

Inclusion in the Languages Other Than English Classroom

María J. Fierro-Treviño
Assistant Director of Languages Other Than English
Texas Education Agency

In September 2002, I was involved in an Action Research Initiative sponsored by the Languages Other Than English Center for Educator Development (LOTE CED). Eleven participants selected topics of interest related to teaching about which they would pose a question, research an answer, and develop solutions to improve instruction and learning in their classrooms. I selected inclusion in the LOTE classroom for many reasons, but most importantly because of the current influx of special needs students into LOTE classes. Foreign language teachers struggle to find ways to teach students with special needs so that they can be successful language learners. Furthermore, Texas Education Code 28.025 requires that incoming freshmen of 2004-2005 graduate under the Recommended Program which calls for Levels I and II of a foreign language. This means there will be more special needs students in LOTE classrooms, and teachers will need to be better prepared to develop and carry out these students' Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). To accomplish this task, teachers will need to be even more highly skilled in their craft and more knowledgeable about special needs students.

In this brief, I outline a plan for helping foreign language teachers improve instruction and learning for special needs students. In the process, I discuss changes in the student population of foreign language classrooms and provide background information on the laws that led to the recognition of the rights of students with disabilities and that mandated their mainstreaming into regular education. I share personal reflections and encounters that I have had with special needs students during my teaching career, experiences with which many language teachers will likely identify. I present information gathered from a survey conducted as part of my research project on inclusion and LOTE and discuss the initial steps in a follow-up project begun by participants at the Texas Conference on Coordinating Languages in April 2003. Finally, I outline proposed future projects regarding inclusion in the LOTE classroom. I hope that as language teachers read this issue brief, they become more knowledgeable about inclusion and the laws regarding its implementation, feel better about teaching special needs students, and begin a working relationship with their special education colleagues to help make language learning a goal for *all* students.

Meeting Learners' Special Needs

LOTE Classrooms: Then and Now. I have been in education for 31 years, and like so many others who have been around this long, I have seen many changes. The field of foreign languages is certainly no exception. Foreign language education has made tremendous advances in all arenas: language instruction, textbooks, materials, name changes (languages other than English), and especially offering foreign languages to all students. Our classes have changed dramatically over the years from enrolling college-bound students with high grade point averages to including all students of diverse abilities in the language classroom. At the state level, LOTE is considered an enrichment content area, but because of the two-year language requirement for the Recommended Program and the three-year language requirement for the Distinguished Achievement Program, school districts often seek to promote foreign language study so that students can graduate with more than the Minimum Program. In reality, LOTE has become the fifth core

The Communiqué is published by the Languages Other Than English Center for Educator Development.

Editors:
Elaine Phillips
Chuck Reese

— Issue 9 —
June 2003

academic area for many districts along with English Language Arts, Social Studies, Science, and Mathematics.

When I began my teaching career, the situation was quite different. Students could only enroll in a foreign language if they had a grade of *B* in English and a recommendation from the English teacher or guidance counselor. The language teacher was not even included in the decision-making process. In my classes, I had mostly students who were high academic achievers, and although I do not recall a special education department, I do remember that we received a list from the counselors of those few students in our classes who were considered “slow learners.” We were advised that these students needed more time to do their work, but there was no special staff development for teachers, and there was no meeting between all concerned individuals to discuss the students’ educational plans. Teachers read their lists, made a notation to provide additional assistance, and moved forward.

During my second year of teaching, I had a student who required more attention, more time for daily work and tests, more explanation—more of everything. In addition to regular classroom instruction, the student came to my class almost every day before or after school for additional help. We reviewed the material orally and in writing and used as many hands-on activities as possible. She was a delightful student, and she tried very hard. Her mother wanted her to be a doctor, so she felt more than a bit pressured to be successful in her classes. One day, this student became so frustrated that she put her hands on her head in desperation and said to me, “Sra. Treviño, are you sure you know how to teach Spanish?” At first I was speechless but finally said to her, “Yes *hijita**, I know how to teach Spanish. I just need to find a way to teach *you*.” She ultimately passed my class with a C+ and was rightfully proud of her grade. I, however, was even more proud of the effort that she had invested to be successful.

As a second year teacher, this incident had a profound effect on me; I realized there was a very long road ahead. From that moment, I began to work with the administration and counselors to change the district regulations regarding student enrollment in foreign languages. Languages were not just for those college-bound students with a *B* in English, and these regulations were keeping many students from studying a foreign language: average students, native Spanish-speakers, and special needs students. This experience helped me to recognize that all students could be successful if given the right opportunities in the classroom to use their unique strengths.

**my little daughter*, a term of endearment used frequently with non-relatives considered close

Thirty years later, enrollment in foreign languages has increased to the point that many classes are overflowing, sometimes with 35 students or more. Most classes are heterogeneous, combining gifted and talented, average ability, native-speaking, and special needs students, and teachers are struggling to find the right combination of instructional strategies to help all of them be successful. The Texas Education Agency’s *TEA Snapshot for 2002* indicates that there were 339,270 gifted and talented students identified in Texas, or 8.2% of the student population. Special education data shows that 485,010 special needs students were identified in the same year. The high enrollment number in special education clearly indicates a need for specialized training so that teachers can help students with disabilities achieve their educational goals in the LOTE classroom and others. But although Texas Administrative Code 89.2 requires teachers of gifted students to complete 30 hours of special training with six hours of follow-up training each year, no such requirement exists for teachers who must meet the needs of students with disabilities. Teachers must seek out training on their own unless a district has a specific requirement for teachers regarding such staff development.

LOTE Learners: The Law and Compliance. The education of children with disabilities was first addressed in 1966 with the amendment of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) of 1965 which provided grants to states to help educate children with disabilities. In 1974, Public Law (PL) 93-380 required states to adopt a goal of providing “full educational opportunities to all children with disabilities.” In 1975, Congress enacted PL 94-142, the *Education for All Handicapped Children Act* which paved the way for federal funds to be used to ensure that students with disabilities were given equal opportunity to obtain an education. Each act included changes to improve upon previous acts so that special needs students could receive a free and appropriate public education. In addition, Congress addressed special education through the *Vocational Education Amendments* of 1968, the *Economic Opportunity Act* of 1972, the *Rehabilitation Act* of 1973, the *Higher Education Amendments* of 1972, and the *Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act* of 1974 (Turnbull and Turnbull, 1998).

In reviewing the list of early laws enacted to help children and adults with disabilities, I am astonished that my colleagues and I did not hear about them as we worked through our undergraduate studies in the 1970s and 1980s. There was no mention of them in our education courses or our student teaching; learning to work with special education students was simply not part of the education curriculum. If ESEA was implemented in 1965, why were prospective teachers not exposed to the law? During my student teaching, I did not encounter any

students with special needs in my classes, but I did observe that special education students in this particular district were kept separate from those in regular education—total exclusion. There were no integrated classes, no socializing at lunch among the two student populations. My first shock came when I saw some Spanish-speaking students mixed in with students who had been classified as mentally retarded. I inquired about their situation since the Spanish speakers did not seem to be developmentally delayed and was amazed to learn that they were considered “special ed” because they could not speak English! The mere fact that the students could not speak English because they had not been taught English classified them as retarded. The strong wake-up call I experienced upon learning of such policies made me question whether I wanted to pursue a career in teaching. In the long run, however, the experience made me even more passionate about pursuing education and eliminating such treatment of students.

The special education program in the school where I began my professional teaching career in 1972 was also totally exclusionary. The special education building was the one farthest from the main campus and, just as I had observed in student teaching, special education students were not allowed to mingle with regular education students. In fact, those students did not know what to make of this isolated group and, in some cases, were actually scared of them. This scenario was, no doubt, repeated throughout Texas and probably the nation. If PL 93-380 and PL 94-142 required states to give equal educational opportunities to handicapped and disabled children, why did we not see their implementation at the district level? I had begun teaching in a poor school district with obviously limited resources, and there were hundreds of districts in the same economic situation—as there are today. But economic difficulties did not excuse districts then—or now—from implementing the law, and there were many court cases to force districts to comply regardless of the funding available to them.

In fact, at that time, schools and teachers were not prepared to deal with students with disabilities. Most school districts did not have funding for special programs, nor were they compelled to address full education of special needs students when they were struggling to meet the basic requirements established for the regular education population. Administrators that did attempt to provide an appropriate learning environment for special needs students usually based their programs on conventional practices of the time. But more time and more conventional practice was not an effective prescription for students with various disabilities. What teachers needed, but simply did not have, were the necessary skills to help special needs students be successful in the regular education classroom.

As I reflect on my early experiences and look at the dates when many laws were enacted, I ask myself how so little could have happened over time. I was not an administrator having to make day-by-day decisions that affected all aspects of educational practice for hundreds or thousands of students, but I cannot help but wonder how many children fell through the cracks. What could have been done to provide the best possible education for all students? What kind of training would have helped teachers help special needs students succeed? These questions come too late for students that passed through the educational system in the years prior to true mainstreaming, but the answers can now be applied to ensure success for all students.

LOTE for All: An IDEA Whose Time Has Come. Even today, despite subsequent laws that have passed, students with disabilities continue to face discrimination in education. In an article in *Education Life*, Tracey Harden, the parent of a child with disabilities, says that “while inclusion gets a lot of lip service, it is one thing to say it, another to do it. Schools tend to be more accommodating of obvious physical problems than hidden problems like learning disabilities.” Nevertheless, according to Turnbull and Turnbull (1998), there are several factors that have contributed to positive changes in the education and treatment of students with disabilities. The first was a gradual change in ideology: “less able” no longer meant “less worthy,” a recognition that came about through a combination of legal, political, and human services doctrines. Second, the terminology used to describe those with special needs changed from the negative image evoked by “handicapped” to “persons with disabilities.” (As language teachers, we recognize that word choice *does* matter.) Third, scientists were able to show that persons with mental retardation are capable of learning different amounts of information in different ways. Fourth, technology advanced tremendously to allow the use of adaptive devices for disabled persons. Fifth, family leadership came to the forefront as families led the movement for better laws for the disabled. Finally, powerful leaders like President John F. Kennedy, Senator Hubert Humphrey, and Representative James Fogarty became advocates and brought these issues before Congress, helping pave the way for new laws.

In response to repeated complaints about discrimination against the disabled, Congress passed several entitlements.* In 1997, PL 105-17, the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA), was passed providing federal assistance to special needs students. In IDEA, Congress recognized 20 years of research and experience that demonstrates the education of children with disabilities can be more effective if:

*Entitlement refers to a benefit that a person can receive if the person qualifies by meeting certain standards of eligibility.

- there are high expectations for these children;
- parents and families have a stronger role in the educational process;
- local educational service agencies, state, and federal governments work together for the benefit of the students;
- these children are provided with the appropriate services and support in the regular classroom;
- there is intensive professional development for all personnel; and
- there is a focus on resources for teaching and learning.

Based on these research findings, the purposes of IDEA are:

- 1) (a) to ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for employment and independent living; (b) to ensure that the rights of children with disabilities and parents of such children are protected; and (c) to assist States, localities, educational service agencies, and Federal agencies to provide for the education of all children with disabilities;
- (2) to assist States in the implementation of a statewide, comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary, interagency system of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families;
- (3) to ensure that educators and parents have the necessary tools to improve educational results for children with disabilities by supporting systemic-change activities; coordinated research and personnel preparation; coordinated technical assistance, dissemination, and support; and technology development and media services; and
- (4) to assess, and ensure the effectiveness of, efforts to educate children with disabilities.

Furthermore, IDEA recognized the following categories as eligible for services (definitions from *A Guide to the Admission, Review and Dismissal Process*, 2002):

- a. Mental Retardation** (Educable Mentally Retarded) – Significantly sub-average general intellectual functioning existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior and manifested during the development period.
- b. Auditory Impairment** – Hearing impairment, permanent or fluctuating, includes any degree of hearing loss ranging from mild to profound resulting in a diagnosis of hard of hearing or deaf.

- c. Speech or Language Impairment** – Communication disorder, such as stuttering, impaired articulation, and language or voice impairments that adversely affects educational performance.
- d. Visual Impairment and Blindness** – Visual impairment includes any type of sight problem which, even with correction, adversely affects educational performance.
- e. Emotional Disturbance** – A diagnosis of emotional disturbance means that the student exhibits one or more of specified characteristics that are not the result of a temporary reaction to home, school, or community situations.
- f. Orthopedic Impairment** – A severe orthopedic impairment that adversely affects educational performance, including those caused by congenital anomaly, disease, or other causes.
- g. Autism** – A developmental delay that significantly affects verbal and nonverbal communication and social interaction.
- h. Traumatic Brain Injury** – A sudden injury to the brain caused by an external event, resulting in total or partial functional disability or psychosocial impairment or both that adversely affects the student's educational performance.
- i. Other Health Impaired** – Limited strength, vitality, or alertness, including a heightened alertness to environmental stimuli, that results in limited alertness with respect to the educational environment.
- j. Specific Learning Disability** – A disorder in one or more of the processes needed to receive, understand, or express information. The student can have difficulty with basic reading skills, reading comprehension, written expression, mathematics calculation, listening comprehension, and/or oral expression.
- k. Deaf-Blind** – Combination of hearing and visual impairments that causes severe communication and other developmental and educational problems.
- l. Multiple Impairment** – Multiple disabilities that occur in combination with each other and cause severe educational problems.

When faced with this potential array of disabilities in the classroom, what must go through the minds of teachers as they see the scores of faces looking back at them, many with special needs? Beginning teachers are struggling to learn the school routine and environment, attending required meetings and staff development, and designing lessons that engage all students. How can they manage 35 or more students as well as multiple learner variables? Veteran teachers may rely on instincts

developed over years of classroom experience to deal with students with special needs. They may even have participated in some staff development that enriched their knowledge of learning styles, learning disabilities, and teaching strategies. Still, interviews indicate a high level of frustration among foreign language teachers at *all* levels of experience, and most of this frustration stems from the lack of discipline-specific training in working with special needs students. The challenge facing teachers as they address issues of inclusion is one I recognize and seek to address through the research project discussed below.

Meeting Teachers' Special Needs

Step One: Inclusion Survey. Although school districts have been mainstreaming students for years, many more such placements have occurred since the implementation of IDEA. Districts have become more sensitive to students' educational and environmental needs, and curriculum specialists are working with teachers to improve overall instruction. Many districts are playing "catch-up" in providing access to school facilities since many school buildings were built years before accessibility became an issue. Special education funding has helped districts provide better educational opportunities for students with disabilities as they have been mainstreamed into the regular curriculum. But while funds have been used to develop curricula and provide staff development for teachers, it is challenging to meet the specific needs of every discipline. Because they work with limited staff development funds, districts must determine which training model can best be replicated by different disciplines at the campus level. It has been my personal experience and that of many respondents to the survey discussed below that most of the special education staff development is generic and not discipline-specific.

Although special needs students have been enrolled in LOTE classes for years, I wondered how successful we have been in teaching them? How successful have the students been in learning the foreign language of their choice? What can be done to help foreign language teachers meet the demands placed on them and help special needs learners? My first step in answering this question was to gather information on the current state of affairs. To that end, I developed a survey entitled *Inclusion in the LOTE Classroom* which was published in the *LOTE CED Lowdown (Vol. 6.1)*, a newsletter developed and distributed by the Languages Other Than English Center for Educator Development. The survey was also published in the *Texas Foreign Language Association (TFLA) Newsletter* and distributed at the TFLA Conference in Fort Worth in the fall of 2002. Teachers were asked to provide information regarding their teaching experience, their experience in teaching special needs students, their involvement in developing

IEPs and participating in Admission, Review, and Dismissal meetings (ARDs), formal special education training, and special education staff development specific to LOTE. Teachers were asked to list two or three learning disabilities of students they were currently teaching plus the accommodations and modifications they were using to meet the students' needs. The following is an overview of findings obtained from the surveys.

IEPs, ARDs, and Staff Development. The 148 surveys received by the initial deadline included teachers of Spanish, French, German, Latin, Japanese, and Chinese at the middle and high school levels, ranging from first-year teachers to those with over 25 years of classroom experience. Twenty-one of the 148 teachers had formal special education training while 62 teachers had received some staff development related to special needs students in the LOTE classroom; however, the length and depth of the staff development was not included for either category. Ninety-eight teachers indicated they had participated in ARDs, while 50 had not, even though 39 of the 50 had students with IEPs!

Learning Disabilities. On the survey, teachers listed all of the disability categories addressed by IDEA (see page 4). They mentioned students who were dyslexic/dysgraphic, had hearing, visual, and speech impairments, and were emotionally disturbed. Teachers also indicated they had students with attention deficit disorder, attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder, autism, muscular dystrophy, and Tourette's syndrome. Some students were physically handicapped, paraplegic, or had other health impairments. Noted also were students with severe depression; mental retardation; Down syndrome; obsessive/compulsive disorders; and disabilities in auditory processing, reading comprehension, written expression, and cognitive difficulty. Surveys indicated some students had low IQs and still others were performing below grade level and exhibiting low self-esteem. One shocking finding was that two respondents thought that having English as a second language was a disability!

Modifications and Accommodations. It was evident from the findings that teachers are still confused as to the difference between a *modification* and an *accommodation* for special needs learners. While it is important to note that these terms are not used consistently throughout Texas or the United States (*modifications, accommodations, and adaptations* are often used interchangeably), according to the Texas Education Agency's Special Education Division, a *modification* is something that a teacher does to modify the content, i.e., a *modification* of the TEKS as outlined by an IEP. An *accommodation* is what a teacher does to help the student that changes the learning environment, such as altered seating arrangements, use of large print

texts, or administration of oral versions of tests. The respondents' confusion of the terms was evident in that the same or similar activities were sometimes listed under both categories. *Modifications* listed included: use notes when taking a test, allow more time to finish work, give preferential seating, give more projects, highlight texts, assign less homework, give oral directions, assign peer tutoring, tape reading assignments, give shorter, modified tests, etc. Sample *accommodations* listed include: make special handouts, one-to-one instruction, modify tests, give more multiple choice tests, use manipulatives, change seating arrangements, pair reading, divide tasks into smaller segments, etc.

Legal responsibilities. According to responses on the survey, some teachers were not aware of their legal responsibilities regarding students with disabilities.* Other comments included: "I don't know the difference between a modification and an accommodation." "Large class size hinders special help for any student." "I often am at a loss. I do not understand what is expected of me for these students. Help me understand!" "I hear teachers saying such things as 'but this is a foreign language. If the student can't perform, he shouldn't be here.' We need to know what our legal responsibilities are, and how to fulfill them."

Conclusions. The variety and quantity of disabilities that teachers see on a daily basis can be overwhelming. Teachers are asked to comply with IEPs based on ARDs into which they have had no input. This is a critical omission because the teacher is ultimately responsible and legally liable for implementing the IEP and, therefore, should contribute to what the IEP outlines for the student in order to ensure his or her success. Obviously, for LOTE teachers to provide meaningful input into the IEP, they need to have discipline-specific training in recognizing appropriate accommodations and modifications for a variety of disabilities. Unfortunately, there are often not enough special education staff members to provide individual assistance to every teacher who has students with IEPs. Foreign language teachers need to initiate contact and should do so for their own benefit, as well as for the students. Jacqueline Turner, Coordinator for Instructional Programs in Corpus Christi ISD, tells

teachers that they can find support from occupational therapists, physical therapists, school psychologists, special education teachers, speech and language pathologists, educational diagnosticians, audiologists, and program specialists. Special education staff are not LOTE teachers and LOTE teachers are not special education specialists, so to provide the best possible learning environment for all students, deciding on an appropriate strategy must become a collaborative effort.

Step Two: Texas Conference on Coordinating Languages. In April 2003, the Texas Association for Language Supervision sponsored the 33rd Annual Texas Conference on Coordinating Languages (TECCL). The focus for this conference was *Inclusion in the LOTE Classroom: Promoting Success for Special Needs Students*. I had the honor of coordinating the program as an extension of my action research project and continuing the investigation and development of much needed special education materials for LOTE teachers. Ms. Jacqueline Turner graciously accepted an invitation to present a session entitled *Special Education in Any Language: Clearly Spoken Here!* In addition, Dr. M. K. McChristian, Director for Languages other than English and Mr. Steve Erwin, Director, Technical Assistance & Quality Assurance, Special Education Department, both from the Richardson Independent School District, agreed to present a session on *Creating the LD Friendly LOTE Classroom: Strategies for Success*. Though participants came to the conference with a range of special education training (or none), both presentations helped lay the groundwork for developing materials to help foreign language teachers work with special needs students. Participants were able to focus on special education issues and consider them from their perspective as LOTE supervisors and teachers.

The main purpose of the second day of the conference was to begin the development of a handbook for LOTE teachers to use when developing IEPs and writing their lessons. Participants used a template and worked in groups to develop a list of modifications and accommodations to address different disabilities and different skills (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) in the LOTE classroom. Eight disability categories were selected based on responses from the aforementioned survey as well as suggestions from the participants: emotional disturbance, autism, visual impairment, hearing impairment, orthopedic impairment, speech/language impairment, attention deficit disorder, and attention deficit/hyperactive disorder. Participants worked feverishly in developing modifications, sometimes pausing and wondering: *Is this a modification? Is this an accommodation? Is this strategy appropriate for this category of disability?* Jackie Turner continued as our facilitator, working with the groups in this draft development stage which was *not* an easy one!

*Special education programs in Texas implement federal laws like IDEA. To read more about the rules and regulations regarding special education programs for Texas students, visit the Texas Education Agency Web site at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us> and locate the Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 89, Subchapters D and AA and the Texas Education Code, Chapter 29, Subchapter A. For teachers new to the profession or who still struggle with why they must teach special needs students, these chapters explain how teachers must meet the new challenges and describe our legal responsibilities to special needs students.

Step Three: Follow-up Meetings. This summer, I plan to meet with a follow-up team of supervisors and teachers to continue developing the handbook. Consideration will be given to its format to ensure that the handbook is user-friendly, and additional disability categories will ultimately be included. Information pages outlining the characteristics of each disability will be followed by pages including appropriate modifications and accommodations for LOTE learners with that disability. Special Education teachers will be part of the group to guide the committee as they continue to write modifications and accommodations for the different learning disability categories. The material developed by the team in addition to the material developed at TECCL will be presented as a session at the TFLA Fall Conference in Austin this coming October. Participants will be asked to evaluate a draft of the handbook and to offer suggestions for additions to it. A final product will be printed and disseminated in the spring of 2004.

Future Initiatives. It never hurts to dream! Despite the budget woes that are affecting the state and local districts, it is my wish to continue to work with LOTE district coordinators and teachers to develop specific staff development modules that incorporate training in teaching students with disabilities. The LOTE Center for Educator Development has trained facilitators in various areas relating to the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills: curriculum development, performance-based assessment, rubrics, and Spanish for Spanish speakers. Though the LOTE CED will close its doors as of June 30, 2003, I hope that current facilitators and new recruits will carry the torch in providing staff development on teaching students with disabilities in the LOTE classroom. It is important to note that many districts have already begun to address this issue specifically for LOTE instruction and therefore will be able to contribute greatly to this endeavor.

In sum, it is clear to me that teachers want to do their job to the best of their ability. I believe milestones in inclusion can be achieved with greater collaboration among special education staff, LOTE educators, and administrators at the district, campus, and state levels. The task is not an easy one, but it can be done. Armed with the facts, discipline-specific training, the necessary strategies, and a positive attitude, LOTE teachers can be successful in teaching languages other than English to *all* students.

Questions for Reflection

1. Do I now have additional background that helps me understand mainstreaming of special needs students?
2. Am I aware of the laws and my legal responsibilities regarding the instruction of special needs students and implementing their IEPs?

3. Have I participated in the ARD for every one of my students for whom I have an IEP?
4. Do I know who to contact on my campus or at the district level for instructional assistance for special needs students? (List everyone who can assist you.)
5. Do I understand how my district addresses modifications and accommodations and how I should use them in the classroom?
6. What staff development is available at the campus, district, or regional (service centers) levels to assist me with special needs students?

References

- Fierro-Treviño, M. J. (2002). *Inclusion in the LOTE Classroom Survey*. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency (Division of Curriculum and Professional Development).
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997*, Public Law 105-17 [Online]. Available: <http://www.idea97a.org/law/law/idea97A.php>.
- Learning with Disabilities: A Mother's Journey*, Education Life, (April 2003). New York: The New York Times.
- Texas Education Agency. (2002). *Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) Data*. Austin, TX: Author.
- Texas Education Agency, Division of Special Education. (2002). *A Guide to the Admission, Review and Dismissal Process*. Austin, TX: Author.
- Tumbull III, J. R., and Tumbull, A. P. (1998). *Free Appropriate Public Education: The Law and Children with Disabilities*. Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.

Additional Resources

- LD OnLine* [Online]. Available at <http://www.ldonline.org/teaching/ellis/index.html>.
- McCarney, S. B. (1993). *Pre-referral Intervention Manual*. Columbia, MO: Hawthorne Educational Services.
- Shinsky, E. J. (2000). *Students with Special Needs – A Resource Guide for Teachers*. Lansing, MI: Shinsky Seminars.
- The Instant Access Treasure Chest: The Foreign Language Teacher's Guide to Learning Disabilities* [Online]. Available: <http://www.fln.vcu.edu/ld/conf.html>
- Understanding Learning Disabilities: How Difficult Can This Be? The F.A.T. City Workshop*. Harriman, NY: WETA Videos.
- Wood, J. (2002). *Reaching the Hard to Teach*. Midlothian, VA: Judy Wood, Inc.

As discussed in this brief, a teacher handbook of modifications and accommodations for different disabilities will be developed within the next few months. If you have successfully taught other languages to special needs students, I would like to hear from you. Please indicate which modifications and accommodations you have used successfully with the different learning disabilities that were mentioned in this brief. For example: *For an autistic student, I have modified the content (TEKS) by _____ and provided the following accommodation (environment) _____.*

Concerns regarding assessment and grading or questions you would like the committee to review may be e-mailed to María Treviño at mtrevino@tea.state.tx.us or mailed to her at TEA, 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, TX 78701. Please take a few minutes to make an important contribution to the handbook. Your input will be very valuable to the final product.

LOTE Center for Educator Development
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-3281
<http://www.sedl.org/loteced>

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE PD.
AUSTIN, TEXAS
PERMIT NO. 314