, multisite trial meets the standards of the What Works Clearinghouse and supports the effectiveness of a program, practice, or approach—and there is no contradictory evidence of similar quality.

- For assessments, evidence of reliability and validity meets the standards in *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*.[107]

Moderate level of evidence

In general, characterization of the evidence for a recommendation as *moderate* requires studies with high internal validity but moderate external validity or studies with high external validity but moderate internal validity. In other words moderate evidence is derived from studies that support strong causal conclusions but for which generalization is uncertain, or from studies that support the generality of a relationship but for which causality is uncertain. Evidence for this Practice Guide is moderate if:

- Experiments or quasi experiments generally meet the standards of the What Works Clearinghouse and support the effectiveness of a program, practice, or approach with small sample sizes or other conditions of implementation or analysis that limit generalizability—and there is no contrary evidence.

OR

- Comparison group studies that do not demonstrate equivalence of groups at pretest and therefore do not meet the standards of the What Works Clearinghouse but that consistently show enhanced outcomes for participants experiencing a particular program, practice, or approach and have no major flaws related to internal validity other than lack of demonstrated equivalence at pretest (such as only one teacher or one class per condition, unequal amounts of instructional time, or highly biased outcome measures).

OR

- Correlational research with strong statistical controls for selection bias and for discerning influence of endogenous factors, and there is no contrary evidence.

- For assessments, evidence of reliability that meets the standards in *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* but provides evidence of validity from samples that are not adequately representative of the population on which the recommendation is focused.

Low level of evidence

In general, characterization of the evidence for a recommendation as *low* means that the recommendation is based on expert opinion derived from strong findings or theories in related areas or expert opinion buttressed by direct evidence that does not rise to the *moderate* or *strong* level. Evidence is low if it does not meet the standards for *moderate* or *high*.

Notes

1. Field & Lohr (1990).

2. American Psychological Association (2002).

3. Greene (1997).

4. Slavin & Cheung (2005).

5. August & Hakuta (1997); Rossell & Baker (1996).

6. August & Hakuta (1997); Francis, Lesaux, & August (2006).

7. Greene (1997).

8. See http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/ltt/results2004/sub_reading_race2.asp (retrieved October 9, 2006).

9. See http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/nrc/reading_math_2005/s0015.asp (retrieved March 16, 2007).

10. See http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/nrc/reading_math_2005/s0015.asp.

11. August & Hakuta (1997); Shanahan & August (2006).

12. Morrison Institute for Public Policy (2006).

13. Fitzgerald (1995); Krashen (1985).

14. Bialystok & Herman (1999); Geva, Yaghoub-Zadeh, & Schuster (2000); Limbos & Geva (2001).

15. Chiappe & Siegel (1999); Chiappe, Siegel, & Wade-Woolley (2002); Lesaux & Siegel (2003); Limbos & Geva, (2001).

16. Chiappe, Siegel, & Wade-Wooley (2002); Geva et al. (2000); Lesaux & Siegel (2003); Limbos & Geva (2001); Manis et al. (2004); Swanson et al. (2004).

17. Geva & Yaghoub-Zadeh (2006); Lesaux & Siegel (2003).

18. Chiappe, Glaeser, & Ferko (2007); Lesaux, Lipka, & Siegel (2006); Lesaux & Siegel (2003).

19. Miller, Heilmann, Nockerts, Iglesias, Fabiano, et al. (2006); Proctor, Carlo, August, & Snow (2005).

20. Baker & Good (1995); Dominguez de Ramirez & Shapiro (2006).

21. Baker (2006).

22. Arab-Moghaddam & Sénéchal (2001); Baker (2006); Baker, Gersten, Haager, & Dingle (2006); Baker & Good (1995); Chiappe, Siegel, & Gottardo (2002); Chiappe, Siegel, & Wade-Woolley (2002); Dominguez de Ramirez & Shapiro (2006); Geva & Yaghoub-Zadeh (2006); Geva et al. (2000); Lafrance & Gottardo (2005); Leafstedt, Richards, & Gerber (2004); Lesaux & Siegel (2003); Limbos (2006); Limbos & Geva (2001); Manis, Lindsey, & Bailey (2004); Quiroga, Lemos-Britton, Mostafapour, Abbott, & Berninger (2002); Swanson, Sáez, & Gerber (2004); Verhoeven (1990, 2000); Wang & Geva (2003); Wiley & Deno (2005).

23. American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education (1999).

24. Chiappe, Siegel, & Wade-Woolley (2002); Geva et al. (2000); Lafrance & Gottardo (2005); Lesaux & Siegel, (2003); Limbos & Geva (2001); Manis et al. (2004).

25. Chiappe, Siegel, & Wade-Woolley (2002); Geva et al. (2000); Lesaux & Siegel (2003); Limbos & Geva (2001); Manis et al. (2004); Swanson et al. (2004).

26. Limbos & Geva (2001); Swanson et al. (2004).

27. Baker & Good (1995).

28. Baker & Good (1995); Dominguez de Ramirez & Shapiro (2006); Wiley & Deno (2005).

29. Chiappe & Siegel (1999); Chiappe, Siegel, & Wade-Woolley (2002); Lesaux & Siegel (2003); Limbos & Geva (2001).

30. August & Hakuta (1997); August & Shanahan (2006); Geva et al. (2000).

31. Cisero & Royer (1995); Gottardo (2002); Hsia (1992); Mumtaz & Humphreys (2001).

32. Chiappe, Siegel, & Wade-Woolley (2002); Geva et al. (2000); Limbos (2006); Manis et al. (2004); Townsend, Lee, & Chiappe (2006).

33. Cisero & Royer (1995); Gottardo (2002); Quiroga et al. (2002).

34. Chiappe & Siegel (2006); Chiappe, Siegel, & Wade-Woolley (2002); Lesaux & Siegel (2003); Geva et al. (2000); Limbos & Geva (2001); Verhoeven (1990, 2000).

35. Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck (2004); Gunn, Smolkowski, Biglan, & Black (2002); Vaughn, Cirino, et al. (2006); Vaughn, Mathes, et al. (2006).

36. August & Siegel (2006); Quiroga et al. (2002); Shanahan & Beck (2006).

37. Denton et al. (2004); Gunn et al. (2002); Vaughn, Cirino, et al. (2006); Vaughn, Mathes, et al. (2006).

38. Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, & Hickman-Davis (2003).

39. In two of the four intervention studies, instructional assistants were trained to provide the instruction. Gunn et al. (2002); Vaughn, Cirino, et al. (2006); Vaughn, Mathes, et al. (2006); Cirino et al. (2007).

40. Haager & Windmueller (2001).

41. Vaughn, Cirino, et al. (2006); Vaughn, Mathes, et al. (2006). Gunn et al. (2002).

42. For further information on the What Works Clearinghouse, visit www.whatworks.ed.gov.

43. Vaughn, Cirino, et al. (2006); Vaughn, Mathes, et al. (2006).

44. Denton et al. (2004).

45. Gunn et al. (2002).

46. Cirino et al. (2007); Gunn et al. (2002).

47. Gunn et al. (2002).

48. Franklin (1986); Limbos & Geva (2001).

49. Gunn et al. (2002); Cirino et al. (2007).

50. In the intervention studies, teachers and instructional assistants were trained to provide instruction.

51. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) (2000).

52. Carlo et al. (2004); Perez (1981).

53. Carlo et al. (2004); Perez (1981); Rousseau, Tam & Ramnarain (1993).

54. Carlo et al. (2004); Perez (1981).

55. Gersten, Dimino, & Jayanthi (in press).

56. August, Carlo, Dressler, & Snow (2005); Blachowicz, Fisher, Ogle, & Watts-Taffe (2006).

57. Gersten, Dimino, Jayanthi, Kim, & Santoro (2006).

58. Gersten et al. (2006).

59. Hiebert (2005).

60. Beck, Perfetti, & McKeown (1982); Biemiller (1999).

61. August et al. (2005).

62. Carlo et al. (2004); Perez (1981); Rousseau et al. (1993).

63. See www.whatworks.ed.gov.

64. Carlo et al. (2004).

65. Perez (1981); Rousseau et al. (1993).

66. Umbel, Pearson, Fernandez, & Oller (1992); Verhallen & Schoonen (1993).

67. Carlo et al. (2004); Perez (1981); Rousseau et al. (1993).

68. NICHD (2000).

69. Baker et al. (2006); Gersten et al. (2006).

70. August & Hakuta (1997); Bailey (2006); Francis, Rivera, et al. (2006); Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian (2006); Goldenberg (2006); Scarcella (2003); Schleppegrell (2001, 2004); Snow & Fillmore (2000).

71. August & Hakuta (1997); Bailey (2006); Callahan (2005); Diaz-Rico & Weed (2002); Francis, Rivera, et al. (2006); Genesee et al. (2006); Goldenberg (2006); Meltzer & Haman (2005); Scarcella (2003); Schleppegrell (2001, 2004); Snow & Fillmore (2000).

72. Proctor et al. (2005).

73. Francis, Rivera, et al. (2006).

74. August & Hakuta (1997); Callahan (2005) Francis, Rivera, et al. (2006); Genesee et al. (2006); Goldenberg (2006); Meltzer & Haman (2005); Scarcella (2003); Snow & Fillmore (2000).

75. Fillmore & Snow (2002).

76. Michaels & Cook-Gumperz (1979); Saunders et al. (2006); Schleppegrell (2004).

77. Feldman & Kinsella (2005).

78. Girard (2005).

79. Dutro & Moran (2002).

80. Snow & Fillmore (2000).

81. Diaz-Rico & Weed (2002).

82. Scarcella (2003).

83. August & Hakuta (1997); Francis, Rivera, et al. (2006); Meltzer & Haman (2005); Scarcella (2003); Snow & Fillmore (2000).

84. Francis, Rivera, et al. (2006); Saunders, Foorman, & Carlson (2006); Schleppegrell (2004); Fillmore (2004); Scarcella (2003).

85. Francis, Rivera, et al. (2006); Gibbons (2002).

86. Goldenberg (2006).

87. Celce-Murcia (2002); Fillmore & Snow (2000).

88. Francis, Rivera, et al. (2006); Fillmore & Snow (2000).

89. Bailey (2006); Gibbons (2002); Schleppegrell (2004). Note that English learners who enter school in the primary grades without the ability to use English in such ways can learn grade-appropriate academic English as well as their English-speaking peers if they are given access to the same rigorous curriculum early and appropriate instructional support and interventions, delivered daily in blocks of time dedicated to the development of academic language. When students receive high-quality instruction in academic English early in their education, we see gains in their test scores later.

90. See www.whatworks.ed.gov.

91. Scientific Learning Corporation (2004); Uchikoshi (2005).

92. August & Hakuta (1997); August & Shanahan (2006); Bailey (2006); Callahan (2005); Francis, Rivera et al. (2006); Gennesee et al. (2006); Goldenberg (2006); Meltzer & Haman (2005); Scarcella (2003); Schleppegrell (2001, 2004); Snow & Fillmore (2000).

93. At this stage, the reader may be a bit confused. In Recommendation 1 (Formative Assessments to Screen for Reading Problems and Monitor Progress), we noted that studies consistently find that oral English language proficiency is a weak predictor of how quickly a child will learn to read in English. Yet, in Recommendation 4 we argue for the importance of intensive work on the development of academic English, including oral language proficiency, beginning in kindergarten.

A subtle but important distinction needs to be made to explain the seeming contradiction. The fact that oral English language proficiency is not a valid predictor of who needs extra support in learning to read in the early grades in no way indicates that oral English language proficiency is not important for the development of reading in the long term. In fact, experts consistently consider building oral proficiency in the features of academic English to be critical. In Recommendation 1, we were addressing screening measures for learning how to read (the act of reading and understanding the relatively straightforward books suitable for students in the early grades).

94. Echevarria, Vogt, & Short (2004); Francis, Rivera, et al. (2006).

95. Francis, Rivera, et al. (2006); Gersten & Baker (2000); Fillmore & Snow (2000).

96. Saunders et al. (2006).

97. Saunders et al. (2006).

98. 90 minutes is the median amount of time per week in the research.

99. McMaster, Kung, Han, & Cao (in press).

100. Calderón, Hertz-Lazavowitz, & Slavin (1998).

101. Klingner & Vaughn (1996).

102. Calhoon, Al Otaiba, Cihak, King, & Avalos (2006); McMaster et al. (in press); Saenz, Fuchs, & Fuchs (2005).

103. Calderón et al. (1998); Klingner & Vaughn (1996).

104. Calderón et al. (1998); Saenz et al. (2005).

105. Saenz et al. (2005).

106. Calderón et al. (1998).

107. American Educational Research Association et al. (1999).

References

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: AERA Publications.

American Psychological Association. (2002). Criteria for practice guideline development and evaluation. *American Psychologist*, *57*, 1048–1051.

Arab-Moghaddam, N., & Sénéchal, M. (2001). Orthographic and phonological processing skills in reading and spelling in Persian/English bilinguals. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *25*, 140–147.

Arreaga-Mayer, C., & Perdomo-Rivera, C. (1996). Ecobehavioral analysis of instruction for at-risk language-minority students. *Elementary School Journal*, 96, 245–258.

August, D., Carlo, M., Dressler, C., & Snow, C. (2005). The critical role of vocabulary development for English language learners. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 20*, 50–57.

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

August, D., & Siegel, L. (2006). Literacy instruction for language-minority children in special education settings. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth* (pp. 523–553). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bailey, A. (Ed.). (2006). *The language demands of school: Putting academic English to the test.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Baker, S. (2006, March). *English language learners and reading first: Some preliminary evidence of effectiveness*. Paper presented at the CORE Literacy Leadership Summit, San Francisco, CA.

Baker, S., Gersten, R., Haager, D., & Dingle, M. (2006). Teaching practice and the reading growth of first-grade English learners: Validation of an observation instrument. *Elementary School Journal, 107*, 199–219.

Baker, S. K., & Good, R. (1995). Curriculum-based measurement for English reading with bilingual Hispanic students: A validation study with second-grade students. *School Psychology Review*, *24*, 561–578.

Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (1991). Conditions of vocabulary acquisition. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 789–814). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Beck, I. L., Perfetti, C. A., & McKeown, M. G. (1982). Effects of long-term vocabulary instruction on lexical access and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 74*, 506–521.

Bialystok, E., & Herman, J. (1999). Does bilingualism matter for early literacy? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 2*, 35–44.

Biemiller, A. (1999). *Language and reading success*. Newton Upper Falls, MA: Brookline Books.

Blachowicz, C. L. Z., & Fisher, P. J. L. (2000). Vocabulary instruction. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 503–523). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Blachowicz, C. L. Z., Fisher, P. J. L., Ogle D., & Watts-Taffe, S. (2006). Vocabulary: Questions from the classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*, 524–539.

Calderón, M., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., & Slavin, R. (1998). Effects of bilingual cooperative integrated reading and composition on students transitioning from Spanish to English reading. *Elementary School Journal, 99*, 153–165.

Calhoon, M. B., Al Otaiba, S., Cihak, D., King, A., & Avalos, A. C. (2006). *Effects of a peer-mediated program on reading skill acquisition for two-way bilingual first grade classrooms*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Callahan, R. (2005). Tracking and high school English language learners: Limiting opportunity to learn. *American Educational Research Journal*, *42*, 305–328.

Carlo, M. S., August, D., McLaughlin, B., Snow, C. E., Dressler, C., Lippman, D., et al. (2004). Closing the gap: Addressing the vocabulary needs for English language learners in bilingual and mainstream classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly, 39*, 188–215.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2002). On the use of selected grammatical features in academic writing. In M. C. Colombi & M. J. Schleppegrell (Eds.), *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages* (pp. 143–158). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Chiappe, P., Glaeser, B., & Ferko, D. (2007). Speech perception, vocabulary and the development of reading skills in English among Korean- and English-speaking children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *99*, 154–166.

Chiappe, P., & Siegel, L. S. (1999). Phonological awareness and reading acquisition in English- and Punjabi-speaking Canadian children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*, 20–28.

Chiappe, P., & Siegel, L. S. (2006). A longitudinal study of reading development of Canadian children from diverse linguistic backgrounds. *Elementary School Journal*, *107*, 135–152.

Chiappe, P., Siegel, L. S., & Gottardo, A. (2002). Reading-related skills in kindergartners from diverse linguistic backgrounds. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *23*, 95–116.

Chiappe, P., Siegel, L., & Wade-Woolley, L. (2002). Linguistic diversity and the development of reading skills: A longitudinal study. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 6*, 369–400.

Cirino, P. T., Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., Cardenas-Hagan, E., Fletcher, J. M., & Francis, D. J. (2007). *One year follow-up outcomes of Spanish and English interventions for English language learners at-risk for reading problems*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Cisero, C. A., & Royer, J. M. (1995). The development and cross-language transfer of phonological awareness. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *20*, 275–303.

Denton, C. A., Anthony, J. L., Parker, R., & Hasbrouck, J. E. (2004). Effects of two tutoring programs on the English reading development of Spanish-English bilingual students. *The Elementary School Journal, 104*, 289–305.

Diaz-Rico, L. T., & Weed, K. Z. (2002). *The crosscultural, language, and academic development handbook: A complete K–12 reference guide*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Dickinson, D. K., & Tabors, P. (Eds.). (2001). *Beginning literacy with language*. Baltimore: Brookes.

Dominguez de Ramirez, R., & Shapiro, E. S. (2006). Curriculum-based measurement and the evaluation of reading skills of Spanish-speaking English language learners in bilingual education classrooms. *School Psychology Review, 35*, 356–369.

Dutro, S., & Moran, C. (2002), Rethinking English language instruction: An architectural approach. In G. Garcia (Ed.), *English learners reading at the highest level of English literacy*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. A., & Short, D. J. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Feldman, K., & Kinsella, K. (2005). Create an active participation classroom. *The CORE Reading Expert*. Retrieved from http://www.corelearn.com/pdfs/Newsletters/CORE%202005%20Spring%20Newsletter.pdf.

Field, M. J., & Lohr, K. N. (Eds.). (1990). *Clinical practice guidelines: Directions for a new program*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Fillmore, L. W. (2004). The role of language in academic development. In *Excerpts from a presentation by Lily Wong Fillmore at the Closing the Achievement Gap for EL Students conference*. Santa Rosa: CA: Sonoma County Office of Education. Retreived from http://www.scoe.k12.ca.us/aiming_high/docs/AH_language.pdf.

Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. (2002). What teachers need to know about language. In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7–54). Washington, DC, and McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems Co., Inc.

Fitzgerald, J. (1995). English-as-a-second-language learners' cognitive reading processes: A review of research in the United States. *Review of Educational Research, 65*, 145–190.

Francis, D., Lesaux, N., & August, D. (2006). Language instruction. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth* (pp. 365–413). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Francis, D. J., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006). *Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: Research-based recommendations for instruction and academic interventions.* Retrieved from http://www.centeroninstruction.org/files/ELL1-Interventions.pdf.

Franklin, E. A. (1986). Literacy instruction for LES children. *Language Arts*, 63, 51–60.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gersten, R., & Baker, S. (2000). What we know about effective instructional practices for English-language learners. *Exceptional Children, 66*, 454–470.

Gersten, R., Dimino, J., Jayanthi, M., Kim, J., & Santoro, L. (2007). *Teacher study groups as a means to improve reading comprehension and vocabulary instruction for English learners: Results of randomized controlled trials.* Signal Hill, CA: Instructional Research Group.

Gersten, R., Dimino, J., & Jayanthi, M. (in press). Development of a classroom observational system. In B. Taylor & J. Ysseldyke (Eds.), *Reading instruction for English language learners: The Bond symposium*. New York: Teachers College.

Geva, E., & Yaghoub-Zadeh, Z. (2006). Reading efficiency in native English-speaking and English-as-a-second-language children: The role of oral proficiency and underlying cognitive-linguistic processes. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *10*, 31–57.

Geva, E., Yaghoub-Zadeh, Z., & Schuster, B. (2000). Part IV: Reading and foreign language learning: Understanding individual differences in word recognition skills of ESL children. *Annals of Dyslexia, 50*, 121–154.

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Girard, V. (2005). English learners and the language arts. In V. Girard (Ed.), *Schools moving up: A WestEd initiative.* Retrieved November 8, 2006, from

http://www.schoolsmovingup.net/cs/wested/view/e/140.

Goldenberg, C. (2006). Improving achievement for English learners: Conclusions from 2 research reviews. Retrieved from http://www.colorincolorado.org/article/12918.

Gottardo, A. (2002). The relationship between language and reading skills in bilingual Spanish-English speakers. *Topics in Language Disorders*, *22*, 46–70.

Greene, J. P. (1997, Spring). A meta-analysis of the Rossell and Baker review of bilingual education research. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *21*. Retrieved April 24, 2007, from http://brj.asu.edu/articlesv2/green.html.

Gunn, B., Biglan, A., Smolkowski, K., & Ary, D. (2000). The efficacy of supplemental instruction in decoding skills for Hispanic and non-Hispanic students in early elementary school. *Journal of Special Education*, 34, 90–103.

Gunn, B., Smolkowski, K., Biglan, A., & Black, C. (2002). Supplemental instruction in decoding skills for Hispanic and non-Hispanic students in early elementary school: A follow-up. *The Journal of Special Education, 36*, 69–79.

Haager, D., & Windmueller, M. (2001). Early literacy intervention for English language learners at-risk for learning disabilities: Student outcomes in an urban school. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 24*, 235–250.

Hiebert, E. H. (2005). State reform policies and the task textbooks pose for first-grade readers. *Elementary School Journal, 105*, 245–266.

Hsia, S. (1992). Developmental knowledge of inter- and intraword boundries: Evidence from American and Mandarin Chinese speaking beginning readers. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 13, 341–372.

Klingner, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (1996). Reciprocal teaching of reading comprehension strategies for students with learning disabilities who use English as a second language. *Elementary School Journal*, *96*, 275–293.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.

Lafrance, A., & Gottardo, A. (2005). A longitudinal study of phonological processing skills and reading in bilingual children. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *26*, 559–578.

Leafstedt, J. M., Richards, C. R., & Gerber, M. M. (2004). Effectiveness of explicit phonological-awareness instruction for at-risk English learners. *Learning Disabilities: Research & Practice*, *19*, 252–261.

Lesaux, N., & Siegel, L. (2003). The development of reading in children who speak English as a second language. *Developmental Psychology, 39*, 1005–1019.

Lesaux, N. K., Lipka, O., & Siegel, L. S. (2006). Investigating cognitive and linguistic abilities that influence the reading comprehension skills of children from diverse linguistic backgrounds. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 19*, 99–131.

Limbos, M. (2006). Early identification of second language students at risk for reading disability. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66* (10-A), 3566A.

Limbos, M., & Geva, E. (2001). Accuracy of teacher assessments of second-language students at risk for reading disability. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 34*, 136–151.

Manis, F. R., Lindsey, K. A., & Bailey, C. E. (2004). Development of reading in grades K–2 in Spanish-speaking English language learners. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 19*, 214–224.

McMaster, K. L., Kung, H., Han, I., & Cao, M. (in press). Peer-assisted learning strategies: A "tier 1" approach to promoting responsiveness to beginning reading instruction for English learners. *Exceptional Children.*

Meltzer, J., & Haman, E. T. (2005). *Meeting the literacy development needs of adolescent English language learners through content-area learning, part two: Focus on classroom teaching and learning strategies.* Retrieved from http://www.alliance.brown.edu/pubs/adlit/adell_litdv2.pdf

Mezynski, K. (1983). Issues concerning the acquisition of knowledge: Effects of vocabulary training on reading comprehension. Review of Educational Research, 53, 263–279.

Michaels, S., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1979). A study of sharing time with first grade students: Discourse narratives in the classroom. In *Proceedings of the fifth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (pp. 647–680). Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Miller, J. F., Heilmann, J., Nockerts, A., Iglesias, A., Fabiano, L., & Francis, D. J. (2006). Oral language and reading in bilingual children. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *21*, 30–43.

Morrison Institute for Public Policy. (2006). *Why some schools with Latino children beat the odds and others don't*. Tempe, AZ: Author.

Mumtaz, S., & Humphreys, G. W. (2001). The effects of bilingualism on learning to read English: Evidence from the contrast between Urdu-English bilingual and English monolingual children. *Journal of Research in Reading*, *24*, 113–134.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Perez, E. (1981). Oral language competence improves reading skills of Mexican American third graders. *Reading Teacher, 35,* 24–27.

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*, 246–256.

Quiroga, T., Lemos-Britton, Z., Mostafapour, E., Abbott, R. D., & Berninger, V. W. (2002). Phonological awareness and beginning reading in Spanish-speaking ESL first graders: Research into practice. *Journal of School Psychology, 40*, 85–111.

Rossell, C. H., & Baker, K. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English, 30*, 7–74.

Rousseau, M. K., Tam, B. K. Y., & Ramnarain, R. (1993). Increasing reading proficiency of language-minority students with speech and language impairments. *Education and Treatment of Children, 16*, 254–271.

Saenz, L. M., Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2005). Peer-assisted learning strategies for English language learners with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, *71*, 231–247.

Saunders, W. M., & Goldenberg, C. (1999). Effects of instructional conversations and literature logs on limited- and fluent-English-proficient students' story comprehension and thematic understanding. *Elementary School Journal*, 99, 277–301.

Saunders, W. M., Foorman, B. P., & Carlson, C. D. (2006). Do we need a separate block of time for oral English language development in programs for English learners? *The Elementary School Journal, 107*, 181–198.

Scarcella, R. (2003). *Accelerating academic English: A focus on the English learner.* Oakland, CA: Regents of the University of California.

Schleppegrell, M. J. (2001). Linguistic features of the language of schooling. *Linguistics and Education, 12*, 431–459.

Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language skills by children with low reading performance who used FastForWord language: Maps for Learning. *MAPS for Learning, 3*, 1–13.

Shanahan, T., & August, D. (2006). *Report of the National Literacy Panel: Research on teaching reading to English language learners.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Shanahan, T., & Beck, I. L. (2006). Effective literacy teaching for English-language learners. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth* (pp. 415–488). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Slavin, R., & Cheung, A. (2005). A synthesis of research on language of reading instruction for English language learners. *Review of Educational Research, 75*, 247–284.

Snow, C. E., & Fillmore, L. W. (2000). *Clearinghouse on languages and linguistics.* Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/ericcll/teachers/teacher.pdf.

Snow, C. E., & Fillmore, L. W. (2000). *What teachers need to know about language.* Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/resources/teachers/teachers.pdf.

Snow, C. E., Tabors, P. O., Nicholson, P. A., & Kurland, B. F. (1995). SHELL: Oral language and early literacy skills in kindergarten and first-grade children. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 10, 37–48.

Stahl, S., & Fairbanks, M. (1986). The effects of vocabulary instruction: A model-based meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 56, 72–110.

Swanson, H. L., Sáez, L., & Gerber, M. (2004). Do phonological and executive processes in English learners at risk for reading disabilities in grade 1 predict performance in grade 2? *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *19*, 225–238.

Townsend, D., Lee, E., & Chiappe, P. (2006). *English or Spanish? The efficacy of assessing Latino/a children in Spanish for risk of reading disabilities*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Reading, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

Uchikoshi, Y. (2005). Narrative development in bilingual kindergarteners: Can Arthur help? *Developmental Psychology, 41*, 464–478.

Umbel, V. M., Pearson, B. Z., Fernandez, M. C., & Oller, D. K. (1992). Measuring bilingual children's receptive vocabularies. *Child Development, 63*, 1012–1020.

Vaughn, S., Cirino, P. T., Linan-Thompson, S., Mathes, P. G., Carlson, C. D., Cardenas-Hagan, E., et al. (2006). Effectiveness of a Spanish intervention and an English intervention for English language learners at risk for reading problems. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*, 449–487.

Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., & Hickman-Davis, P. (2003). Response to treatment as a means for identifying students with reading/learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 69*, 391–410.

Vaughn, S., Mathes, P., Linan-Thompson, S., Cirino, P., Carlson, C., Pollard-Durodola, S., et al. (2006). Effectiveness of an English intervention for first-grade English language learners at risk for reading problems. *Elementary School Journal, 107*, 153–180.

Verhallen, M., & Schoonen, R. (1993). Lexical knowledge of monolingual and bilingual children. *Applied Linguistics, 14*, 344–363.

Verhoeven, L. (1990). Acquisition of reading in a second language. *Reading Research Quarterly, 25*, 90–114.

Verhoeven, L. T. (2000). Components in early second language reading and spelling. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 4*, 313–330.

Wang, M., & Geva, E. (2003). Spelling acquisition of novel English phonemes in Chinese children. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 16*, 325–348.

Wiley, H. I., & Deno, S. L. (2005). Oral reading and maze measures as predictors of success for English learners on a state standards assessment. *Remedial and Special Education*, *26*, 207–214.

Woodcock, R. W. (1991). *Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery-Revised*. Itasca, IL: Riverside.

Woodcock, R., & Muñoz-Sandoval, A. (1993). *Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey*. Itasca, IL: Riverside.